

May I be kindly permitted to suggest that most people do not find it necessary to think of those subordinate organizations as being anything apart from the Church, outside of the Church, or opposed to the Church, but rather as part of the Church. Those who oppose such organizations seem to base their opinion on the idea that the Church is a crystallization, so that, however much it may increase in size, it can never change its form. Those who favor those organizations believe the Church to be not a dead crystal, but a living organism, so that, though it cannot change in its essential nature, it may expand and take on new growths in harmony with its own nature and purposes. It is, indeed, true that Christ established a visible kingdom in this world, and it is equally true that He did not complete the organization. The Church had no system of theology, no officers of any sort, until long after the ascension of Christ. It was the apostles, especially Paul, who developed the theology of the Church, appointed its officers, and established its polity. Furthermore, it cannot be proved that there is a church on earth to-day that is organized exactly after the New Testament model. The diacönite as now interpreted was not known in the apostolic age. The ordination of ministers, either by a bishop or an ordaining council, is a modern invention, as well as many other things that the various denominations claim to be of scriptural origin. I fail to find in the New Testament any such ironclad notion of the Church as our brother lays down with such decisive authority. In the same chapter from which he quotes (Eph. iv.), as well as in the twelfth chapter of first Corinthians, Paul certainly makes ample provision for a division of labor, showing how God had given, not only apostles, prophets, and miracle-workers, but also teachers, help, governments, etc. Just what those helps were no one knows, but if a Sunday-school or a Christian Endeavor society, a Ladies'

Aid or a mission circle can help, then by all means let it be organized, just as Paul, when he felt the need of help, appointed deacons to look after the poor. I cannot see how the unity of the Church is affected by these societies any more than the unity of a school is affected because it is divided into classes and departments.

Again, how can the local church perform the work of education and foreign evangelization? Are not our Christian colleges and academies the property of the churches? Are not our great missionary societies and our boards of education parts and parcels of the churches? And yet our brother, if he is logical, puts them all under the ban together with the Sunday-school and all reformatory organizations. Mr. Campbell truly says in his article on "The Mission of the Church," that its mission is threefold — evangelistic, educational, and sociological. Therefore it follows that the Church must organize boards of education and missionary societies, as well as hold revival meetings. The Church must go into society, into politics, into everything that concerns human welfare; and it is the glory of the Church that it is flexible enough to do all these things without losing its unity or its divinely constituted form. As the vine has a perfect right to grow, and in growing to add new branches and run over the wall and bear grapes on the other side, where the poor and needy and suffering ones may gather them, so has the Church a right to grow, and in growing become more complex and carry blessings through multiplied channels to a dying world. And all this because the Church is not a dead machine, but a living organism.

PRESTON K. SHELDON.

WATKINS, N. Y.

#### "English Undeified."

WHILE I cannot but admire the zeal of our good Canadian Brother Fenwick for the purity of our common mother-tongue, I very much fear that the task