

to settle the question if those who write on the other side would only give it a fair hearing and accept its declarations as final. But just here lies the whole difficulty. For example, among the neglected passages we find such as the following: "Let the women learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." 1 Tim. 2: 11-14. "Let you women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law." 1 Cor. 14: 34. That this Scripture is applicable there can be no question, for here Paul is talking of women speaking in the public assemblies or churches. Then why not let it settle the question? The language of Paul, "There is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus," is not to the point; and to make such a use of it is a manifest perversion of the Scriptures. The Apostle is simply showing, that instead of being justified by the law of Moses, the blessings of the gospel had come to all, so that the Jew, the Greek, the bond, the free, the male and the female, having all been baptized into Christ on the same terms, were all alike the children of God by faith in Christ; and in this sense they were one in him. But if the passage means that men and women were to be one in every sense, or placed on an equal footing in church and official work in every particular, then the women, as well as the men, could have been apostles, evangelists, pastors, teachers, etc., which we think is more than our Sister can show from the Scriptures. To intimate that any one would keep three-fourths of the church members "doing nothing," because they are women, is doing a great injustice to those who do not find in the Scriptures that women are to be placed on an equal footing in every particular with men. That there is a large field of usefulness for woman's work in the church, and that they largely occupied it in the days of the apostles by their zeal and faithful labor in the gospel, is true; but that they did this by claiming equality with men in every particular, and by making speeches and becoming public teachers in the churches, can not be shown from the word of God.

There is much in the article we heartily commend to our readers; but these unguarded expressions place woman's work in a false light before the world.

MORE CLERICAL NON-SENSE.

Two or three more preachers in New York city and Brooklyn are just now making themselves ridiculous as well as disgracing the cause of Christ by vigorously attacking the historic record of the Old Testament Scriptures. Prominent among the number we mention R. Heber Newton of the first named city and a leading divine in the Episcopal Church; Mr. Newton flippantly says:

"Perhaps Elisha's iron axe did swim upon the water. I am prepared to believe almost any thing after our spiritualistic mediums, and their expositors. Whether it did or did not concerns me no whit. I shrug my shoulders and read on. I can not make out the historical fact which was at the basis of the Red Sea deliverance; nor do I care much to make out this or any other Old Testament miracle. If I felt obliged to accept literally these stories, or to lose my faith in the voice of God which speaks through the men of the Bible I should care greatly. In the true view of the Bible I am delivered from solicitude about these traditions, and am under no constraint of credulity. Those who can believe the story of Elisha and the bears, or of Elijah's ascension into heaven, may; those who can not, need not; and both alike should read reverently their Bibles, not for these tales of wonder, but for the still small voice of the eternal spirit sounding through holy lives and holier aspiration, until He come whose life was the Word of God, the Wonderful."

Now is it not a little strange that after such language as this Mr. Newton is willing to accept the New Testament miracles! He does not care to make out any Old Testament miracle; yet he accepts those of the New Testament as standing apart from all other miracles, and instead of being contrary to law, are in harmony with all the forces of nature in her manifestations! Then he strangely overlooks, or intentionally avoids the fact that the connection between the two Testaments is complete—that the historic value of the New depends largely upon the miraculous element and historic accuracy of the Old. He "can not make out the historical fact which was at the basis of the Red Sea deliverance;" yet the apostle Paul refers to it as

a fundamental fact of which he would not have his brethren ignorant. According to Mr. Newton one may believe the story of Elijah's ascension to heaven, or he may not; yet the same Old Testament about whose miracles he is little concerned declares that God tood Enoch, and Paul confirms the fact by stating that God translated him that he should not see death. Is the one story any more difficult to believe than the other? What nonsense! Does it require any greater effort to believe that Elijah ascended to heaven than to believe that he appeared in glory on the mount of transfiguration and taked with the Savior? Is it any more unreasonable that Elisha's axe should swim than that Peter should walk on top of the sea? Is it any greater marvel that the Red Sea should be divided by the miraculous hand of God through Moses than that Tabitha should arise from the dead at the command of Peter, or that Lazarus should come forth at the word of the Master? Or is the story of the creation and the fall given in Genesis any greater miracle than the resurrection and the ascension of Jesus?

Our candid opinion is that when a minister of the gospel treats the Old Testament as Mr. Newton and his school are now doing, it is only a matter of time when they will deal in like manner with the New Testament Scriptures. Then would be arguments are only so many stepping stones down grade from faith in God and in the Bible to avowed Atheism. They commence with a timid denial of the first chapter of Genesis and close with a bold denouncement of the last chapter of Revelation. Or from another point of the compass, they begin by wishing there were no hell, and end with declaring there is no heaven. At first the idea of a personal devil is rejected, and at last the doctrine of a personal God is a myth. When will these leaders of the people learn the difference between independent Biblical criticism and the popular esthetic bosh of the pulpit.

THROWING DUST.

When the apostle Paul was declaring his conversion to the people of Jerusalem, his enemies cried out, "Away with such a fellow from the earth, for it is not fit that he should live;" and they "cast off their clothes and threw dust into the air." This seems to be the chief cry and

business of the *Pacific Christian Advocate*. That paper can dogmatically assert infant baptism in the household of the jailer, and denounce immersion; but when politely asked for the proof, it can only cast of its clothes and throw dust into the air. Here is its reply to our unanswerable proof texts and criticisms:

"The CHRISTIAN HERALD does not vouch for the truth of the silly story it told about a Methodist class-meeting. We hardly believed it would when we put the question to it, but still it was, and is, a wonder to us what motives can influence a paper to publish such caricatures, which amount to misrepresentations, of the doctrines and practices of other churches. As it cannot be devotion to truth, it must be an intense and blinding sectarianism. As to our declining to fill the *Advocate* with controversies about doctrines or practices that have received the sanction of perhaps seven tenths of the believers in the Bible since the days of the Apostles, and do to-day, we certainly have no apology to make to the HERALD. And that is all.

Any thing to cover up and evade the main issue. Why does the *Advocate* pass over our column and a half of criticisms and Scripture arguments and raise the silly question about the class-meeting? The question is not whether such a class-meeting ever actually occurred or not, but whether or not infants were baptized in the jailer's household and whether the jailer was immersed instead of sprinkled. Is the class-meeting of more interest to the *Advocate* than the question under consideration and the Scriptures that bear an it? Besides, we did not pretend to vouch for the truth of the story, as our contemporary knows; but distinctly stated, "As the account runs. We told it only as it come to us, and for this much we vouch. But our recollection is that it was told as a fact, and hence we would not feel justified in calling it in question. But whether true or not, the *Advocate* knows that it fairly illustrates the Methodist argument for infant baptism, and for this purpose only we used it. Any child can see that the whole drift of the illustration was to show that the only argument intelligent Methodists pretend to offer for infant baptism in the Scriptures is logical inference. Hence we deny that the illustration misrepresents any doctrine or practice of the M. E. Church as stated by the *Advocate*. And now to put this matter to the test, we ask that paper definitely, Has it any argument to offer for