

the single purpose of setting the garbled extract from McGarvey's Commentary in its true light before our readers. In the next paragraph following the one from which our contemporary quotes, Bro. McGarvey says:

As a practical issue between the advocates of weekly communion and their opponents, the question really has reference to the comparative weight of evidence in favor of this practice, and of monthly, quarterly, or yearly communion. When it is thus presented, no one can long hesitate as to the conclusion; for in favor of either of the intervals last mentioned there is not the least evidence, either in the New Testament, or in the uninspired history of the Churches. On the other hand, it is the universal testimony of antiquity that the Churches of the second century broke the loaf every Lord's day and considered it a custom of apostolic appointment. Now it can not be doubted that the apostolic Churches had some regular interval at which to celebrate this institution, and seeing that all the evidence there is in the case is in favor of a weekly celebration, there is no room for a reasonable doubt that this was the interval which they adopted.

Now in conclusion we would like for the *Signs* to promptly answer the following plain questions:

1. Was it the custom of the primitive Christians to observe the weekly communion?
2. Is such an observance at the present day in harmony with the Christian religion?
3. If so, what good reason can be offered for not following the example of the primitive churches?
4. If not, what was their custom in reference to the communion?

THE WASHINGTON CHURCH.—In reference to the completion of this church-house the *Christian Standard* says:

Within six weeks \$8,000 must be paid out, which will complete everything except the furnishing of the house. They are pushing the work on to completion, on the faith of subscriptions that have been made, and of the good will of such brethren as have been waiting until they were sure the enterprise would not collapse. That point has been reached. Failure is now out of the question. The house will be completed in a little while. It is all-important, therefore, that all who have subscribed shall redeem their pledges without further delay, and that all who wish to share in this noble enterprise send in their contributions at once, either to the brethren in Washington, or to Joseph Smith, Jr., 207 W. Seventh St., Cincinnati, who is the treasurer.

Brethren, let us round out this work promptly and handsomely, for the honor of the cause we serve, and for the sake of the brethren in Washington, who are in need of instant assistance. Let it be completed without a dollar of debt remaining, and it will be an honor to our brotherhood. Don't forget—*within six weeks* this money must be had. It is an anxious time with the building committee—the real tug of war before final victory. Let us meet the issue manfully. We hope our papers generally will call attention to this matter, and publish the financial statement that appears in our columns this week.

LITERARY THIEVERY.—We have once or twice called attention to a certain characteristic of modern journalism which can scarcely be regarded in any other light than downright thievery. We should like to know by what kind of reasoning anyone is justified in appropriating literary matter without proper credit? By common consent public journals are allowed to republish articles from other journals, or make extracts from books to a reasonable extent, provided the proper credit is given to the authors. But we do not believe anyone can justify religious journals especially in using other people's brains without the slightest recognition of the true authorship. Nor do we believe that the moral character of this question is at all changed because the matter appropriated is clipped from foreign journals. The absence of any international copyright law affects only the legal aspects of the case, but from a moral point of view no appropriation of literary matter can be allowable unless the authorship is distinctly recognized. And yet several religious journals known to us not only indulge in the questionable practice referred to, but not unfrequently use the quotations in such a way as to create the impression upon the reader that they are original with the papers in which they are republished. We cannot look upon this small business without feeling that it ought to be severely rebuked.—*Christian Commonwealth*.

All the Luthers and Wesleys who have pioneered great reformation, and all the missionaries of Christ who have invaded the kingdoms of paganism, have had to endure night-watching and sleepless work before God opened to them the gates of the morning.—*Theo. L. Cuyler*.

Original Contributions.

ECCLISIASTICISM.

CHRISTIAN MISSIONARY.

Dear Bro. Floyd:

I see you deem it your duty to put in a caveat against Christian Missionary. This is the province of "ye editor." I am perfectly willing to have my articles criticized, but I would like it done in a fair and candid way, and not by the mere cry of *heresy*. I 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. Webster defines ecclesiasticism—a strong attachment to ecclesiastical observances, privileges, etc. He defines ecclesiastic—a person in orders, or consecrated to the service of the church and the ministry of religion; a clergyman; a priest. Now we give to these words even a stronger meaning. I said there was no ecclesiasticism in the New Testament. I said the remnant we had was a cherished idol. Now while I don't want ecclesiasticism or idols in the church, I did not say one word against elders and deacons. Now you will pardon me if I say that I am so obtuse as not to see how this is a remnant of Papacy. It would rather seem to me directly opposed to the Papacy, which is the grandest ecclesiasticism on earth. Maybe it serves better to cry *Papacy* and *dangerous*. Now if you will allow me to state my position, it is this: When *diakonis* is applied to a particular class of servants in the New Testament it refers to ministers of the gospel, and that nowhere is our *modern deacon* described at all. Still we have need for a variety of servants, among these what we call *deacons*. We also need trustees, clerks, etc. Now God hath set everyone in the body as it hath pleased him. If there is one suited to the work of a bishop, deacon, trustee, clerk, and the church, recognizing this fact, sets him apart to this work, we are simply in harmony with the will of God. If the church chooses a person to do a certain work who is unqualified, it is not in harmony with the will of God. And in neither case does the setting apart confer qualification, authority or power. Now this is just the position I combat. It seems to be the view among us, as with the church

of Rome and all her daughters, that when one is placed in official position a certain power attaches by virtue thereof. It further seems to be the idea among us that the New Testament was given for the purpose of ecclesiasticism.

I commend right here to the reader of this: Matt. 20: 25-28. And while the New Testament is composed of many books each written for a certain purpose and complete in itself we bind them together and attempt to get a body of doctrine, to make an ecclesiasticism for all the ages.

You say: "The tenor of the brother's whole article is to the effect that the members of every church are to *decide for themselves* what suits them best and then act accordingly." I never said anything about *suiting* ourselves. But certainly it is the province of the individual as well as congregation to decide as best he may what is the will of God, and this is "the glory of Protestantism; and whether that will is embraced in a set of formularies for all ages, or whether it is comprehended in great principles of life, I pledge myself to show that some things that have the greatest sacredness with us, have no divine foundation upon which to rest.

In speaking of washing feet and the Lord's supper, you say as much in fact as that one is a church ordinance and the other not. Will my dear brother cease to use the language of Ashdod, for which he seems to have such a hatred? Does he not know that neither the *language* nor *idea* of church ordinance is found in the New Testament? Did not Jesus institute both? Did he not tell his disciples to do both? Yes must be the answer to both questions. Did the disciples not do both? Yes again. Why did one cease to be observed and the other not? Simply because while the *principle* of each is of universal application, the *manner* of showing forth one principle was local, temporary; the manner of showing forth the other is universally appropriate. But today Christians are quarrelling over washing feet—whether it shall be done by the double or single process—while the world is dying without Christ.

Pleasure may be aptly compared to many great books, which increase in real value in the proportion they are abridged.