

ren of Seattle wisely had an eye single to this fact in selecting their lot. Their house is neither large nor expensive, but is said to be one of the neatest in the city and will meet all present demands, and is so constructed as to have additions built to it as soon as practicable. Its size is 28 by 44, and has a seating capacity of about 200. The lot was a donation of one of the congregation, Bro. Denny, and the house was built at a cost of about \$1200. The brethren have managed to pay the entire cost of building with the exception of perhaps \$400, which debt they hope to settle in a short time. Bro. Bruce Wolverton has been employed to preach for the church one half of his time and will enter upon his work on the 2d Lord's day in this month, at which time the house will be formally dedicated. While it will require a strong and constant effort on the part of the brethren to build up a flourishing congregation, yet we think the outlook is very encouraging. The brethren are at peace among themselves, are very hopeful and zealous, and indeed we see no reason why they should not move right on to victory. We expect to hear good reports from this church.

We made our headquarters in the pleasant home of Bro. Benedict, and it is only necessary to state that Bro. and Sister Benedict know how to make a preacher and his wife feel happy and enjoy life. We also "broke bread from house to house" with other sisters and brethren during our stay, among whom we mention Bros. Osborn, Littell, McDonald and Denny. Bro. J. W. Osborn is one of the first members who came to the city and he has taken a very active part in collecting the members together and organizing them into a church as fast as they have moved in and could be found. Our week's visit at Seattle was a very pleasant one indeed, and one long to be remembered by us, for in such cheery company as that of sister Littell, and other like congenial spirits, it is hard to see how it could be otherwise. We are under obligation to them all for their Christian kindness and liberality to us, and we hope at some future time to be privileged to meet again with these good brethren.

WOMEN IN THE CHURCH.

A few weeks ago we had occasion to write two articles on "Woman's Work in the Church." The editor of the *Christian-Evangelist* with

other able writers were discussing the same important question. About that time the following editorial note appeared in our neighbor, the *Pacific Church News*:

Some of our exchanges are discussing the old hackneyed theme of Women speaking in the Church. It is astonishing how terribly scared some people are that women will exercise some privileges that don't belong to them. The discussion of this question, it seems to us, can result in no good. Our experience is that no man can prevent a woman from speaking that wants to, and no man can make her speak if she don't want to. We read that "in Christ Jesus, there is neither Jew nor Greek; bond nor free; male nor female, but all one in Christ." This is true, I suppose, when it comes to hard work; there women may and do take the lead often, but when it comes to speaking a tender word to her brethren and exhorting them to good works; when it comes to lifting up her soul in prayer in the presence of her brethren, though her words may be as the burning coals from the altar of God, and her petition as sweet incense that is pleasing in his sight, because she is a woman, it must not be permitted. The "Lords of Creation" must exercise these exclusive rights and privileges. We talk about Scripture contradictions. If Paul taught the proscriptive doctrine in reference to women, as it is claimed by some, then, indeed, we have a teaching from an inspired apostle, that is not only opposed to other plain passages, but to the whole spirit and genius of the Christian institution.

We saw this note, which was evidently intended partly for our benefit, soon after its publication; but thought it demanded no serious attention from anyone. We now give it not because of any argument it contains, but as a sample from some writers on that side of the question who too often manifest a greater desire to exercise their own opinion about the matter and allow the women to do as they please, rather than follow the plain teaching of the divine Spirit. According to the opinion of our "experienced" brother it is now in place for Bros. McGarvey, Johnson, Garrison, Bruner and other able writers to close their investigation of this "old hackneyed theme," because it "can result in no good," and the brother's experience is that no man can prevent a woman from speaking that wants to, and no man can make her speak if she don't want to! We thank God, however, that the time has come that something more than a little ridicule is required to induce all Christians to

disregard the teaching of the New Testament and the practice of the primitive churches in reference to this matter, or to deter true men of God from placing the subject in its proper light before the people. Until the subject becomes too "hackneyed" for the apostle Paul to handle, we shall feel proud of our company. The idea that anyone desires to prohibit women from speaking simply because they are women, is too crude to require more than a passing mention. It is because of the reverence we have for the Word of God that we desire to follow it, not in preventing women from speaking, but to have them both speak and work at the right time and in the right place. But the following to an exchange written by Bro. L. B. Wilkes, of California, who stands head and shoulders above his preaching brethren of that State in scholarship and Biblical knowledge, so fitly speaks our sentiments on this subject that we take pleasure in giving it to our readers. He says:

