

The Progressive Christian.

HOLSINGER & BASHOR,

"LEAVING THE PRINCIPLES OF THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST, LET US GO ON UNTO PERFECTION."

1.25 per Annum, in Advance

VOL. IV.

BERLIN, PA., FRIDAY, FEB. 10, 1882.

NO. 6.

Essays and Selections.

For the PROGRESSIVE.

TO HOWARD MILLER.

Brother Howard; Do you candidly believe that you have fully and faithfully answered my reply to your uniformity plea? And farther, do you sincerely believe in the pungency and force of all you say? Your reply reminds me of Dr. Bergstresser's plea to his brethren, during the Waynesboro debate, in behalf of infant baptism. He appealed to their conscience in behalf of the dead who had been baptized in infancy and passed to the world of spirits; but the fact is, Howard, eloquence, and art, and music, and rhetoric, all supernal can neither change a truth into error, nor evade its ultimate force. As to my mother, she to me was the fairest and dearest among women. What her peculiar views were upon the subject of exclusive uniformity, I do not know. She died before that peculiar doctrine was very widely advocated among the Brethren. In what ever she believed she found ample teaching in the gospel, for it was to that only to which she pointed. As to my father, Howard, you have missed your bearing. I hate to spoil your exhortation, but can't help it. The "old man" who you say "went to the grave with a procession a mile long after him," never wore a uniform coat, and likely never will, as he is yet alive and hearty, and he is a plain man, and a Dunkard as was his father before him.

That feeling of kindness which characterizes the church, and springs open the latch strings of Harshey and Balsbaugh's door, is also behind the heart of Holsinger and Bashor, and would lift the latch string on the approach of Balsbaugh, Harshey or Howard Miller, as readily; make them welcome as they passed over the threshold, and give the best afforded until their calling urged them to go. That principle, Howard, is in our hearts and religion yet, and it is the doctrine of exclusive uniformity that has closed the doors and even the Lord's table among conservatives and old orderites against the admittance of some of your progressive associates, and has made the wide difference among us to-day. Yes sir, you know, and I know and every other man knows, that that fraternal feeling that once pervaded the church has been denied progressive ministers in many localities, because they wore a "gentile coat" and were not dressed in the uniform garb. And you, and they, know farther, that there is no class of men among us in whom this fraternal feeling more largely prevails than among that very class you call progressives, and who opposed the ostracism that exclusive uniformity among us has occasioned.

Yes, some man gave money for a Dunkard bell and some other man gave money for three or four more instruments of the same kind only they were a little larger and these men were conservative uniformists, and now one of the bells calls elder James Quinter to church at Huntingdon; another one R. H. Miller at Ashland, and another the editors of the *Brethren at Work* at Mt. Morris. Now the fact stares you in the face that uniformists have bells and steeples. If bells and steeples are the product of heresy among progressives, what are they among uniformists? Will you tell?

And Howard, I know precisely what I say when I tell you that I am not putting the knife to the throat of the love, good will and Christian benevolence among us, when I stand up in opposition to that doctrine which has cut the bonds of union that once bound good men together and left one standing with a heavy heart while the other denied him the privileges of the Lord's table because he was progressive. You have always opposed turning a sister out of the church with a plain hat on because there were masculine evils in the church? Howard, do you know what you do in this? You espouse a principle that says one wrong justifies another, as you understand wrong to be. On the same principle you would refuse to disown a drunkard because others in the church are guilty of fraud and theft, and are not yet punished. That principle, Howard, that fell from your pen like a thunderbolt, drives, crowding beneath it, that sacred principle of maintaining purity of life among us, and measuring each by its own weight. It is saying in other words: "If some men steal and go unpunished, I will not give my vote to correct the

man who is besotted and stupid because of strong drink."

If John Wesley deplored the display in dress among the Methodists in his day then they never were a plain people, and both your and my arguments go for equal market value.

Yes, Howard, when you and I stood that evening on the brink of Casselman River, and I saw your soul returned in peace to God as your form clave the crystal wave, and my eyes were fountains; as the heart swelled and the thoughts shot out as the starlight shoots, and I saw you in prophecy, in future standing by my side, a giant and a scholar leading men to the fountain of living water, and feeding them upon the bread from heaven, little did I think that we would ever cross swords, and that too over the traditions of men, and the principle that says one wrong justifies another, or if a man sins unrebuked so can a sister, and you will defend her! Whatever may have been my views on the uniformity question I changed to what I am through critical biblical study, and am able to give an answer for the hope that is within me; and whatever may be the legitimate outcome of the reform among us, my reasons are greater than holding to a doctrine because the church holds it. I want the gospel to satisfy my mind on grave questions; questions so grave as to involve the eternal destiny of men and the final glory of the world.

I have never opposed uniformity as a model, but I have opposed its being made a test for church relation; and while you admit in your last production my claims, you say as true as God lives you believe I am wrong. You admit all for which I contend when you say you "have only opposed the doings of that class who want to make clothes their all in all." This is all for which I contend; and brother Howard, I can't help but think you can see it; and after endorsing my views of opposing dress as the *ne plus ultra* of Christian living, I am astonished that you deliberately turn around and declare that as true as God lives you believe me wrong? Is a doctrine correct when you enunciate it but heretical when my pen strikes its vitals? How can you do this and yet assert your desire, not to injure me?

Yes you may ask me any question in relation to that clothing house you wish, without being considered hypercritical, and I will reply frankly and fully. I have changed some since then and can give reasons for it. So you too will take the responsibility of turning women out of the church who wear a plain hat, after you have pleaded and coaxed and wept and prayed with them? And suppose when you are done she takes her hat from the rack and by actual comparison proves to you that it is as plain as the bonnet you want her to adopt, and demands gospel or its equivalent, for making the change, and you could not give it would you dry your tears, hush your prayers, and call a council and throw her out into the world? Come now brother Howard, could you in the face of God, over the graves of the sanctified dead and in view of the meeting at the eternal bar, do such a thing?

