

to Peter nor to any other apostle; neither Peter nor any other could delegate this authority to any other.

Now, we conclude from the foregoing, that if there had been such a thing as apostolic succession there could not possibly be our Lord's authority in it. For our Lord retains His authority in full all the time. "He is head over all things to the church which is His body."

But we wish to notice in the next place, that as our Lord's authority covers the whole ground of authority; so, obedience to Him covers the whole ground of obedience.

The apostles were obedient to Christ, and taught all men everywhere to obey Him. In obedience to Christ the apostles proclaimed the Gospel "for the obedience of faith among all nations." Obedience to the apostles' teaching is obedience to Christ. Those who obeyed the Gospel obey Christ. He is the great King. He sends forth His commands by His apostles, and all men have a right to obey Him. Children who are obedient to Christ are obedient to their parents. Men who are obedient to Christ are obedient to magistrates and to all others placed in authority over them; for obedience to Christ covers the whole ground of obedience. And loyalty to King Jesus covers the whole ground of loyalty.

J. B. WALLACE.

### "THE FELLOWSHIP."

That the fellowship is an act of Christian worship may be seen in Acts ii. 42. "And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching, and in fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers." (N. V.) If the teaching, and the breaking of bread, and the prayers, are acts of worship—as all admit—so must the fellowship be—as it is—an act as equal and as distinct as the others. If there is any reason or authority that will exclude one, the same reason will exclude another. If we should omit the fellowship we would not dare to chide others if they should omit the breaking of bread, as one omission would be culpable as the other. We should not condemn in others what we allow in ourselves. The apostles continued *steadfastly* in these four acts of worship. If they attended once a week in the apostles' teaching and in prayers, they also attended to the fellowship and breaking of bread the same. The plain construction of the language shows that one act bears the same relation to the work steadfastly as the other. There is no possible way to make it read that the apostles continued once a week in teaching and in prayer, and once in three months in breaking bread and in the fellowship. The same authority that makes teaching and prayer necessary worship on the first day of the week makes the fellowship and the breaking of bread equally necessary. The order of their worship in which they continued steadfastly includes the four acts; to destroy or omit or change one of them destroys the order of the worship on the Lord's day. We might as well omit the act of repentance or baptism in the order of conversion as to omit one of these acts in the order of worship. We complain when we find baptism expunged from the commission. We earnestly contend for all the commands in order to obtain the blessing. Why should we omit one in the order of worship? Why should the church expect a blessing, if, when they meet on the Lord's day, they omit the fellowship? We believe the practice of the apostles and early disciples was the breaking of bread on every first day of the week. Luke records the fact in Acts xx.: "On the first day of the week when they were gathered together to *break bread*, Paul discourses with them." But there is no need of further proving this point, as the thought before us is the fellowship, and that this with the breaking of bread must stand or fall together. If we neglect the fellowship on the first day of the week,

do we not practically admit the correctness of the position of those who neglect the breaking of bread every Lord's day? If we can omit the fellowship and be safe, can't others omit the breaking of bread and be safe?

We are compelled to admit that to neglect or omit the fellowship in our Lord's day worship, is unscriptural and anti-scriptural, and therefore unsound, and any who will neglect this must not condemn others for neglecting other acts of worship, least they condemn themselves.

But what is the fellowship? An act of worship is something done. What is done when we attend to the fellowship? In Cor. viii. 4, we see the fellowship was "the collection of the churches in Macedonia." This agrees with Paul's injunction to the church in Corinth, as recorded in 1 Cor. xvi. 1.: "Here they were to lay by in store, as they were prospered, upon the first *day of the week*." This agrees with what has been said on Acts ii. 42. But to show that the fellowship is the collection, we refer to Rom. xv. 26. The same circumstance here called contribution, is called collection in 2 Cor. viii. 4. We find also the same Greek word that gives us contribution in Rom. xv. 26, gives us fellowship in Acts ii. 42. We find the same original word in Gal. vi. 6, but is translated communicate—"Let him who is taught in the word *communicate* unto him who teacheth in all good things." These passages, with others, show that the fellowship is a plain, definite act, and not a feeling only of mutual love and sympathy. The act of contributing our means to the support of the church. Mosheim, in his Ecclesiastical History, says that often the disciples attended to the apostles' teaching and the prayers and the sacred supper, they manifested their mutual love by their liberality. Dr. Wm. Smith, in his Dictionary of the Bible, gives the fellowship as one of the conditions of church communion, making it an act of public worship.

