

Head, the Holy Scriptures as our rule, and love as the bond of union, uniting all our members in one body, of which Christ is the Head.

The principles adopted by the Evangelical Alliance, of which you have given your readers a copy in the last *Tribune*, sound and good as they are, have caused a diversity of opinion, and clearly show that they will never gain the end which we have in view. If ever all evangelical christians are united in one communion, I verily believe it will be upon the three principles I have named, and by adopting a name free from all sectarian bias. THE TRUE CATHOLIC CHRISTIAN CHURCH is the best I can think of. True, because founded on the word of God—*Catholic*, universal, not sectarian—*Christian*, followers of Christ our Lord and Master. By setting up separate communions, from which many as good as themselves are excluded, some well meaning Christians are unconsciously disobeying the commands of Christ, who expressly desired that all his followers should be one.

Another great error, into which some sections of the church have fallen, is their becoming the followers of men instead of Christ. The will of our Lord is, that we call no man *Master* on earth; and yet this is daily done by many of his professed followers. The two evils I have noticed, namely, sectarianism and man worship, I believe to be great hindrances to the progress of the gospel, and one great reason why the Spirit of God does not operate more powerfully, either upon the churches at home, or missionary stations abroad.

I have still much to say on these subjects, but I dislike long articles myself, and so, I have no doubt, do many of your readers. I shall be glad to hear more of your own mind on the important subjects I have thus brought before you.

Yours respectfully,
W. B.

20th. August, 1855.

REMARKS.

The interest manifested by the venerable author of the foregoing letter, in relation to the cause of Christian Union, is well calculated to stimulate younger ministers to increased activity and zeal in seeking its promotion. Conscious of being profited by his earnestness, the conductor of the *Tribune* would shrink from controverting the opinions of one so much his senior, were it not for the open frankness of manner in which it is solicited.

It is intimated that a union organization might now be ushered into existence, less influenced by sectarian views and feelings, and less clogged with a sectarian name than has ever been the case heretofore.

But it may well be asked, what name could be less sectarian than "*Brethren*"—"Disciples"—"*Christians*"? And who could be more free from sectarian views and feelings than the founders of these respective sects? As numbers, however, rallied around

each of these names, partizanship soon made its appearance; so that even at this early stage of their existence, they are seldom if ever viewed in any other light than as sects, and often, apparently, as fully if not more deserving of the name than any of their predecessors. In view of making still another effort to secure Christian union by a new organization, it is proposed to call it "*The True Catholic Christian Church*," overlooking the fact that thousands of devoted Christians consider it very wrong to call an incorporation of churches a *church* under any circumstances, contending strenuously that such an use of the term *church* is grossly unscriptural, inasmuch as it is never used by the sacred writers in the singular, except when either speaking of a particular company of believers wont to assemble in one place, or when referring to the body of Christ, *the church* of the living God; the plural being invariably used in every other case, as, "*the churches of Asia*," &c. The new name proposed, is therefore not so good as some that have been already tried, and which have nevertheless utterly failed to preserve the communities adopting them from becoming sects. Indeed, it may now be safely assumed, that it is quite impossible for any church organization to adopt a name that could in any degree diminish the *certainty* of its becoming a sect. So clearly apparent is this fact, that some churches are now trying the experiment of doing without a name—they have been trying for years, but, as might be expected, the longer they try the more difficult it becomes. When a child is first born, it can do for some time without a name, but when it begins to act outside the sphere of babyhood, its actions necessarily become more and more intermixed with the doings of others, who will on that account have occasion to speak of it more and more frequently, so that the necessity of the new actor's having a short and specific name of easy utterance, will be ever increasingly felt till it can be no longer dispensed with; and then, unless the parents furnish their offspring with a name suited to their taste, the public will furnish one suited to its own taste, which will probably be expressive of some defect instead of suggestive of some excellency; and hence it is much to be regretted that the necessity of bestowing a name should ever be thrown upon the public. And the conclusion may be considered perfectly warranted, that it is not in the power of a name or the want of a name to prevent a christian organization, if it lives and prospers, from becoming a sect; and hence that it is the duty of every Christian who would promote union, to seek it not by entering into new organizations, but by liberalizing and uniting those already existing. If wrong in these conclusions, the light which will make the wrong manifest is most earnestly desired. A communication from W. B. on this subject, although four times the length of his last, will not be considered too long for insertion in the *Tribune*. The subject well deserves a careful examination.