I say no, too, to lugging the world into the church, and I wish I could impress upon uniformists the difference between the world, uniformity and gospel simplicity. You did not answer my questions involving the principle of exclusive uniformity, and less passion and more theology and logic in your reply would be more convincing. I did not say that *uniformity* had proved a religious farce, but I did say that it had proved a farce so far as a means of maintaining gospel plainness and simplicity in dress, and you inadvertently admit my plea in your reply. Howard, will you tell me frankly whether you believe all these churches, Quakers, &c. divided on the dress question? I say they did not, or if they did the record fails to show it, so far as I have seen. I say that the greatest simplicity in dress is not seen in uniformity. If you believe it stop and look abroad again and calmly consider. Tell me, Howard, was the doctrine of exclusive uniformity taught by Christ? If it was not is it of God or of men? I believe you are on the road that leads back into the world when you plead for uniformity as the exclusive Christian garb. I cannot say that your letter is discourteous but it seems to me to be a little out of the line of logical discussion. My reply to all you say in comparison of Christian churches is that the church maintaining the greatest gospel simplicity had nothing

like uniformity nor did it preach, advocate or practice it. That church was founded by Jesus Christ the Lord, and the preachers were the Apostles. That was the model church and your argument against a church maintaining simplicity without uniformity will apply with equal force to the Lord himself and the church he started. I do not wish to wound you, Howard, but I asked you if you had changed your mind on the subject of uniformity, because it is currently reported in Ashland, O., that when there, four years ago, you advocated sisters wearing hats. If you have forgotten it probably some of the members in Ashland can refresh your memory. I am ready to discuss the question with you, logically in all its bearings. But brother Howard, please keep my mother's name out of the question as she is dead and on the subject of uniformity I do not know what she believed. Believe me to be your friend and brother, BASHOR.

For the PROGRESSIVE.

THIRD TERM OFFICERS.

BY S. Z. SHARP.

In June 1880 delegates met at Chicago from all parts of the Union to choose a candidate for the Presidency. There was one presented who, as a general in the field, had won the admiration of all the civilized nations, as a statesman; had twice been elected to the highest office in the government, once by a majority greater than had ever been received by another man in this country. No crimes had been charged against him, nor was his competency as an officer questioned. The most powerful influences were brought to bear in his favor that a combination of his old friends and favorites could command. Long and persistent efforts were made to elect him, but the great mass of the American people said, "No, we want no third term President." Experience has proven to us that when a president is elected too often, rings and corruption are inevitable and justice is perverted.

What is true of the great body of the American people in regard to third term Presidents, is true of a large body of our Brethren in regard to third term Standing Committee and A. M. committee men. Not that their competency is questioned nor their motives impeached, but knowing the frailty of human nature and the disposition to become exalted, the strong attachment springing up among men associated with each other in important duties, making it almost impossible to convict one of their numbers when he does wrong, because some of his associates are always chosen as jurymen in his case. The standing committee having it in its power to appoint the A. M. committee, any one who will look over the minutes of Annual Meeting for last two years, can see who has been appointed? As lovers are blind to each other's faults, so may some elders be who love each other so much, and when called upon to act on a charge preferred against one of their number, their charity for their erring brother is exceedingly great. Now as the Brethren do not want these elders to love each other less, nor that their charity should suffer, it is proposed to relieve all those who served the last two years on standing committee or Annual Meeting committees during the last two years and elect only such as have not served for several years and some who have never served before.

Among the many reasons that might be offered for not electing Elders to the above named offices three times in succession, we only name the following:

1. There are about four hundred elders in the church among whom this important church work would be distributed, instead of limiting it to forty or fifty.

2. It would remove the reproach resting on those who are charged with sending themselves out on committees from year to year, and against some of whose decisions so much feeling and trouble is aroused in the church. Should other elders do no better, then these would receive more credit and the Brotherhood would be better satisfied.

3. It would inspire more confidence in the Annual Meeting and quiet the anxiety in a measure. Many would say: "Well, we have new men and perhaps it will go better now."

4. It is well known that some elders were repeatedly sent to Annual Meeting as delegates whose services were afterwards entirely lost to the church, and it is thought best not to sacrifice any more.

5. It is believed that if some of the "Old Order" elders had been placed on committees it would have been different to day. It is to be hoped that all the elders who served during the last two years either on the standing committee or on Annual Meeting committees will decline serving this year, and that those churches who elect delegates to district meeting will instruct their delegates not to impose such a burden on any elder who served the last two years in succession. For Mercy's sake have pity on them and give them at least one year's rest.

For the PROGRESSIVE.

WHO ARE THE GERMANS?

THOS. E. DAVIS.

Amongst the different growlings in our periodicals, I observed that brethren are somewhat excited about the title, "German Baptist." I do wonder if those brethren have had access to all the archives and libraries of Germany. Ypey and Dermont, two learned Pedobaptists had such access; and they affirmed that the German Baptists may be considered as the only Christian society, which has preserved pure the doctrines of the gospel, through all ages. And Mosheim has said that the Baptist church—(meaning German Baptist,) go back up the stream of time, so far that their origin is hid in the remote depths of antiquity." This being true, I cannot see the necessity of brethren becoming so much alarmed over the appellation: "German Baptist," if the German Baptists have stood since the days of the Apostles; if they have preserved pure the doctrines of the Gospel; if they do go back up the stream of time, so that their origin is hid in the remote depths of antiquity. The qualifying phrase: "German Baptists" will do me.

But who are these Germans? Whence came that element of mind that has preserved pure the doctrines of the gospel, or that has created the so-called German literature, German science, German art, German metaphysics, German modes of thought?

Mind is every thing. When we are tracing the history of man, we are tracing the history of his mind. What is the quality of mind most distinguishes one race from another? One individual from another? Man from woman? The dark from the fair portion of mankind? It is the power of generalization, of abstract thought; of rising from detail to general laws. Have the Germans this distinguished quality? It is said that there is a small knob of bone growing upon the inner side of the arm bone of man; in most persons scarcely apparent. And it is also claimed that all the Saxon nations on earth could not in twenty centuries have explained the nature, the meaning of this nodule of bone. But this with a thousand other phenomena met with a full and complete elucidation. By whom? The matter of fact men, of detail—Germans.