This fellowship or contribution was also an act of worship under the Law. In Deut. xvi. 9, 10, we learn that a freewill offering was brought and given to the Lord when they came before Him. In Exodus xxiii. we find they were not to appear before the Lord empty. "Every man shall give as he is able, according to the blessing of the Lord thy God."

The propriety of this order of worship is seen in the necessity of the case. It is right because the Lord gave it. It is right also because it is necessary. The cause of God in all ages of the world needed funds as much as it needed tongue. He who supposes the worship and service of God is acceptable without this element has studied his pocket more than his Bible.

It is safe to say that a healthy, prosperous condition of the cause of Christ is impossible where this duty is neglected. The system of begging the Lord's children to support His cause, to do their duty, is about equal to begging them to pray. Strange, indeed, that we would pray because some friend was anxious about it. Equally as strange that we would be induced to give only because some one is begging it from us, or because some one is needy. This system destroys the motive of our service and brings into disrespect the Church of Christ. We bring our offerings to God because we love Him and His cause. In this we show our love and appreciation of His love and mercy toward us. The same motive induces us to give that induces us to keep the feast of His love. We see, to-day, in the violation of this sacred Divine order of Christian worship, a weak, unhealthy condition of the churches in many localities. Now we see the few burdened and discouraged.

But let the Divine system be established in every church, then we would see none burdened, but God and His cause honored and all the wants of the

cause met—no paupers in the churches or among the preachers.

Some may say "that this being the Divine plan, it is therefore wrong to give in any other way or at any other time." This conclusion cannot be deduced from the premise. Would it be wrong to pray at other times and places because it is right to pray on the Lord's day in the regular worship? The conclusion is this:—That giving, like prayer, is part of the worship and in the regular order of worship, and must be heeded in order to make the worship of the Lord's house acceptable to God.

H. MURRAY.

## THE FAMILY.

### WHEN YOU'RE DOWN.

BY B. B.

What legions of "friends" always bless us  
When golden success lights our way!  
How they smile as they softly address us,  
So cordial, good-humored and gay.  
But ah, when the sun of prosperity  
Hath set, then how quickly they frown,  
And cry out, in tones of severity,  
"Kick the man; don't you see he is down?"

What though when you know not a sorrow,  
Though your heart was as open as day,  
And your "friends," when they wanted to borrow,  
You obliged, and ne'er asked them to pay.  
What though not a soul you e'er slighted,  
As you wander about through the town,  
Your "friends" become very near-sighted,  
And don't seem to see when you're down.

When you are "up" you are loudly exalted,  
And traders all sing out your praise;  
When you're "down" you have greatly defaulted,  
And they "really don't fancy your ways."  
Your style was "tip-top" when you'd money,  
So sings every sucker and clown,  
But now, 'tis exceedingly funny,  
Things are altered "because you are down."

Oh, give me the heart that forever  
Is free from this world's selfish rust,  
And the soul, whose high, noble endeavor  
Is to raise fallen men from the dust.  
And when in adversity's ocean  
A victim is likely to drown,  
All hail to the friends whose devotion  
Will lift up a man when he's down.

### THE PLAIN TRUTH.

"If the working people of this country want to know why they have hard times every few years, we can tell them. It is not over production nor under consumption, as these phrases are commonly employed. If they had kept the \$900,000,000 they spend every year for strong drink in their pockets for the past five years of good times, the present temporary lull in manufacturing and business activity would find many of them able to bear it without being pinched for the necessaries of life. It is not the over-consumption of food and clothing in this land of liberty and liquor. The annual bill for bread, meat, cotton and woollen goods of this great American people foots up to a total of about \$1,250,000,000. But its annual bill for whiskey, beer, and taxes thereon, is \$1,400,000,000. In other words, it unnecessarily drinks \$140,000,000 worth more than it necessarily eats and wears. And the people who commit this folly every year are amazed that once in a few years they are hard up, and some of them want to hoist the communistic red flag and destroy everybody else's property, because they have wasted their own share of the national substance in rye juice and other riotous fluids."—*Boston Traveler*.