

to stand up in the meeting for the prayers of God's people. Four little ones stood up. Their ages ranged probably, from ten to sixteen years. After they stood up the clergyman asked the people to pray for them—all to pray for them—pray unitedly. Agonize with God that He may be willing to give them the blessing of salvation—that he may adopt them into His family.

Thoughts came to me something like the following: What a travesty on the character of God? What an erroneous impression must have been made on the minds of those young persons if they were capable of reasoning? Does God have to be made willing to give salvation by the importunities of His people? Is not God as good as we are? Is not His love as great as ours? Is not His love greater than ours? Is not His love to those children as great as the love of that clergyman? Is it not greater? Has He not loved them and proved His love in the gift of His Son?

Has He not provided salvation and offered not only to those little ones, but to all, without money and without price? Why then mislead them? Why deceive them? Why not tell them to accept salvation as it is offered in the gospel, where the way is too plain to be mistaken?

He says, "Come unto me, all you who labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." The way is plain. The directions are without fault. The promises are sure. Why not, then, come to Him?

The prophets of Baal agonized. They importuned. Their zeal was marvelous. It was all in vain. Why? Because it was utterly voluntary.

Elijah made a little quiet prayer for the sake of the people. But Elijah was acting by divine authority, hence no need of agonizing. When people to-day comply with the conditions of salvation, no need of agonizing, salvation will be theirs.

Prayer is all right, when it is in accordance with the will of God. But when we pray without divine authority we will not receive because we ask amiss, and they who trust our prayers will be deceived.

O. B. E.

"SHE HATH DONE WHAT SHE COULD."

MARK XIV. 8.

That was indeed a very pleasant company that sat down "in the house of Simon the leper," where a "supper" had been prepared for Jesus. The time, place and company combined to make this social gathering intensely interesting to all concerned. The earth life of Jesus was drawing to a close, and He was now on His way to Jerusalem where He was to be offered up for the sins of the people. The place—Bethany—was a quiet village where our Lord had often found rest and quiet in the home of Lazarus, with his sisters, Martha and Mary. The company was made up of those who evidently loved our Lord, and would improve any and every opportunity to express their gratitude for the great blessings enjoyed from His hand.

Let us pause a moment and consider those who composed this pleasant company. Of Simon the leper, at whose house they were assembled, we know nothing beyond the fact that he had been a leper and one whom probably Jesus had cleansed, and a near neighbor of His most intimate friends, Lazarus and his sisters. It was doubtless his love for his great benefactor that prompted him to open his house for this special feast made by the friends of Jesus for Him and His disciples.

Then there was Lazarus whom He had raised from the dead. This man had evidently loved his Lord before he had sickened and died. When he was taken sick his sisters sent unto Jesus, saying, "He whom Thou lovest is sick." But now he had not only been under the influence of the love of Jesus, but had experienced His mighty power in

being raised from the dead. Hence this, to him, was a feast of love.

We learn also that Martha and Mary were there, and that "Martha served." Jesus loved this pious family, and it is very evident that they all loved their Lord. But it was fitting that Martha should be serving the table. This was characteristic of the woman. Her expressions of gratitude must take the form of hard work. It was her nature to be "careful about many things," even at the expense of "the one thing needful."

But Mary "had chosen that good part which should not be taken away from her." Thus while Martha was serving, and Simon and Lazarus were enjoying the company of their Lord and His apostles, who also were present, Mary was preparing for the expression of her love in a way that none present, save the Lord Himself, could have thought of.

This supper, which had been made for Jesus and His apostles, had doubtless cost both money and labor, of which, no doubt, Mary had borne her part. But there was more that she could do, and she felt that she must do all she could, for she loved her Lord. Hence this costly box of ointment. She evidently had this by her for the occasion, and our Lord accepted it as a preparation for His burial.

There were some present who said this was a waste of the ointment. It might have been sold "and given to the poor." If those unkind words stung the tender heart of Mary, the words of approbation spoken by her Lord would not only put to silence those who would censure her, but would cause her to rejoice that her humble act, prompted by love, was so acceptable to Him whom she loved.

So pleased was our Lord with this act that He promised that "whosoever this gospel shall be preached throughout the whole world, this also that she hath done shall be spoken of as a memorial of her."