The man who discovered the theory—the transcendental theory of organic bodies—the greatest discovery which has ever been made? Germans. The law of gravitation—that theory of fluxions, ascribed to Newton. Newton? nay verily; he only shared with Leibnitz a German. Whence came this element of mind to which the German owes his vast reputation as the most philosophical of all men, the most abstract; in reasoning the most metaphysical, the most original; and, in a word the most transcendental? The element of mind which produced Kant, and Goethe, and Gall, Leibnitz and Oken, Carus and Spix, and hundreds of others; the fair haired, large bodied, blue-eyed classic German is now exactly what he was two thousand years ago, and occupies nearly the same ground he did when, crossing the Rhine, he was routed by Caesar, who chased the Saxon Boor with his Vaans and Pard Vaans back again across the Rhine.

There they are to this day, no doubt unaltered and unalterable. Whence came they? It is claimed that no mixed race can, or ever did, exist for any length of time. Are not the Germans an original race? The people whom the Romans called Goths, who overthrew the Roman empire: who lived in Austria, and in the Denubian provinces, before Rome was founded, then of great energies and numbers? It is to this race that Germany owes all its intellectual superiority over the rest of mankind.

Highland, O. Dec. 23, 1881.

The Progressive Christian.

A Religious Weekly.
Having the BIBLE for its creed.

H. R. HOLSINGER, } Editors.
S. H. BASHOR, }

BERLIN, PA., FEB. 10, 1892.

The subscription of the PROGRESSIVE CHRISTIAN is \$1.25 a year, in advance. New subscriptions may commence at any time during the year, but we cannot agree to furnish back numbers. The PROGRESSIVE CHRISTIAN will be sent only till the term of subscription expires, unless otherwise ordered. Payment, when sent by mail, should be made in Money Orders, Drafts or Registered Letters. Money orders shall be made payable at Meyersdale, Pa. All letters and communications to be addressed,

H. R. HOLSINGER,
BERLIN, Somerset Co., PA.

OUR PRIVATE VIEWS.

A Letter and Reply.

Brother Henry:—There are some things I can hardly understand. I wish you to make it more plain to me. You say you had no trial, which according to your report is correct; or no investigation at least. Now I received a pamphlet, are you in the church or not? The idea is you are not out. Now if you consider yourself in the church, are you working in harmony with the church. And why are you sending out your platform or rules to govern your church affairs? This is what I can't understand about it. I want some explanation. Now brother Henry, I have rather stood by you, and plead for you; but the matter now looks as if you are working for another division. I hope and pray I am wrong in this matter. There is such a feeling and malice working that eternity will only heal if healed at all. We have lived and experienced some with the Thurman Brethren. With all the jangling we are one faith; we can't be anything else, unless we deviate from the gospel. These little minor differences which are talked of are not on account of being conscientious. It is more of education or usage. I think charity should be cultivated instead of talking about division, cutting off, and then devouring each other. That shows what kind of spirit it is. When we speak evil of our Brethren it is known what kind of a spirit it is. We are to know the tree.

In your platform you advocate plainness. If you mean it why are some always clamoring for hats. You know it has not been a custom for many years. Now why agitate this question, when all the scripture speaks of is modest apparel, and be not conformed to the world. The agitation of this question has done a great deal of harm, and I don't think one sister out of every hundred would wear a hat if privilege were granted. I hope and pray that there will be no more such contentions but work for oneness. It does seem that there are some who want to rule or ruin. I am afraid we will be like the Mennonites divided into factions. I see some are talking of uniting the River Brethren in Canada and letting our own brethren go. I don't understand these things. I think the name progressive and conservative should not be used. I think Brethren would be much better. The letters from those radical Brethren ought all go in the waste basket until they are seasoned with love and charity. This is a private letter, and I wish a private answer from you concerning these things. What are your views in regard to your case at next Annual meeting, and what is your idea about things in their general course, and can we ever unite with those who have left us. Let me hear from you individually, as soon as you can.

REPLY.

The above is from a private letter, and as will be seen desired a private reply, but as there were thirty nine others before it, many of which are of much more importance to us than this one, and the file accumulating daily, there was no hope of complying with the request for the next three months. And as the subject matter is of such a nature as to cover many parts of the others, and of general interest, we have concluded to lay the matter before our readers, and then fully and frankly answer our brother and perhaps thousands of others at the same time. And while his letter is published his name and residence will be retained, thus still being held private. We know him, and we love him. He is an esteemed elder, and a citizen of the United States, and for convenience sake we will call him brother X.

1. In regard to our committee, you have all the information there is upon that subject. You have as full a report of all that was said and done as can be given. And you have the correct view of the matter. We had "no investigation," and so we had no trial. That is clear enough; no one can be condemned without a hearing. We had no hearing, therefore we cannot be condemned. We are therefore in the church same as always before. This seems to be the universal impression, personal opponents who want it otherwise excepted.

But it appears our brother seems to find a puzzle in regard to our "platform or rules to govern your church affairs," and wants to know how we can reconcile this with the idea that we are working in harmony with the church at the same time. We will try to explain. In the first place he will notice that he is making a mistake when he calls our "Definition of Progressive Unity" a rule to govern our church by. It is simply a statement of the points upon which the clement of the church commonly called the progressives are agreed. Only that and nothing more. We believe the sentiment therein expressed the sentiment of the large majority of the church. We believe the majority of the members of the church to be the church, and therefore we are working in harmony with the church for the promulgation of gospel truth. Please notice this item carefully, we believe that a large majority of the members of the church agree with us in the progressive principles as defined in what you term our platform; we believe the majority of the members of a church to be the church; we work for the promulgation and practice of said principles, hence we are working in harmony with the church.

