

the deep waters and over the rough seas. While this language perhaps, had a special application, it nevertheless comes to every Christian bearing the sweet consolation of heaven. It is not only physical suffering through which Christians must sometimes pass, but it is mental, moral and spiritual as well. The frowns and scorns of the world must be endured, the cunning and malicious serpent of gossip will drive his poisonous fangs into the innocent Christian, while the fierce and unjust attacks of designing and godless men and women must be met and overcome with the courage of the true soldier. This will all cause more or less suffering. But when the thought fully comes home to us that it is all for Christ, we glory on this behalf, thank God and take courage.

Selections and Comments.

FAITH AND OBEDIENCE. — A writer in the *Central Baptist*, St. Louis, Mo., writes an article on "Faith and Obédience," from which we clip the following:

1. We often speak as if Christians are saved by faith only, and not through faith that "worketh by love," and purifies the heart. We seem to forget that faith is made perfect by works—by "the obedience of faith"—and thus all righteousness is fulfilled and made complete. Hence, Jesus said to John the Baptist, "Thus it becometh us (by obedience) to fulfill all righteousness." But we seem to separate what God hath joined together, and speak of faith—saving faith—as if it could exist, without its consequent—obedience. James says: "Faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone;" therefore true faith and obedience thereto must go together in the work of salvation, for without faith it is impossible to please God, and faith without works is dead, and consequently inoperative and useless.

2. Mark 16:16, says, "He that believeth (hath faith) and is baptized, (obeys that faith) shall be saved." But we are not authorized to say he shall be saved, whether he obeys, and is baptized or not.

Thirty years ago this would have been strange doctrine to appear in a Baptist paper; but now it can go in without even a word of comment from the editor. This looks a good deal like baptism for the remission of sins which our Baptist brethren have so earnestly opposed all along, and if the writer of the above paragraph should prove able to escape this conclusion we should regard his theological feat as another wonder of the world. Let the good work go on.

HEAVY LOGIC!—Dr. A. M. Collins has been writing a good deal of late on wine in the communion. He has said some good things and some things that are not so good.

His last contribution is to the *Christian Standard* from which we clip the following paragraph. He says:

It is a fact that can never be explained away by "Oriental poetry," or in any other way, that wine is condemned and that wine is approved. All this talk about the use of wine being approved and its abuse being condemned, is mere twaddle; it is the sheerest nonsense, it is dodging the question, it is bosh. It is wine that is said to be a mocker, not its intemperate use; it is wine that is said to be a deceiver, not the excess of wine; it is wine that is said to bite and sting; it is wine that is said to produce woes, wounds, contentions, babblings, redness of eyes, etc., etc. On the other hand, it is wine that is said to be a gift of God (tirosh); it is wine that is said to cheer the heart of God and man; it is wine that is said to contain a blessing.

If there is any more "twaddle" and "bosh" about the thing our brother so severely condemns than is found in this paragraph, we pity the cause it advocates. Dear brother, will wine be a mocker to any one if it is not used? Will wine deceive any one if it is not used? Will wine bite and sting any one if it is not used? Will wine produce "woes, wounds, contentions, babblings, redness of eyes," etc., if it is not used? On the other hand, will the Dr. tell us how wine will "cheer the heart of God and man" and "contain a blessing" if it is not used? In getting away from one error let us not swing into another equally absurd.

BASE-BALL ON SUNDAY. — The *New Northwest*, of Portland, comes back at us on this fashion for our little note of her display advertisement, on the editorial page of a match game of base-ball on the Lord's day:

The *Christian Herald*, of Monmouth, saw in the NEW NORTHWEST a base-ball advertisement, and straightway asked:

"Are we to understand that base-ball on the Lord's day, in which gambling is not a stranger, is one of the planks in the "Woman Suffragists' platform?"

