

ADDITIONS AND SUBSTITUTES.

In the April *CHRISTIAN* appears an article headed "Substitutes," by our esteemed Bro. Murray, in which reference is made to my letter in the March number. This was a private letter to Bro. M., who courteously replied, kindly answering my questions (all but one) in consecutive order, and saying, "I agree with you in all of your questions;" also proposing, if I had no objections, an investigation through *THE CHRISTIAN*. Being aware of some diversity of sentiment among the brotherhood of the Provinces, I could not in fairness object to investigation through the ostensible organ of said brotherhood. Agreeing to this proposition, I allowed him to publish my letter, stipulating at the same time that I would forward his answer for the next issue. It has not appeared. But an article on "Substitutes" has—somehow—got substituted; and I am somewhat disappointed, as I wanted to rub off some of the "salient points."

In the article before us, Bro. M. has fused all of my questions into one of his own, and answers that. Thus, "The question plain to be seen is that of 'substitutes,' *i. e.*, 'Is it not wrong to adopt, or to encourage the adoption of other plans as substitutes to the Divine plan, and thus destroy the Divine plan, and retard the return to apostolic order?'" This, although in quotation marks, is not my question. I wrote, "Is it right to adopt, or encourage the adoption of other plans in place of, or in addition to it?" Bro. Murray's answer to this was, "Most emphatically, No!" A question not of substitutes only, but of "*additions and substitutes.*" Now if those things in question are used in place of, or in addition, to the "Divine plan," they are pronounced wrong by Bro. M. and by the Book. Please stick a pin right here.

In his article on the "Fellowship," Bro. M. has shown that we have a prescribed "Divine plan," ample to meet "All the wants of the cause." The apostolic methods are among "the things which are written in the Book." But a morbid craving for something new takes possession of us (some of us), and like Israel, we want to be "like all the nations." So something new is *invented* or *borrowed*, and added to or used for the same purpose as that which God has given. Some new and novel plan must be added to the Divine plan of contributing our money to the support of the cause. Bro. M. says, "Yes, it is wrong to adopt anything human *in the place* (mark the italics) of the Divine." Webster and Worcester both define "place" to mean *office*. Then anything human used *in the office*, that is, for the same purpose as the Divine, is wrong. Are none of the things or plans in question thus used? Are not Christians working through some of these things instead of through the church, to do the legitimate work of the church? Of course they are; and if so they are adopting human things *in place of the Divine*. Another pin here.

You have shown the Lord's plan of contributing our money for the support of the cause is to give on the first day of the week as the Lord has prospered. That this "Divine plan" is ample to meet all the wants (financial) of the cause, none dare deny. It collects all the Lord enables to give. Wisdom Divine ordained this plan. It is sufficient. Then why invent another; why substitute or add a human plan? This Divine plan, let it be noted, will collect all that can be given for the love of God or for the sake of the cause. All given from any other motive is an abomination to the Lord. Hence any side show to draw money; anything outside of the church, adopted by Christians, which has for its object the *pumping* of money for the support of the cause, is wrong. Our duty as disciples of the Great Architect of the church is not to *improve* on the Divine plan of church polity, but to wait also on the Lord in his appointments.

The right person and a wrong person, or the right thing and a wrong thing, may both occupy the same office at the same time; and then one is genuine and the other a substitute, even while the right thing is not wholly discarded or "left out." While the temple was yet "*in its place*" (mark the italics), Jeroboam "organized" a substitute in Bethel.

"He who prays and studies the Bible during the week is not substituting anything in the Divine plan." Of course not, for this is *in the plan*. We have precept and example for this; and this we should have for all we do religiously. He who gives, not on Wednesday evening, but "on the first day of the week," as *the Lord has prospered him* follows the Divine plan. But he (or she) who adopts some other way and time of giving, cannot give as the Lord has prospered on the first day of the week. A "salient point" right here, Bro. M. If a brother (or sister) gives on the first day of the week as the Lord has prospered them, how much will they have left to give by any other arrangement?

"Is it wrong to contribute at other times and places because we have it in our regular worship?" Ans.—Because we have "it," *i. e.*, the giving of all the Lord enables us to give, in our regular worship, it is wrong to *invent* and adopt other regular ways and times. Because they substitute and add to the Lord's plan, and *rob the fellowship*. "But is it wrong to have our giving well organized or systematized?" "Our giving organized" I am unable to understand; but "systematized" is sensible and wise. Infinite wisdom has done this for us. The attempt to improve on His system is surely presumptuous. I know of no better "organized company of brothers or sisters for the purpose of giving" than a church of Christ. The Scriptures recognize no other. *We need no other*. This is *assumed* but never proved by those who are set for the defence of these things. The work done in what are called Sunday-schools and Bible classes, *i. e.*, "studying God's word," is right, and authorized at all times and places. But there is no analogy between this and "organized" societies of Christians, distinct from the church, with regularly-elected officers with high-sounding titles, etc., for doing the work of the church.

