

much more frequently to designate believers than the word "disciple." It was known to the Old Testament writers in Deuteronomy, Samuel, Chronicles, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Daniel, Hosea, Zechariah in the New Testament "the bodies of the saints who slept" arose when Jesus rose; Saul was accused of having done evil to God's "saints"; Peter came down to the "saints" at Lydia; and when he had called "the saints and widows" together he presented Dorcas alive. Paul confessed to his Lord, "Many of thy saints have I shut up in prison;" but he does not confess to have killed any one of them. And then, when he comes to write of the things of the kingdom, he uses the word "saint" not less than thirty-nine times to designate those accepted as saved. They are the "sanctified," the redeemed, the regenerated; they are the purchase of the blood of Christ. When we use a word which, rather than any other, describes the people of God we call them "saints." That is what they are. No man ought to be called a Baptist who is not first a saint. "The disciples were called Christians first at Antioch"; but Paul never knew them as Christians. To him they were usually "disciples," but they were saints, "sanctified in Christ Jesus." Careful not to give offense, we shall not use that word when speaking of those who would have us call them "disciples." We are not chary of its use when Baptists are considered.—Sel.

To the Editor of the MESSENGER AND VISITOR.

Dear Brother:—I see by a recent letter from Mr. Adam's that the completion of the Twentieth Century Fund is not yet an assured success. But I believe that before the time expires for the accomplishment of this work our people will have proved themselves equal to the task. If we are alive to the responsibilities, and possibilities that lie before us, we surely will. To this end let each pastor seek to lead his charge in the accomplishment of this labor of love. I do not mean that he should perform the work of collecting; but rather have an oversight of it and set his people at work; his aim being to accomplish the highest possible Christian service with them. This would be success indeed. I believe, as a rule, our pastors do too much, are overworked, while they get too little out of their flock in the way of aggressive Christian labor. Don't be afraid to harness them up, and set them at work, it will do them good, and they will love you the more for it afterwards when they have learned the sweet enjoyment of love's service.

Then there are in every church a number of faithful ones who bear heavy burdens and often more than their just proportion; because it is easier to do so than to get it done by others, while this may enrich them in the grace of liberality, if others are thereby kept from doing their just part there is a wrong done them, their life is dwarfed; for Christian life is expanded and developed by Christian acts and exercises only. So the more the work can be divided, or the more that can be drawn into the service the more the Christian life is expanded. While there has been generous responses to special appeals by our people and many do give constantly and generously, yet there is a very great lack on the part of a great many whose names are on our church rolls, in the grace of liberality, and this will no doubt continue to be so until there is a more universal adoption of better principles or methods of giving.

Now in all the walks of life the first thing necessary to the accomplishment of results is a definite and settled purpose. Without this we wander aimlessly and land where the tide of events may cast us. No goal is reached because there was none set before us to attain to. And this principle applies as practically to Christian giving as it does to every other object or act of life. We have an apt illustration of this as we scan the columns of statistics in the year book. In one column you will find the amount contributed by the Women's M. A. Society, in others the amounts contributed by the church for the year to the various benevolent objects; and it is a noticeable fact that in many instances the amounts contributed by the W. M. A. Society equal, or exceed the contributions of the whole church and the cause is not far to seek, they have a definite purpose. The minimum to be raised by them is a dollar per member per year, then they seek to exceed that amount as far as possible. And the reason that in so many instances the balance of the church members contribute so little compared with the W. M. A. Society is due to this one fact, that on their part there is no definite purpose in the matter, they wait until a call is made upon them, then they will plead that they have nothing to give, or perhaps they will give ten, twenty-five, fifty cents, or a dollar with the kind expression "I would like to give more, but that is all that I can do now," and never think of the matter again until the next appeal is made. Consequently the labor and strength that should be directed to the ingathering of the unsaved, and to the strengthening of the Redeemer's kingdom, is taxed to gather from the professedly Christian world the means to carry on the Lord's work, a condition of things that should not be, because these should flow into the Lord's treasury as freely as the water finds its way to the ocean. Now the question is, how is this to be brought about?