Why was this act so acceptable to Jesus that it must be "spoken of her" wherever the gospel is preached? It is important that we study this lesson that we may learn how to offer acceptable service "with reverence and godly fear."

While the Lord doubtless appreciated the expression of the love of His friends in Bethany in making this supper for Him and His apostles, there are no such words of approbation as are spoken of the act of Mary. There must be some clear reason for this. There must be in it some important lesson else it would not have been handed down to all generations marked with the approbation of heaven. To my mind, the answer to this question is found in the words of Jesus at the head of this article, "She hath done what she could." Others may have done much. Some, even, may have done more than she did; but could have done still more. But Mary kept nothing back. She was wholly consecrated to the service of her Lord. This expression of love cost considerable money. The cost of this ointment is estimated to be from \$45 to \$50. However this may be, it is evident that it was "very costly." The lesson, then, that we should learn from this incident is this: We should always be ready to do *all we can* to promote the cause of Christ on earth. Mary had the privilege of doing this act of love while her Lord was yet on earth, and heard from his own lips His words of approbation. But though we cannot see Him on earth, we can just as acceptably offer to Him our best gifts as though He were here with us in person. "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto Me." This opportunity to do good we always have. Shall we improve it? The same who spoke those words to Mary will speak to us in the great day of judgment. Are we doing *what we can* to advance the cause of Christ? If not, He will not say, "Well done," in that day. But if we are, He will say,

"You have done what you could, enter into the joy of your Lord."

Let us not wait till we come to die before we make an effort to do good. Mary did not know her Lord was to die so soon, yet He accepts her act as the last service of love to a dear friend. Let us not wait till our friends die before we say kind words to them. Let us not wait till they get sick and ready to die before we try to tell them of Jesus. Let us not coldly look on while men and women are going down to death without Christ and withhold our means, by which the gospel may be preached and souls saved. When we have done what we can to cheer those who are cast down; when we have done all we can to send the gospel to the unsaved; when we have done our best to maintain the cause at home; when we have done our duty to our neighbors and families; in a word, when it may be said of us as it was said of Mary, "She hath done what she could," then, and then only have we done our duty, and the righteous Judge will then be able to say to us, "You have been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

E. C. FORD.

Port Williams, March 17, 1890.

MAJORITIES.

I noticed, some time ago, a statement taken from the *Christian Quarterly*, the import of which was that Bro. Campbell was wrong in believing and teaching that majorities should rule. In the *March* CHRISTIAN I noticed this statement: "The Lord desires that *everything* done by the church should be done unanimously. So it was done by the church long years ago." How long ago the writer did not say. It must have been before Bro. Campbell's day, as he was a believer in majorities, ruling and acted upon it in all things that the Bible did not decide. The statement, that there was a time "long years ago" when *everything* was done unanimously, may be a slip of the pen, so we will not hold the writer responsible for the mistake. As all know that such a thing is impossible, there has never been, neither can be, such a thing as an organization acting unanimously in *ALL THINGS*. We are commanded to be one in faith, but never to be one in opinions, because this is impossible. What we mean to say is, that we are not unanimous in our opinions, and the only possible way to act unanimously is for the minority to submit to the majority. Instead of the troubles and confusions arising from this rule, they arise from the violation of it, i. e., when the minority insist on the majority, yielding their judgment. There is not a church to-day in existence that has any strength or success that does not act on this principle of the majority ruling. In fact it is not possible for any organization to prosper in any other way. When the minority insist on ruling, then destruction must necessarily follow. All co-operative work must be accomplished by this rule. To teach different from this is like the theory of repentance before faith. It may be taught but cannot be practiced. I know a church that needs a meeting-house very much indeed, but cannot get one because the minority will not submit to the majority. The majority want the house in one locality and the minority want it in another locality, neither party is able to build the house without the assistance of the other—and so they are obliged to worship in the old house. This is only one case out of many where all success is blocked, simply because the church will not yield to the notions of a few. There is no lover of the church of Christ who will demand or expect that the church will submit to his notions or wants unless they can see it is best.

The same mistake is made in the functions of officers. It is said "the elders should rule," and yet we are told there should not be "one man