In the *Church News* for July 1 find an article from the pen of some graceful writer, on what he calls "the old hackneyed theme of woman speaking in the church." He says: "It is astonishing how terribly scared some people are that women will exercise some privileges that don't belong to them." * * * Again the brother says: "Our experience is, that no man can prevent a woman from speaking that wants to, and no man can make her speak if she don't want to." The brother's experience is, I would suppose, of but small account in the discussion of this question. With the speakers and writers of the Christian Church the rule, that we speak where and as the Bible speaks, and are silent where the Bible is silent, needs not to be reargued now. In sectarian churches, where men make the rules, it may be sound doctrine for women to speak in the church. But in the Church of Christ, where the voice of God decides all questions, and the voice of strangers is not heard, it is not so. I am aware that some good and prominent brethren in the Christian Church think that women may, of rights, speak in the church; but so Paul did not hold, if I understand him. 1 Cor. xiv: 34.

Paul says, "Let the women keep silence in the churches, for it is not permitted them to speak," etc. The writer of the article referred to is requested to look at this statement of Paul's, and see if it is not in the flattest and severest kind of conflict with what he wrote in the article alluded to. If it shall be said that this text may be explained, my reply is, yes, it may be explained; but no explanation is a correct one which leaves women full permis-

sion to do what Paul says they are not allowed to do, in the churches. This statement of Paul's is not an accident or error; it is not an isolated remark of his on this subject; nor is it an obscure or equivocal statement. There is no objection, of moment, at the translation. At the thirtyfifth verse, he says, "For it is shameful for a woman to speak in church."

Now whether a "man can prevent a woman from speaking" in the church or not, is a matter of no great concern to me; but it is a matter of deep concern to me that, as it seems, God is not able to stop or suppress this woman-speaking mania in the churches. Whenever the charm of a soft, plaintive, stammering, delicate female voice in the church is of more force—has more head and heart logic—over the "lords," or ladies either, of creation, than the word of God has, the outlook in that quarter is not hopeful for the church of God. This error of which we speak is not alone; it is "e pluribus unum." In the same nest is hatched a large brood of errors, all having for their differential attribute a "I don't care" manner of dealing with the word of God. A man once tried to convince a woman, who had got religion, that her view of Bible teaching was wrong, and so he proceeded to quote what Peter says. She answered: "I don't care what Peter says; I 'recon' I've tried it." So Mr. Beecher replied when asked for his authority for infant baptism. He said: I have no authority, in the Bible, for infant baptism; but I have some better than that; I have tried it, and find that it works well. So, his idea of what works well supplies all the omissions of the Bible, and suppresses all the objectionable features of that book made by Him whose foolishness is wiser than men. L. B. W.

Selections and Comments.

ON PROBATION.—The *Pacific Christian Advocate* says:

Rev. S. Mathew has just closed a protracted meeting at Rooster Rock of more than four weeks continuance. Sixteen united with the M. E. Church on probation. The most of them were truly converted and the most of them were heads of families. He baptized and organized them into a class and set them to work.

"Then they that gladly received his word were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." Acts. 2: 41. Did these unite with the M. E. Church on probation?

THE FORCE OF EXAMPLE.—The *A. C. Review* gives us this note on the force of example:

Two ministers, meeting in a country store a young man recently married, asked him to treat to cigars, which he did, and the min-