In this way we are disseminating the sentiments and doctrines of the church, and not "for another division." We are opposed to any and all division in the church. We agree with you exactly when you say: "With all the jangling we are one faith; we can't be anything else unless we deviate from the gospel." We hold there is not difference enough among any part, or clement, or school, or party, or division of the church, and we will not separate ourselves from any of them who practice the commands of the gospel. If they exclude us, we cannot help it. It will not be our fault. We regard them all as Brethren. If we were to go among the Old Order Brethren of Beavertown, Md., Antietam, Pa., or Miami Valley, Ohio, or anywhere else, and be at their lovefeasts, and they would invite us to participate with them, we should thankfully and happily accept. And if any of them in good standing were to come to us we would surely invite them. We would say the same of the congregational Brethren or the Leedy Brethren, or the Thurman Brethren, or the Far Western Brethren, or any other Brethren who practice the ordinances and obey the Gospel as we do.

No brother X, we have always been opposed to separation, and have always worked for union. It seems to us this is so clear that every person who is as well acquainted with our course as you are should know it. Do you suppose that if we wanted to have a division of the church we would have suffered ourselves to be slandered and disgraced by the Berlin Committee as we did and still claim fellowship with them and those whom they pretend to represent? And do you think we would now still claim membership with said body, and persist in continuing in said relation? Why you know brother X, that you and I and a few other ministers can go together and organize a church just as ours was organized in Germany, and adopt the Bible as our constitution, that would at once have all the elements of success and prosperity for time and eternity. You know that. We all know it. We believe too, that if such an effort were to be made we would not need to organize with eight unbaptized men and women, but that more than eight times eight ordained elders, intelligent, good and true, with tripple the number of ministers, representing scores of churches would unite in the Brotherhood. Notwithstanding we have always opposed any idea looking to any such division or organization. We want the whole

Brotherhood to remain in one communion. Then we can assist and influence each other.

There is no essential difference between any of these various elements of the Brethren church. Let us look at them. We all believe the same things substantially in regard to the Godhead. We all practice trine immersion for the remission of sins, followed by the laying on of hands; feet-washing, the Lord's Supper; the communion; the salutation of the holy kiss; the anointing of the sick with oil; non-swearing; non-resistance, anti-war; anti-secrecy; plainness of dress, and general simplicity conforming to the humble teachings of the Gospel of Christ. Why the Bible recognizes us all as conforming to its teachings, and the world regards us all as Dunkards. The sects recognize us all as Dunkards and cannot see what in the name of reason we are disputing about. We will tell you, brother, what is the cause of the whole trouble among us. It is humiliating but it is true. It is jealousy, and hatred. It is not conscientiousness, or tenacity for truth. It has given us a great deal of trouble to notice so much personal opposition to ourself. It has caused us to examine ourself with the most scrupulous care. We have spent many sleepless nights worrying over some of the charges that were brought against us by some of the District Meetings; especially at first. This opposition was one of the causes of our disposing of the *Christian Family Companion*. Can it be possible, we would exclaim within ourself, that we are such a bad man? Are we really in the way of any one who would do good and glorify God? And are we so blinded that we cannot see it? O how earnestly we have besought our heavenly Father to lead us into the perfect truth! We have studied God's word diligently on all the subjects in dispute. We are recognized by our disputants as of fair intelligence and by some have received credit for much more. We know we are honest in our intentions, and God knows it. Why then must we be constantly opposed by some of our brethren, and why must every onward step that we make be so bitterly contested. For several years we had retired from active service in the field; but our brethren have called us out again and have loaded additional duties upon us. We can prove that it was with reluctance that we entered into the church publishing business again. Circumstances seemed to impel us. It appears that

"There is a divinity that shapes our ends,
Rough how them how we will."

And here we are, with such a feeling of hatred and envy aroused against us from a part of the church that would cast us into outer darkness. And if there were any possible way by which we could keep our conscience clear and do it, we would drop from the stage of action into private life in less time than it takes to write this editorial. But we now believe that we are in the right; that we are laboring in the Master's cause. We believe we are working in the interests of truth, and there is no means of our escape. We know no way of retreat. We must go forward. We remember Lot's wife, and the fate of Jonah, and mean to profit by them. Our opponents have aided largely in establishing and confirming us. We used to have some doubts in ourself and hesitate in our work because we were opposing the dignitaries of the church; the great and mighty men among us. But we have been among them; we have interviewed them. They have laid themselves open before us. We have seen their true inwardness. They are but men—only men. And some of them not very manly. We are convinced, overwhelmingly convinced that it is "not on account of being conscientious" for truth that they are opposing and persecuting us. It is because they dislike us, and cannot bear to have us succeed. Are we in your way brother X? Does our work cross your path in your efforts to convert sinners and lead them to Christ? Did you or your church ever originate a query for Annual Meeting in regard to our progressive movements? I am quite certain you did not. Is the southern District of Missouri the most holy and pious district in the church, that they must every year have some fault to find with Holsinger? And now without a hearing they demand his expulsion from the church with all who sympathize with him? Is it the love of God and the salvation of souls that prompts them? Can there be any doubt in the minds of any rational, candid, fairminded people as to the motives that prompt such decisions as were passed by their last district meeting?

You are right in your opinion that all the scriptures say upon the subject of dress is for "modest apparel." "Be not conformed to this world" has no more to do with clothing than it has with eating and drinking and speaking and all other actions and conduct. We do not defend or advocate hats for women. It is our opponents who are advocating and defending bonnets. We are on the negative. They say it must be a bonnet and we say it need not be. It must be only a plain or modest article of clothing. It is likely that not more sisters would wear hats if they had liberty to do so. It would suit us just as well if none of them would wear them. And we would not object if all would wear hats. And it will suit us if some will and others will not. They do not need to dress alike. There is no occasion for it in religion, or God would have so ordered it. They do not look alike, they do not walk alike; and they need not dress alike. A bonnet may be plain, a hat may be modest, a hood is common, and other articles may answer their purpose. The busybodies in other people's matters are the ones who are making so much trouble. It is astonishing how much trouble some brethren have with the dear sisters. They have no other criterion by which to detect pride except by a ribbon or ruffle or flower on a women's head or body. The moment that the word pride is mentioned a women's figure springs up before their imagination, robed in some article of dress which is new to them.