This is about as sensible as the *Herald's* previous references to Woman Suffrage. With equally good (or bad) taste, we might ask, after noting several advertisements of patent medicines in the *Herald*, if aiding quacks to defraud the public is a part of the creed of the

Christian Church. We hope our contemporary can see the point.

When our fair sister convicts us of advertising that which we know to be demoralizing to the community and a sin in the sight of God, we pledge ourselves to clear our columns of all such; and if we fail to do so, she is at perfect liberty to set down demoralizing the community and defrauding the people as a plank in our platform. Can we expect as much of the *New Northwest*? From the following advertisement which appeared on the editorial page of the last number, we leave our readers to judge:

NEW THIS WEEK.

BASE-BALL!

Stars vs Portlands.

SPECIAL MATCH GAME,

At City View Park,

NEW SUNDAY, JULY 15, AT 2:30 P. M.

The New Team, McElroy and Kragen, will play with the Stars.

CHURCH RAFFLINGS.—The *Domestic Journal*, Springfield, Mass., has this to say about church rafflings which we fully indorse:

Church rafflings and lotteries have for the most part, we are happy to say, become things of the past; but there are some relics of these still remaining in some of our churches, that ought to be buried with the grab bag and games of chance. We refer to the bed quilt mania. It is sometimes some other article, but the bed quilt seems to be the most popular in this line. Some would be Dorcas gives a bed quilt; two or three prominent members of the church are mentioned as candidates for the honor of receiving the prize, and the friends pay a dime or a quarter for the privilege of counting a vote in favor of their candidate. By such cunning devices a few dollars are diverted from the pockets of the people into the treasury of the church. The plan is less objectionable than the lottery it is true, but it is one that is not creditable to the church of God, and the sooner it is consigned to the oblivion of the past the better.

WOMAN-SUFFRAGE.—Once upon a time one of their orators was led to exclaim: "Shall Senators tell me in their places, that I have no need of the ballot, when forty thousand women in the city of New York alone are earning their bread at starving prices with the needle?" In reply, Gail Hamilton (Miss A. M. Dodge), one of the brightest

and most gifted writers of the nineteenth century, and a believer in the abstract right of woman-suffrage, says:

But what will the ballot do for those forty thousand women when they get it? It will not give them husbands, nor make their thriftless husbands provident, nor their invalid husbands healthy. They can not vote themselves out of their dark, unwholesome sewing rooms, into counting-rooms and insurance offices, nor have they generally the qualifications which these places require. The ballot will not enable them to do any thing for which their constitution or their education has not fitted them, and I do not know of any law now, which prevents them from doing anything for which they are fitted, except the holding of government offices. I can think of no other occupation, which the right of suffrage will open to woman, and of public officers the number must be, in proportion to population, insignificant.

"WE WOULD SEE."—Under this heading the *Signs of the Times* says:

We have no disposition to interfere in any controversy between the *Christian Advocate* and the *Christian Herald*, Disciple, of Oregon, but we have a request to make of the *Herald*. In its indictment of the M. E. Church, it says:

"In this church the Lords table is set quarterly, whereas the Scriptures require it weekly."

We have no little anxiety to learn where in the Scriptures that requirement may be found. The *Herald* makes a strong profession of strictly conforming to the Scriptures, and we are certain that we wish to do so. Now we will conform to that particular Scripture of which it speaks as soon as we are informed where it is.

Prof. McGarvey is a man highly esteemed among the Disciples as a teacher, a preacher, and an author. In his "Commentary on the Acts," he says:—

"It must, in candor, be admitted that there is no express statement in the N. T. that the disciples broke the loaf every Lord's day."

Now as there is no commandment that they should do so, and no express statement that they did so, that is, there being neither precept nor precedent, how is it to be known that "the Scriptures require it?" We wait for an answer.

We would ask the *Signs* how he know that females have any right at all to commune?—for there is "no command that they should do so and no express statement that they did so." When the *Signs* answers this question we will tell him how we know the Scriptures require weekly communion.

But we give the above extract for