The most practical and just solution of this problem is

systematic giving or tithing and it is also the most Scriptural method. Many object to this, because it was a Mosaic law. They seem to be possessed with a mortal dread of anything that savors of the law. One is sometimes almost constrained to think that to confess yourself a sinner, then live so that there will be no hypocrisy in the confession was the highest ideal they possessed of Christianity. We certainly are not forced by the law that is foreign to the spirit of Christianity. But if we are the children of God in truth then have we become obedient children, the law is no longer our task master, but it is a light and lamp; for by it is the knowledge of right and wrong. So the adoption of it as a rule of giving is only fashioning yourself as an obedient child. It simply resolves itself into a question of faith in God.

Moreover tithing was not instituted under the law, but under grace. When Abraham met Melchisedec who blessed him he gave him a tenth of all, not to win favor or buy his salvation, but in acknowledgement of debt, because of blessings received and promised, from him who was a figure of Christ. We, my brothers and sisters, have professed to have met the High Priest in the way who has blessed us and made us to inherit the promise with Abraham whose children we are. Now if he was indebted to give it, are we under less debt? There was a clear acknowledgement of debt on the part of Abraham in that he gave it, and there was also as clear an acknowledgement of the right to receive it, on the part of Melchisedec, in that he accepted it. Jacob gave a tithe upon the same principle and was blessed in doing it. Afterwards it became a statute in Israel which only proves the more conclusively that it had the divine approval, and was the divine right, and they that adopt it are insured by the promises of God. "If you are satisfied with the security down with the dust." Now how do we learn our duty or moral obligations to God but by the law? Take the Sabbath for an illustration, we concede the fact that our conduct in respect to it should be governed by the law. If in this, then why not in every other moral obligation? There is certainly no other source by which we can learn what God requires.

Then the Apostle speaking of the Levitical priesthood, its duties and privileges, says, "they serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things. They were made priests after the law of a carnal commandment and were a figure or shadow of the heavenly who is made high priest after the order of Melchisedec and is worthy of as much honor." Then, if they in receiving tithes of the people served unto the example and shadow of heavenly things where has the example and shadow gone in our relation to the heavenly high priest? Then let us become alive to the responsibilities, possibilities, and privileges, that are ours in this and we will enjoy a richer spiritual life and hasten the triumphs of the kingdom.

N. P. WHITMAN.

Church Choirs.

BY DIMOCK ARCHIBALD.

A Colloquy.

Whoso offereth praise glorifieth me. Ps. 50:23.

Let all the people praise thee, O God, Let all the people praise thee. Ps. 67-5.

A great supper was spread. Two hundred guests sat down to partake thereof. Behold and wonder at what took place! The twenty waiters having previously selected the choicest viands and arranged them on a table at the head of the room, together had a pleasant time partaking of them, accounting that the guests may well regard themselves as happy in seeing them enjoy the rich repast. The abused—and insulted—guests, with one accord queried—What ought to be done with such waiters? A wise woman spoke—"If I were hostess they would be discharged at once. Is not the action of the choir that sings unfamiliar tunes, and thus hinders the congregation from joining in the worship, very much like that of the waiter? Is not such a choir supremely selfish, in pleasing only themselves, utterly regardless of the needs and happiness of the congregation which they serve.

Question—Since members of choirs are self-denying, noble, Christian, people, how do you account for it that they should so often seem to pervert the service of song to an exhibition of their own skill?

Answer—It is a matter of wrong habit arising in part from a mistaken theory, that in order to be progressive, new tunes must be sung, forgetting that success in the worship of God ought to be the chief object of the choir. What if the pastor should do likewise and fill his sermon half hour with a declamation in which his ability in acquiring new ideas was apparent, with also abundant quotations from Hebrew and Greek? Would not his resignation soon be in order?

Question—Please name some objection to the singing of new tunes?

Answer—It tends toward emptying the church, to dispirit the pastor. It grieves the Spirit of God. It hinders souls being saved. Sankey's leadership of song resulted in all the people singing with him, the gospel by which many souls were saved. Is it not then plain

that the singing of new tunes in the great congregation in which they do not join is at war with the object and work of the Holy Spirit since the one object of the whole church machinery is to co-operate with the pastor and the Holy Spirit for the edification of the church and the salvation of souls. How blessed to have the intelligent support of the choir.