But finally, you want our opinion of things in general, and the prospects of keeping the Brotherhood together. To be candid we must confess that the outlook is a bad one. The prospects are discouraging. Our opponents are embittering themselves against us. At one place the elder publicly denounced us and our paper. At another the members were kept in after service and forbidden to support our paper or to read it. Efforts will be made clandestinely to pass such decisions as were smuggled through the Southern District of Missouri from various Districts, and there is no telling what the result may not be. If reason and religion with its spirit of love and calmness and patience will be allowed to prevail, and the gospel of Christ observed as an infallible rule of discipline, then all will be well, and harmony and union will prevail. But if "Minutes," and "resolutions," and "usages," and "orders," and traditions will be made the standard of appeal, and the spirit begotten of all such works of man be suffered to have sway, then may the Lord have mercy upon us.

We fear the Old Order Brethren have become so far alienated from us that for the present there is no hope of a reunion. After a while, when the present mania for power and position shall have died away, and the public mind calmed down to Christian principles and zeal for truth and righteousness, our troubles can be adjusted and union effected.

The hasty and unjust actions of present committees and councils will be revoked, and as there will be none living to make acknowledgment, there will be a general jubilee, and a feast of love such as has not been known in a century. Take the history of the John A. Bowman Brethren of Tennessee, the Moore Brethren of New Jersey and the Thurmanites of Virginia for an example. When the storm of prejudice and personal antagonism shall be over, the battlefield have been cleared and its dead all buried, then men will think, and reason and truth will prevail.

"The seas are quiet when the winds give over;
So calm are we when passions are no more!"

OF THE BRETHREN AND FROM THE BRETHREN.

Under the caption of "the inside turned out," our little brother Eshelman of the *B. at W.* writes a war article for that paper, and in conformity with conservative principles it is decidedly schismatic and one-sided. He refers to the Meyersdale brethren in a very unchristian manner, and declares that church as the "fruits of progression," "progression ripened," "progression gone to seed," and purports to show the difference between the "Meyersdale society and the Brethren church."

About the first difference he notes is the Meyersdale church has a steeple and a bell in it. This certainly is of the Brethren, as a bell and steeple will be found at Ashland, Huntington, Mt. Morris, and at Antioch, Indiana. The church at the last named place has had a bell for several years, and it is a "Brethren's church," presided over by a conservative elder. At Warsaw, Philadelphia, Johnstown and Elk Lick Pa., there are pulpits in the church, and carpets in the aisles, same as at Meyersdale. And conservative preachers and elders go to these places, sanction these things, and assisted in dedicating them.

In California at time of communion the sisters break bread same as the brethren, and a conservative committee consisting in part of R. H. Miller and James Quinter, decided that this California church should be fellowshiped as a part of the Brotherhood, and by the Brotherhood.

In the Miami Valley last winter, and at different times in Iowa, persons were baptized by the brethren and not confirmed by the laying on of hands until afterwards, when the ceremony was performed in the house or church; and when dissatisfied old orderites brought complaint to Annual Meeting the conservatives or Eshelman's "Brotherhood," with the assistance of the "progressive party" laid it on the table as unworthy of consideration. And thus it is that the laying on of hands after baptism by a regularly ordained minister is of the Brethren.

The California church only pass the salutation once during the lovefeast, and that practice is therefore of the Brethren.

The Brush Creek church, Ohio, and several other churches have for years allowed sisters to commune, some with "white caps," others with "black caps," and others still with bonnets or veils. And in Robert Miller's church last fall we saw sisters at the communion table with this diversity of head dress, saving the black cap; and we must inform brother Eshelman that this practice is also of the Brethren church, and has been fellowshiped by conservatives for years.

As regards sisters wearing hats, Lint's church, which Eshelman defends, allows it. So do fifty other churches, including some in Illinois. And that is therefore also a product of the Brethren church. R. H. Miller, Eshelman's associate, allowed it in his church, and to Eshelman that ought to be exceedingly good authority.

If he had taken time to reflect and refresh his mind he could have honestly said that there is not a single thing at Meyersdale, from the steeple, the bell, the pulpit, the regular Sunday morning collection of pennies, the confirmation of believers after baptism, out of the water in the house, diversity in the head dress at communions, breaking bread, organ in Sunday school, (an organ is used at several places in the church, in Sunday schools) down to the napkin used at the supper which so aroused his warring propensities at the Meyersdale church, but can be found again and again in the "conservative Brotherhood."

And if he has a spark of manliness and honesty he will correct the false impressions he has made, and tell his readers that all these things were practiced by the Brethren church before the Meyersdale communion, and before that church was erected. He will further tell them that in anything in which H. R. Holsinger and the Meyersdale church are wrong they stand ready to be corrected in the proper way. Eshelman knew that all those things were allowed by the church and by his conservative associates at that, and he knew that they were all of the Brethren church before the Meyersdale branch had an existence, and our knowing that he knew this, makes us the

THE PROGRESSIVE CHRISTIAN.

IN MEMORY OF HARRY MUSSELMAN.

least bit suspicious that he is not "defending the church," but doing his utmost to arouse the prejudices of the uninformed with a view of separating the church and destroying the union of that organization that now exists. We tell him too, and we tell him in earnest but fraternally that he is transgressing every principle of brotherly forbearance and charity, he so recently avowed. If the Meyersdale church had introduced a thousand irregularities there is a legal and Christian way for their correction. But all these things have characterized the church at different places, a few things at a place, and have been allowed, and, when he anathematizes the Meyersdale branch, disorganizing them, he goes beyond what he knows to be the facts in the case. And we wish to say to him further that it is a shame and a disgrace to the church with which he is identified, the historical truth of our church admissions, the noncombative principles of Christianity, and the love and fraternal conduct of men, that such statements should be made. And farther the persecuting spirit of the *B. at W.* and its supporters has done more to throttle the Christian fellowship of our brethren than can be undone by fifty journals of its size for years to come.