I am set for the defence of the Gospel, and plead for a return to apostolic order. We are not indebted to Rome or any one of her daughters for anything that "pertains to life and godliness." The Scriptures will "thoroughly furnish us unto every good." We shall not lack by adhering to Bible things and Bible names for Bible things.

In his article on the "Fellowship," Bro. M. has shown that the Lord directs us *how* to "contribute of our means to the support of the church," and to "meet all the wants of the cause." He now labors to prove that the Lord never directs how to do anything. Not even how to be baptized. I thought the disciples of Wesley had a copyright of this argument. It is hardly fair for Disciples of Christ to use it without acknowledgment. And I had, somehow, got the impression that the Lord is *very precise* in both telling and showing how to do his commands. I very much fear that the rescue of some *pet* has caused this change of base.

Yes, yes, my dear brother, we need more "kind and earnest words of caution and warning against the evil of making *our own* ideas of right the rule and standard of action;" and trying to get "our own" little pet idols in, "and thus sow the seed of strife and discord." We can never convert the world, or even unite, on "our own ideas." This is why we plead so earnestly for a close adherence to the ideas of the Holy Spirit.

"When certain methods of Christian work produce good results, we may be certain they are in the line of New Testament truth," etc. Why this is the very argument used for what is called "In-

fant Baptism," the "Mourner's Bench," etc. Under this very same kind of reasoning the Inquisition flourished, and the Auto-de-fe. O, brethren, let us haste to return to primitive faith and practice.

D. McDUGALL.

Riverside, April 17, 1886.

THE FAITH THAT SAVES.

BY IRA C. MITCHELL.

A learned brother, in an essay in the March number of *The Disciple*, gives us this definition of faith: "*Faith then, is the mental faculty which finds its true and special function in the apprehension of the supernatural.*" As this writer declares it to be "a primitive, original and innate faculty of the mind," it must be something entirely different from the Faith of which the Apostle Paul speaks when he says, "Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God," unless this Apostle was guilty of "a momentary lapse of memory," such as Bro. G. W. Longan, another of our "advanced" thinkers attributes to "that disciple whom Jesus loved," in a lecture recently published in the 3rd volume of *The Missouri Christian Lectureship*. At any rate, a common man feels safer if he stands to the Apostle, and puts his trust in that sort of faith which comes through "belief of the truth," rather than the "innate" kind. If any man is in possession of the "faculty" of "innate faith," it is to be presumed that there is no danger of his faith being "overthrown," unless he becomes insane. This essay is not designed as a criticism, but simply to present the teaching of the Scriptures for the instruction of those who have not been so fortunate as to be born with the faculty of faith, and consequently are compelled to obtain their faith in the old way—by the hearing of the Word. The learned author of this new definition of faith, takes issue with the proposition that faith and belief are the same, and relies on John xii. 42-43, for the proof: "Among the chief rulers many believed on Him, but because of the Pharisees they did not confess Him." Now, if these dignitaries had possession of the "innate faculty" of faith, they would have been bound to confess Him? If belief in Christ is the same as faith, why did they not confess Him? To a common, unlearned man, who relies on the Apostles, the answer is at hand: they did not believe *with the heart*, for "with the heart man believeth unto righteousness." (Rom. x. 9-10). This leads us to enquire what is meant by the word "Heart" when thus employed. Clearly it is to be understood metaphorically, and by the rule of the *usus loquendi* we obtain an explanation of the metaphor.

The prophet Isaiah, foretelling the condition of the unbelieving Jews, in language quoted by our Lord, (Mat. viii. 15), and by the Apostle Paul, (Acts xxviii. 27), says: "For the heart of this people is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes have they closed; lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and should be converted and I should heal them!" It is as plain that the word "Heart" in this passage designates the understanding of man, as the eyes are what we see with, or the ears what we hear with. If it is never used by the inspired writers in any other sense we are restricted to this meaning, and a mere intellectual apprehension of the truth concerning Jesus will satisfy the requirement. But we find the Great Teacher, in his inaugural address, saying to His disciples, "Where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." (Mat. vi. 21.) Here the term "Heart" obviously signifies the affections or that "innate faculty" of the soul with which human beings love objects esteemed treasures. Again, when Barnabas, the good man, came to