

for the missionaries to have a dispute and separate as Paul and Barnabas, and we have the modern example in Norton and Wharton.

Certainly when we send a preacher among the Jews we should circumcise him, for thus did Paul.

If Paul knows to-day the use made of his conduct and writings, and is of the same spirit he was on earth, he is rending his garments and tearing his hair worse than when the heathens brought out the oxen and garlands to offer him sacrifice. Just as there are many things then done which we are not to do now, so there are many things we may and should do now, that were not done then. We do many, why don't we acknowledge the principle throughout and thus be consistent. We have no account of the disciples building a meeting-house, but we build them. This gives rise to many things, that robust common sense and Christian forbearance must settle. Among these are location, style of architecture, furnishing, incorporation, trustees, &c., &c.

If Bro. Anderson does not know that these having been sources of strife and division he does not know much of the history of so-called Christianity. Even the subject of warming the house with a stove has been a subject of dispute because there was no *divine authority* for it.

In the assembling of the saints the virtue is not in the simple coming together, for as Paul says that may be for the *worse* and not for the *better*.

The means used for edification when together has been made a question of fellowship, and so has the kind of houses, &c. Now if Anderson means that the mere question of coming together because of the injunction, "neglect not, &c.," without regard to the *profit* of the coming together, I for one would never make it a question of the fellowship of a brother.

I think it makes no difference whether the early disciples cooperated together to preach the gospel, or whether the apostles instructed them to or not. If we can the more effectually preach by cooperating, then we should. This effort to find an example for a missionary society in the apostles' days, which if found would not suit our age is the chief cause of failure in our missionary enterprises.

The Lord will hold us to account for our opportunities and abilities

in the generation in which we live and not in the apostles' age. The work of the early church is done, whether well or not, our work is yet to do.

It seems to me that some scribes use the name of the Lord as talismanic. Why did not Bro. A. refer to my other quotation from Phill., where Paul says *whatsoever* is true, &c., &c. It seems to me he thinks a thing is true just because Jesus or Paul said it and not that they said it because it is true.

"Truth is truth wherever found  
On Christian or on heathen ground."

About singing—I contend as I did before—Jesus never taught one syllable with regard to it. It is true the disciples sang after they ate the supper; but it is also true that this was before the church and the same evening they ate the passover. Now if one is an authority so is the other. So we read also anciently of their playing on instruments, and Paul refers to it. Paul and Silas sang in the jail. Yes, Paul says in Col. 3: 16, to teach and admonish in psalms, hymns and spiritual songs. But does Bro. A. not know that there has been division over *what* we shall sing, &c., &c., and that music has won its way from psalm chanting to written music and human composition, from one part in music to many, from no method of pitching a tune to the tuning-fork and finally to the instrumental accompaniment?

Now there are some things we ought to know. It was just as proper and honest and necessary to compensate the man who preaches the gospel before Paul said it as it was afterward. So it was just as proper to praise God with song or instrument before Paul spoke about it as afterward. Why did he not tell the brethren at Rome just what he did those at Colosse if it was so very necessary to specify *just what* and *how* they must sing?

Now my brother admits the use of an instrument is not wrong, and well he may, for anciently it was used by God's approval, if he admits the Jewish system was of God. But he says what is right in one place may be wrong in another, and cites the Corinthian church. My brother does not surely think that the sin Paul rebukes was that the Corinthians brought their supper and ate it in a house which he calls the house of God, or that the whole church gathered together and eating supper would be a sin?

Paul rebukes them for eating to *gluttony* and drinking to *drunkenness*, and this for the Lord's supper. That would have been wrong anywhere. But did the disciples not hold meetings in their dwelling houses where they were accustomed to eat every day? There is an appropriateness as to time and place, but a thing that is *right per se* is never *wrong* any place and a thing *wrong per se* is never *right* any place. There is as much more that needs to be said about interpreting and applying Scripture which I must not take the space to say now.

One more thing I desire to refer to before closing. In my reference to officers I did not design discussing that question, neither do I now. I merely referred to it to illustrate the tendency to ecclesiasticism and then our desire to bolster up our view with the Bible to support our bibliolatry. With reference to the elders ruling—there is no such thing as ruling after the order of men with God. In other words God does not clothe or invest with authority some one who has not the qualification natural or supernatural for the position, and then make his acts because official right.

Jesus is the Savior of the world because in character and nature he necessarily can and will save all who come unto God by him, and not because he has been inducted into the official position because of his fitness in truth and verity. As to the deacon, I am making no war upon the office or official. I say it cannot be shown from the New Testament, because it is not in it, that there was a *servant* of the church having the official title of *diakonis*, whose duties were to pass the emblems, look after the finances, see to the poor, &c., &c. If those appointed at Jerusalem are referred to as an example then I say their work was special and soon ended, and those whose history we read afterward—Stephen and Phillip were then preaching.

When the contribution was sent to Jerusalem it was sent by apostles to the *Elders*.

The qualifications required do not seem especially necessary for the work we give the deacon, and nowhere else that I remember of is his work referred to, except where he has used the office well he has secured great boldness in the faith, and Paul in addressing the Phillipians addresses them with their Bishops and deacons. This is the

amount of the evidence that he was a part of the officary and in every congregation. But I forbear.

### BIBLE TALKS.

BY M. R. LEMERT.

NUMBER XVI.

Israel crossed the Jordan on dry land the tenth day of the first month, and on the 14th, at evening, ate the passover on the plains of Jerico, just forty years to a day after it was instituted in Egypt, the night they were thrust out by Pharaoh. The passover was a monumental institution, to be observed annually, after they came into possession of their land, and as it was eaten with unleavened bread, it became known as the feast of unleavened bread. This feast Jesus ate of, with his disciple, the night he was arrested. The next day after Israel kept the passover near Jerico, they ate of the old corn of the land, and the manna ceased—the manna which had been rained from heaven regularly six days of every week, for near forty years, fell no more. Israel had become used to miracles. That generation knew not what it was to live without the presence and aid of miracles. Having been delivered from Egyptian bondage and taken through the sea by miracles, they were then fed by miracles—bread and quails rained down to them; a flinty rock followed them and gave them water to drink; their clothes and shoes became not old by use, and a cloud gave them shade by day and light by night. So, for forty years, they were never without some miraculous manifestation of the fatherly care of God over them, as his people. But these things were not always to be; after getting into Canaan, where sustenance of all kinds abounded, their food, drink and clothing were no longer to be furnished by miracle, but in the ordinary way.

At first, miracles, great and astounding, were indispensable, to reveal God to Israel as the Almighty, the ever living One. Then his almighty power must often be exhibited in their behalf, to secure their confidence, and enable them to trust him always. He must first show himself to be their loving Friend, their Rock, a very present Help in time of trouble, before he could require them to trust in him. So, thus far, they had found the Almighty arm on which they had