There are differences among us, but we are brethren, and we are men, and we have manhood, and consciences, and feelings that must be respected. When has brother Eshelman written a union article, urging the brethren to harmonize their differences? Everything he has done has looked to the embitterment of feelings against the *PROGRESSIVE*, its editors and the class it represents. And in this last article on the Meyersdale matter there is not a word of pity, nor is there a quiver of sympathy or compassion for the men he says are in error. He compares himself to Paul fighting the good fight of faith and opposing men in evil; but for the compassion and human sympathy of Paul he has substituted the spirit of Waterloo and Fort Pillow. If we had the power of a genius, or the power of eloquence, and our love was as immeasurable as the limitless region of thought, we would plead that this spirit of persecution and disunion should stop here, now, at once and forever.

We are progressive and differ in a few points from the conservatives, but not so largely as they supposed; and we have used our energies to explain away false impressions, and show that we are not so far apart, but our explanations are woven into Eshelman's and Miller's mind as so many deceptive speeches made for a purpose. We tell brother E. in conclusion that his persecution and empty charity can never destroy us, and today if he only knew it, he is making himself an unenviable reputation and more friends to the progressive cause. And if he has half a soul of honor he will correct the false impressions he has made; and his action in this matter will prove of what sort of spirit he is.

Brother Holsinger has never received a word of friendly or brotherly advice from Eshelman and his associates; has been treated by them as an enemy from the beginning. Not a line has reached him from them looking to union through any means, but instead his motives have been imagined, his explanations disbelieved and his character assailed. All this has produced an effect, and that effect has been the general sympathy and support of the intelligent and manly portion of the church; and even now, men who have an opportunity to read and learn are coming to the side of progression. What Eshelman can say of us we care not. Ours is a cause and under the conscious impression that it is right we propose to will and do. No power on earth can hinder progression, and brother Eshelman might as well consider and retract. It is union we need, but not at the terrible sacrifice of good men and principles; principles as lofty as the climax of eternal truth are ours and on them, for them, and with them we stand or fall.

We pity Eshelman, and we pity the condition of the church, but our pity and our appeals seem to be labor lost on him, and for our appeals we receive pebbles and stones.

As to brethren Brown and Beachly, they can answer for themselves. We can only answer for our own work.

If the *Brethren at Work* will make the same efforts to union that we have made, and accept the truth from us as we will accept it from them, our troubles will largely decrease. But this they will not do; and not satisfied with their inability to crush us to the earth they seek to injure the good name of the *Primitive Christian*, because it will not be a party to their schismatic work. Not content with the simple statement of facts, they color and paint, and contort things out of their natural shape and put them in the worst possible form, to have the greatest effect against us.

Subscribe for the *PROGRESSIVE CHRISTIAN*.

Our friend HARRY C. MUSSELMAN died on the 31st day of January, 1882, at the age of 22 years and 10 days. He was sick only about one week. He suffered severely at first, and said he would die, and that he was ready to die. In a few days he became delirious, and at no time afterwards was fully rational. His last moments were calm and peaceful. He died at Ursina, this county, where he had charge of the Public Schools. His father was the only member of the family with him during his illness and death.

On Tuesday, February 2nd his remains were brought up on the train and interred in the Cemetery at Somerset. The schools of Ursina, with a number of citizens accompanied the friends and attended the funeral. Brief services were held at the depot at Somerset, by the senior editor and elder Woollery of the Disciple church. An immense concourse of people followed the remains to their last resting place, among whom were a large number of children, who mourned the loss of a teacher whom they had learned to love; and many of the best citizens of the community.

Harvy Musselman was a young man of promise. He had taught several terms of the public schools very successfully, and was much loved by the children.

He graduated very honorably at the Indiana, Pa., State Normal last June. He was one of the most active members of the Teacher's Institute held at Somerset last December, and who would then have thought that he would be the first in that happy, hopeful, and promising circle to receive the summons of death? He was kindhearted, chaste and moral, and loved and followed that which was pure and elevating. He was affectionate and sociable, and hence will be sadly lamented by his bereaved friends, who have the sympathies of the entire community. The Lord support and comfort them.

GLEANINGS.

Do you teach? Send for sample of Brethren's Teacher. You need it.

The Pine Creek Church, Indiana, will begin a protracted meeting shortly.

Brother David Hildebrand's address has been changed to Johnstown, Pa.

The report of Berlin committee and council is now ready in pamphlet form, 16 pages. Price 5 cents each. Per dozen 50 cents. Per 100, \$3.00.

The Indiana Creek Congregational Brethren church, Elkhart Co., Ind., is to be dedicated on the 12th of February. William Summers of Huntington, is to preach the dedication sermon.

Before ordering your Sunday school supplies for 1882, send for Samples of the Brethren's Teacher and Lesson Quarterly. Greatly improved for 1882. Address E. E. ROBERTS, 2135 Frankford Ave., Phila.

Brother Edward Beachly, formerly of Meyersdale but lately of Nebraska, is visiting friends at Berlin, and gave us a call. He is cheerful and friendly as usual, and seems to enjoy life as he ought to do.

The tract "Where is Holsinger?" is now ready and all orders at hand have been filled, and we are prepared, we think to supply the demand. We put the price at 10 copies, for 5 cents; 25 copies 10 cents; 100 copies, 30 cents.

One of our correspondents proposes the consolidation of the three leading papers under the head of the "Progressive Primitive Preacher," with office at Huntington and Ashland. He also suggests the merging of the *Vin.* and *B. at W.* into one, with an office at Dayton, Ohio. The latter arrangement we think would be wise.

Somebody writes us a letter telling us about Jos. N. Kauffman's outrages upon the churches in the Miami Valley, in locking meeting houses and such like, but forgot to sign his name to his letter. We must have the name of all parties who write us in order to inspire confidence in the statements set forth by the writer. Don't forget this fact friends.

