

order them in quantities, they could readily dispose of them to their friends. Prices: Cabinet size 25 cents, Panel size 75 cents, sent by mail to any address. For large orders, address the artist for rates, etc. Send money by postal note, postal order or in registered letter. Address all communications to the artist, Prof. G. W. Sittler, Springfield, Missouri, who will give his prompt attention to the filling of your orders. Don't fail to send for these fine photos at once.

One of the greatest hindrances to our work on this coast is the habit of many of our sisters and brethren in connecting themselves with denominational churches and sending their children to their Sunday-schools. It is astonishing to us that good brethren can not see and feel the evil effect this habit is having on our plea for primitive Christianity. Because there is no church where you may chance to locate which is satisfied to be known as simply the church of Christ, is that any reason why you should commit spiritual adultery by repudiating the authority of Christ and identifying yourself with a sectarian body? Does that make you any more of a Christian than you are, or give you any advantages of working for Christ which you do not already possess? But is it not true on the other hand that, by such an act you compromise your plea and lend your influence to the up-building of sectarianism and other unscriptural and injurious doctrine and practices—all of which you believe to be positively sinful? No Christian man or woman has any right to thus forsake the Lord and the brethren. If all are right and it is simply a matter of choice in uniting with a church, then the sooner we abandon our plea and join some of the denominations, the better. But if we are advocating and defending the doctrine of Christ and his apostles, then the Lord will hold us guilty for compromising these grand principles for the sake of sectarian affiliations or popularity. There is no neutral ground in this matter; it is to be on the Lord's side, or against him. If any one is a child of God and is providentially deprived of the association of his brethren, he is none the less a Christian and a member of the one body on that account, provided he does his duty as best he can under the circumstances. Let all such be true to their calling. As for sending our children to the

denominational Sunday-schools, we are fully satisfied that in many places it is doing more to weaken and destroy our peculiar plea than the continued opposition of all the denominations on the coast. While the children are sent to their schools, it is useless to object to their becoming members of their churches. When will our brethren fully realize this fact?

When the New York *Independent* in a lengthy article on the "Power of the gospel," argues that the successful ministry of our Savior and his apostles was largely due to the influence of the Holy Spirits with which they were richly endued, it is evidently quite right. But when it draws the conclusion from this fact that the gospel to be preached now, is a "message that is to be accompanied with power, and that not natural power, but the supernatural energy of the Holy Ghost working in and with the minister of the gospel," it speaks without the evidence of either the Bible or of experience. We had an idea that the apostles were supernaturally endued with the Holy spirit that they might be able to reveal the will of God to the world and fully demonstrate their mission by the miracles they did; but since the gospel revelation has been completed and we have the same words that were preached, heard, believed and obeyed in the days of these inspired men, we fail to see the evidence or necessity for a supernatural energy of the Holy Ghost to accompany the preaching of the modern proclaimer. Our contemporary further says: "Not only is the ministry of Jesus characterized by the presence and power of the Holy Ghost, but it is the purpose of God that all the ministers of the gospel, who beseech men as though God did beseech by them, should be similarly endowed with power. Therefore we find Jesus during his ministry training his disciples in the way of ministry and power, by sending them forth to preach the gospel and giving them power over devils and disease."

Now is it not a little strange if God intended that all his ministers through all time should be endowed similarly to Jesus and his apostles that we do not occasionally see some demonstrations of that "power over devils and disease?" We should remember that the day of miracles has passed, and hence all

the energy of the Holy Spirits put forth in the conversion of sinners is to be found in the word of God, and that this gospel faithfully preached and accepted is God's power unto the salvation of the world.

DID PAUL BAPTIZE?

In the first chapter of first Corinthians, and in the seventeenth verse the Apostle Paul says: "For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel," and this statement has been used by some as an argument against the doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins. We have before us a letter from a brother in Oregon in which he says that in conversation with a minister of the M. E. church, South, the position was taken that the apostle never baptized any one, because Christ sent him not to baptize, but to preach the gospel. We are asked for an explanation of the passage. We supposed that in this enlightened age and country a Methodist preacher, nor one of any other order, could hardly be found who would not be heartily ashamed to still urge this objection to the design of baptism; but it seems that there is at least one who has made but little progress in biblical knowledge for the last thirty years. This preacher doubtless accepts Paul's language in the same connection in a literal sense, which says, "God hath chosen the foolish things of this world to confound the wise." But as in all probability foolish objections will be made to the teaching of the Bible till the millennium, so we continue to explain.

Now suppose it should be admitted that Paul never baptized any one, does it therefore follow that baptism is not for the remission of sins? So far as the record goes, our Savior in person did not baptize any one during his ministry, for "Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples," John 4: 2, yet the baptizing was done all the same; and this baptism was for the remission of sins. See Mark 1: 4; Luke 3: 3. So we might argue in reference to Paul. If the baptizing was done, it was immaterial who did it, and this transfer of the administration from Paul to some one else would not affect the design nor invalidate the act in the least. It was necessary that the baptizing be done, whether by the apostle himself or through some one else did not matter; and that the people where he preached and established

churches were thus properly baptized is unquestionable. Besides, if this objection is worth any thing it may be urged with as much force against baptism itself, as against its design; for if the apostle paid no attention to baptizing any one, not being sent to baptize, but to preach the gospel, and our Methodist brother follows his example, why does he baptize at all? Why not argue that he is simply sent to preach the gospel! This would soon put an end to the unscriptural practice of infant sprinkling. We insist that he follow the example of Paul; and if he does so he will not only baptize the people, but he will baptize them into Jesus Christ, and in doing this he will bury them with their Lord in baptism and raise them up to walk in newness of life. Rom. 6: 3, 4.

But did Paul baptize? He expressly states that he baptized Crispus, Gaius and the household of Stephanas. Hence that he *did* baptize is a settled fact unless we impeach the divine Spirit. Would the apostle raise his hand and in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ do that which he had not sent him to do? That Paul fully knew the will of his Master in this matter is beyond doubt; and if it was not the will of Christ that he should baptize all, why did he do it? While the apostle received a special call from the Lord, yet he was laboring under the same great commission as were the rest of the apostles. But that commission commanded them not only to preach the gospel to the people, but to baptize them also, and the promise was, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Hence Paul was only doing what the commission required him to do on all proper occasions, either in person or through some one else. So when he says Christ sent him not to baptize, but to preach the gospel, it is evident he does not mean that he was not to baptize at all, but that he was not sent to baptize only, but to preach also. Or perhaps that his chief business was to preach the gospel while others were to do the baptizing. Paul did not thank God that he had not baptized any one, nor that baptism was a "non-essential," but that he had baptized none of the Corinthians, except those mentioned. And he gives as a reason for this, "Lest any should say that I had baptized in mine own name." The Corinthian church was divided over