Question—But shall we never sing new tunes?

Answer—Yes, under certain conditions it may probably be wise—How to do it is best illustrated by what I witnessed in an alive church in Boston, whose average annual addition to her membership by conversion was about seventy-five persons. The deacon who led the music had a choir of three hundred mostly girls in the Sabbath school, also a choir of fifty in the organ gallery. When these three hundred and fifty in the organ gallery and spread through the congregation led by the deacon who stood on the pastors' left, sang together the new tune, which the choir had previously practised, do you wonder that it at once became popular.

Question—Why are old tunes best?

Answer—(1) Because very often they are best as compositions. (2) And principally because the singing of the old tunes awakens anew the hallowed memories of the past, of childhood with its never to be forgotten impressions at the family altar, of the prayer meetings on the hill of the revival scenes of early youth, the resolutions then made through the power of the Spirit. Thus full of the singing of the old tune to the familiar hymn prepares many a heart to listen to the sermon with saving effect.

One of the crowning victories of Dr. Lorimer's last pastorate at Tremont Temple was in that he secured a choir leader who was in intense sympathy with him in saving men—and by his arrangement this leader was always present at the weekly prayer meeting selecting and leading all the music and oft gave his word of testimony for Christ.

Question—Are you not mistaken in holding the choir as a body responsible? Are not the choristers who select the music wholly to blame?

Answer—Thank you, no doubt but that you are right.

Question—Then can you tell me why it is that intelligent choristers will persist in forcing new tunes upon the people?

Answer—Can it be that it is simply for want of a study of the subject? We have Sunday School Conventions to discuss how best to teach so as to lead men to Christ,—when do we hear of choristers' conventions to discuss how best to lead in praising God in order that souls may be saved?

Question—My difficulty with the choir is, that though they profess to serve both God and the Church, they do not seem to consult the wishes nor feel any accountability to either God or the church. Can you suggest a remedy?

Answer—Thank you, brother, for so clear a statement of the case. How would this do? "If any of you lack wisdom let him ask of God." If choir leaders would arrange to preface their rehearsals with a few short prayers for divine aid, it might work wonders in developing in them true joy in the worship of God by the service of song. Naturally their next thought would be—since we now have true joy in service can we longer bear to see the whole congregation robbed of the privilege of worship by our singing new tunes? No! No! We will sing old tunes, any kind of tunes possible but all the people with us shall praise the Lord.

What about anthems?

We regard it as appropriate that a choir should have a free hand in the selection of anthems—meanwhile we have witnessed most happy results when the choir in regular Sabbath services rendered familiar revival selections instead of anthems.

What have you to say of the performances of choirs and soloists, when it is difficult, if not impossible, for the audience to understand the words they sing?

Answer—The chief value of a gospel song is, that the sentiments of the song is made plain to the hearer. "He that speaketh in an unknown tongue edifieth himself," not the hearer. I Cor 14:4 Is it not a waste of the congregation's time when they cannot understand the words.

Tremont Temple, the world around, is regarded as a model church. Their rule is to sing only old tunes in the great congregation. Well do I remember Dr. Lorimer's dilemma in that Sabbath morning service, Professor Chelms, for eleven years their musical director, had arranged to sing a new tune. The first verse was nearly through. The great audience was silent. The Doctor was equal to the occasion, as he said, "The people don't know that tune. We will sing the next hymn and sing Old Hundred, please. The volume of song from that great company was in itself a thanksgiving to God, and to Dr. Lorimer for the change.

Never shall I forget the pathetic appeal of a model chorister to the young people of the church, as he urged them to obtain a liberal musical training possible but to have one motive in it all, in order that they might the more effectively sing the gospel of Christ, that men may be saved thereby.

The most effective Christian soloist to which I ever listened—said with beautiful simplicity "that she always went to her public services—after much prayer for divine help in order that souls might be saved through her singing of the gospel."

Dear readers—Are we not now all convinced that generally the singing of new tunes in the public worship is a sin, a shame and a crime against the God of our salvation as well as an insult to the intelligence of the congregation?