Brother Holsinger; I sympathize with you in the forced defence you are making before the Brethren. I am glad that you are freeing the *PROGRESSIVE* from bitter personalities, for nothing good can result therefrom. Plead boldly for a united church, let others cry schism and separation as they may. It seems to me, at least, the part of wisdom, to plead for brotherly love and harmony, and the considerate judgment of the church everywhere, will be with you, whatever else betides. W. B.

In the last *Brethren at Work*, above the initials of "R. H. M." occurs this significant sentence: "In justice to brother Eshelman we wish to state that his incessant labors under financial embarrassments, had so worn him down in health that he was compelled to stop and rest for the time being." It is a bad time of the year for an editor to be under "financial

embarrassments," and especially so soon after having taken in a fat partner. Hope it is only a mistake, and that what brother R. H. M. wanted to say was something quite different.

Dr. Simon Sipe, practicing physician at Buenavista, Bedford county, came to his death by his own hands, at the National Hotel, at this place, on Wednesday, Jan. 27, at about 10 o'clock in the forenoon. No cause is known except impaired health and habits of dissipation, which would be likely to produce a weak mind, though nothing unusual was observed during the brief period he had stopped at the hotel. His father is a highly esteemed brother residing at Centerville, this county, belonging to the Middle Creek congregation, and has the sympathy of his friends in this painful affliction. The young man was about 29 years of age, and was unmarried.

I am glad to see the *PROGRESSIVE* conducted so ably. I realize the trying position you and brother Bashor occupy at this time. I do not wonder at your both getting on the "war path" occasionally; for some times, when the true principles of the doctrine of the Bible are so sharply attacked and it is thrust at you as if it were necessary that you be crucified, I feel like taking my pen and going on the "war path" too; but then that gentle voice says no, better go to your closet and ask Jesus to sustain those brethren that are working so hard to sustain the cause of Christ. Be encouraged and trust and risk everything on the WORD OF GOD. ELD. J. MYERS.

CORRESPONDENCE.

FROM THE SANDY CREEK CHURCH, W. VA.

The harvest being great and the laborers few, Saturday the 14th 1882, was appointed to select two brethren to the ministry, and 2 to the deaconship. The lot fell upon brethren John Baker and Jeremiah Thomas, for the ministry. The latter is a grandson of Elder Jacob M. Thomson lately deceased. May the whole fraternity remember those dear brethren at a throne of mercy. For deacons Irvin Wilson and John Nyman were chosen. Upon the same evening a series of meetings commenced which continued for 2 weeks, with the rich reward of thirty five precious souls received into the fold, 22 by baptism, and the balance reclaimed. Others made applications, and many more no doubt willing, and waiting to come; but alas man has placed a huge barrier in the road, that many weak yet loved ones cannot surmount. Can we, O can we stand in the day of Judgment with this responsibility resting upon us? Pardon me, I want all traditional barriers taken away. Let this suffice at present. Probably can't help but say something more upon this ere long. Truly this was a refreshing and encouraging season of divine love. May, O may we all now prove more faithful, more obedient, more loving in Jesus. Do let us all labor more for each other's welfare. Remember this sweet promise: the Father, Son and Holy Spirit will dwell with us if we love and obey Him. With this thought and great aid let us join hand in hand and so travel on till we shall arrive at home to meet but part no more.

Brother Wm. Buckalew labored with us 2 days, and brother John M. Freeling some 4 or 5 days. The sweet food and kind words of instruction given by the brethren will long be remembered. May some bright reward be placed upon the book of life for them.

F. C. BARNES.

FROM MOUNT MORRIS COLLEGE ITEMS.

Not only we, but others report the school to be in a flourishing condition, which, however, speaks for itself, there being 199 students enrolled.

Rev. R. H. Miller preached for us in College Chapel Sunday evening, Jan. 29th.

Several students are absent on account of sickness in their families. Students when sick are tenderly cared for by Mrs. D. L. Miller who gives them a motherly care.

We are sorry to report one public reprimand this year, and yet are thankful there are no more.

Prof. S. Z. Sharp still continues his free lectures on the Art of teaching, to the delight of all endeavoring to be successful teachers.

College Sunday School reports an average attendance of 220. All students are expected to attend one of the four schools in town.

Special attention will be given to all desiring a Normal Course, the coming Spring term. Such would do well to examine our course of study. While the terms are exceedingly moderate, every chance is given to students for improvement. Four literary societies are formed; two under guidance of the faculty.

Many of the students are suffering from sore arms. "Tis that abomination"—known to the world as Vaccination.

Prof. Rohrbough's class in penmanship numbers 102.

ANNUAL MEETING BUSINESS FROM SOUTHERN MISSOURI.

3. Does District Meeting consider Sunday School Conventions a means to promote the interest and peace of the Church, a means to maintain the simplicity of the Gospel of Christ, and a means to encourage the principles and the practice of non-conformity to the world?

Ans. No; and since holding such conventions is not authorized by our Annual Meeting we ask Annual Meeting to advise against them. This query for Annual Meeting.

4. Will District Meeting ask Annual Meeting to clearly define the relation in which the high schools stand to the general Brotherhood, as also that of brethren who form and conduct such schools, as follows: (a). Will Annual Meeting reaffirm that such schools exist as individual enterprises? (b). To declare that the forming of such schools, conducting them, and the manner of conducting them, are all matters subject to the notice and discipline of local church government in like manner as all other private individual or corporate enterprises are. (c). To declare that such schools or colleges are not church institutions and therefore they should not be called "Brethren's schools;" for the reason that other enterprises in which brethren are engaged are not called after our church name.

Ans. Yes; we ask for the definition. This query for Annual Meeting.

5. Does not the future peace, unity and prosperity of the church demand that the church have but one organ, or church paper, and that under the supervision and control of the general Brotherhood, and if so, will not this District Meeting ask Annual Meeting to adopt means and measures to bring about this much-desired end?

Ans. We recommend that Annual Meeting appoint a committee to confer with the brethren that are publishing papers with a view of consolidating them into one paper, said paper to be subject to the control of Annual Meeting, for Annual Meeting.

