

it except the Christian church, which appears to be quite strong. The College has been changed somewhat into the form of a normal school, and it is in a very prosperous condition. If we mistake not there are in attendance at the present time over two hundred pupils. During the few days we have been here we have had the pleasure of attending some of the exercises in the "chapel," and also in the classrooms, and are much pleased with them. Their methods seem to us to be excellent. The order is so complete that every thing works like clock work; and yet there is in the school none of the stiffness we sometimes have seen in other schools. The students all march to and from their recitations to the beat of the drum and seem to enjoy it hugely. M.

Monmouth, Nov. 9, 1883.

THE REFORMATION.

On the tenth day of this month was the four hundredth anniversary of Martin Luther, one of the greatest reformers the world has ever known this side of Christ and the apostles. As the eyes of the Protestant world are just now being turned towards this great man and his work, it is fitting that we also should give an expression of our appreciation of what he has done for us; and we only have time and space for one lesson. It is not simply Luther as a man, but Luther as a reformer, we wish to notice. In doing this we are not set for the defense of Protestantism as such, but only so far as it is found to be in perfect accord with the teaching of the New Testament. Protestantism is the state of being protestant against the Church of Rome; and the term protestant was originally applied to Luther and his followers because they solemnly and earnestly protested against some of the doctrines, practices and decrees of the Pope and the Roman Catholic Church. Although Luther was a monk and in sympathy with the Church, yet his righteous indignation was aroused at the wicked and blasphemous traffic in indulgences. The following circumstances, says his biographer, led to the traffic. "The Roman Catholic Church maintained that the saints, during their life on earth, had accumulated a treasury of merit because of their good works; that they had done more good than they were obligated to do. This surplus might be used for the benefit of sinful men who

had accomplished less good than was needed for their salvation. The Pope claimed that he had received authority from God to draw from this reservoir of merit, and to apply it to those who had shown themselves worthy by their sorrow and repentance. But soon sorrow and repentance were dispensed with, and matters were satisfactorily arranged by the use of money. Thus arose the so-called traffic in indulgences, which has proved to be a source of great revenue to the popes." This was too much for Luther, and hence, on the 31st of October, 1517 he nailed to the door of the Castle Church, Wittenberg, Germany, his famous theses, written in Latin and which read as follows:

"A Disputation to set forth the Virtue of Indulgences. Actuated by love and by a desire to bring the truth to light, a disputation will be held at Wittenberg, concerning the following theses, under the direction of the Reverend Father Martin Luther, Master of the Liberal Arts and of Sacred Theology, and authorized Teacher of the same. Therefore it is requested, that all who cannot be present in person to discuss theses may do so in writing. In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen."

Here was really the beginning of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century. Here stood the man who dared to rebuke the Pope of Rome. War was not only declared, but was actually carried on until the voice of liberty was heard throughout the civilized nations of the earth, and the whole Protestant world could inscribe "victory" on their banner.

While then Protestants should praise God and thank Luther for the great and noble work that has been done, they should not lose sight of the important fact that the work of the Sixteenth Century has not yet been completed. This is the lesson we wish to impress on our readers. Luther's work was emphatically a reformation. His great object was to reform the Church of Rome, and doubtless never once thought of going back of her and restoring Primitive Christianity in all its purity. Just at this point is where above all else, we as a religious body of people should take up the line of march and proceed towards Jerusalem. While our work is largely a reformation, it is more properly a work of restoration. We propose to go back of all popes, creeds, confessions of faith, and sectarianism and denomination-

alism in all their forms and take our stand along with Christ, the apostles and the primitive churches and accept their faith in all its purity and their approved practices without charge. Here is opened to our view the grandest field of Christian work; here, we hold, is the only true basis of Christian union. Let us then like Paul of old, forgetting those things which are behind, press toward better things in the future, remembering that our work of restoration is not yet completed.

Selections and Comments.

BAPTIST LOGIC (?)—A Baptist brother in the *Christian Index* caps the climax of his argument against baptism for the remission of sins with the following:

Now, if "baptism is essential to salvation," then water saves; but if water saves, where is the glory of Christ's death and resurrection? Nay, where is the necessity of the atonement?—where is the glory of the Holy Spirit who regenerates the soul? If water saves, our faith is not essential, anybody and everybody can be saved by being simply baptized! Why, let us baptize everybody, that all may be saved!

This is a fair sample of the logic (?) employed by those who write against the Scripture teaching of baptism. "If baptism is essential to salvation, then water saves!" The writer could just as truthfully have said, if faith is essential to salvation, then faith saves; or if repentance, prayer or confession is essential to salvation, then repentance, prayer and confession save us! Does this writer believe that these essentials actually save any one? If so, then according to his own logic, "where is the glory of Christ's death and resurrection," and "where is the necessity of the atonement." If it be said that the Scriptures attribute salvation to faith, we answer that the same can be said of baptism, for the apostle Peter says, "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us." These essentials are all placed on the same spiritual plane, and they all save in the same sense. We do not understand that there is any virtue in any of them to save the soul, for that is in the blood of Christ which alone cleanses from all sin; but these are all simply condition, on which God, through Christ, proposes to meet and save the sinner. This Baptist brother is evidently a quarter of a century behind his own brethren.

A DIFFICULT TASK.—Bro. Errett, of the *Christian Standard*, is having a hard time of it on account of the Island Park ordination, a thing which to our mind was altogether unnecessary to say the least of it. To make out his case he denies that Barnabas was a member of the church at Antioch when he was ordained, and thinks his membership was still at Jerusalem. In answer to this point, Bro. F. G. Allen, of the *Old Path Guide*, makes the following pointed reply:

We know that Barnabas had been laboring with and for the church in Antioch considerably over a year at the time of the ordination. See Acts 11:19-30. 12:25. 13:1-3. The accepted chronology makes it three years. The presumption is that Barnabas would not have labored with this church that length of time without becoming indentified with it. To reason that his membership was still at Jerusalem, because there is no account of his removing it, is no reason from the silence of Scripture. If Barnabas was a member of the church in Jerusalem at the time of the ordination, no one knows it to be a fact, and no one can prove it. Hence, Bro. Errett's position here is simply an assumption not susceptible of proof.

But we are not left simply to inference in this matter. The text says, "Now there were in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas," etc., Acts 13:1. Here it is asserted that Barnabas was in the church at Antioch. His relation to the church, as here expressed, is precisely that of the other prophets and teacher, and Saul. They were all in that church. If in the church doesn't mean in its membership, we are curious to know what it does mean. If Saul and the rest were in the church at Antioch, so was Barnabas. The best authorities make them the officary of the church, as we shall hereafter see. In this capacity they could not act without membership. Hence, Barnabas was a member of that church.

The text of the revised version is even stronger: "Now there were at Antioch, in the church that was there, prophets and teachers, Barnabas, * * and Saul."

When Bro. Errett performs the oft attempted task, of proving that "in" doesn't mean in, but round about somewhere in the neighborhood, he may get Barnabas out of the church at Antioch; but then he would have to out Herod Herod himself, to get him as far away as Jerusalem.

THE MORALIST.—In an able article on "The Great Evil," the *Christian Intelligencer* thus speaks of the moralist:

Men living where the light of God's Word shines brightly, where