6. WHEREAS, Annual Meeting of 1880 under Art. 21 declared that brethren teaching through the press, ministry, or otherwise, sentiments conflicting with the recognized principles and peculiarities of our fraternity, shall be considered offenders and dealt with as such, and

WHEREAS, H. R. Holsinger had a committee appointed by Annual Meeting of 1881, to wait on him for refusing to regard such counsel of Annual Meeting; and

WHEREAS, He refused to proceed in the investigation of his case otherwise than in violation of our long established usages in hearing and adjusting matters of offense, because of which his committee declared him no longer a member of the Brethren church. Therefore

Resolved, That we endorse the action of his committee, and

Resolved, That we hereby recommend to Annual Meeting of 1882 that committees be appointed to wait on J. A. Ridenour, S. H. Bashor and others, ministers, deacons or lay members, who are encouraging H. R. Holsinger, publicly or privately, and endorse his opposition to the rules and principles of our general Brotherhood, and in like manner declare all such separate from the fellowship of our people if they persist in such opposition. This query for Annual Meeting.

BROTHER NICHOLSON'S MOVEMENTS.

Arrived at the Brethren's meeting house near Delta, Fultons Co., O., on the 14th of Jan. Meeting had been going on for 23 days conducted by Eld. E. Horn. We continued the meeting. The weather was very unpleasant during last week, on account of rain and muddy roads. Eld. Horn was called home on account of sickness in his family and did not return until today. After sermon he returned home again. Our meeting is progressing. Last Saturday evening we extended an invitation and three young men came forward. On yesterday we gave a nether invitation and four young men and two young women came forward. To-day the nine were buried with Christ in baptism. Our meeting is still going on.

JOHN NICHOLSON.

Just commenced a protracted meeting in Wolf Run church, Kans. Have a glorious beginning. Four Meetings thus far. One convert. Others almost persuaded. Interest growing. May God be greatly magnified here, and sinners converted.

I wonder if it would not be better for the cause of Christ if we had more good, warm, whole souled, protracted meetings, and less council meetings? What think you brethren?

W. J. H. BAUMAN.

Morrill, Ks., Feb 1st '82.

FROM INDIANA.

Brother D. B. Gilson came here on the 4th of January and continued Meetings till 26th. He preached Seventeen Sermons in the town of Burnettsville, and nine at our meeting house on Pike Creek, Fourteen received by Baptism. Meeting closed with a good interest at both places.

D. A. MERTZ.

Burnetts Creek, Ind.

Feb. 3.

I am after truth and how will I arrive at the whole truth concerning our church troubles, if I only hear one side of the question in dispute. To hear all sides is what I am after, and not until I do will I be prepared to pass my opinion on any as to the correctness of one of them.

H. M. BAKER.

Brooklyn, Iowa.

APPROBATION.

I am a reader of the *PROGRESSIVE* and like to read it very much, because it is an advocate of plain gospel truth, and progression in its primitive purity, as we have received it from the divine oracles of God.

ELIJAH BERKEY.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

THE YOUNG DISCIPLE.

An illustrated juvenile weekly, especially adapted to the wants of our young folks, containing the SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS, illustrated by Mrs. D. Emert. TERMS: Single copy, 50 cents per year; Six months, 25 cents. Special rates to Sunday schools. Send for sample copies, free. Address, QUINTER & BREMBAUGH BROS., P. O. Box 50, HUNTINGDON, PA.

THE PROGRESSIVE CHRISTIAN.

THE ESHELMAN PROGRESSIVE WAR.

BY J. H. WORST.

So brother Eshelman has declared war. We saw the smoke and heard the din, but where are the dead? Don't forget, good brother, to observe the rules of honorable warfare or your weapons will kick; then what? Perhaps we should have looked for the dead behind the guns, since there is no blood on the field.

There is doubtless some excuse for an honorable war at this time, that error may be eliminated and truth vindicated; but there is no excuse for any man to make a simpleton of himself, and bring his cause into contempt, by manifesting a mean, vicious spirit. The differences, of opinion in the church belong clearly to the domain for reason and sound judgment, for adjustment, and no better plan seems now open to us than the arbitrament of honorable discussion.

We said some weeks ago that our system of making decisions was unfair; but both brethren Moomaw and Moore in commenting on it, say that she does everything open and fair, and had about one thousand votes against less than fifty for the decision rendered. Both seriously misunderstood our meaning. Of one thousand votes which is the maximum of representation possible to be accommodated in the tent at one time, not over fifty are sent there, and even that small number recognizes no constituency. The other nine hundred and fifty were not sent there, and fully half of them live within twenty miles of the place of meeting. The passage of a query affects 100,000 members, and passes on the vote of 1000 persons, five hundred of them representing the church at large, or rather assuming its representation, because they have relatives near the meeting they want to visit while they can go for half fare, and the other half of the casting power is wielded by parties living near the place of meeting who manage to get a seat in the tent. There is absolutely no just representation, and the voting power is assumed by chance spectators responsible to no one but themselves, making the place of holding the meeting equal in power to the remainder of the brotherhood.

We still maintain that laws made without adequate representation are unjust, and our standing committee, though partially a representative body, yet recognizes no constituency, neither has it power to make a single decision. No government on earth can stand on such a basis, as it is antagonistic to justice and the rights of the governed. It is unjust to pass a decision by unauthorized and irresponsible agencies, allowing locality to give to it complexion, and then make it binding as the law of God upon the whole church.

It would be far wiser to lay aside the sword that the *B. at W.* has so lately flourished, and in its stead seek to remedy the defects in our system of church government which invites hostility and contention. We must have a system of church government, hence let us be willing to establish one that will mete out justice to all parties, and not make Annual Meeting the absolute property of a few individuals to dispose of its patronage on one hand, and yet but a cipher in the disposition of a query, on the other.

The leading minds of the standing committee control every thing on one hand, and are yet powerless where the legitimate work should be done. We do not blame them so much as the system that gives the church no adequate representation in making laws, yet allows a privileged few to monopolize the committee work which enforces them. The present condition of the church is truly alarming, and the methods employed are inadequate to meet the emergency.

It is painful to see momentous issues before the brotherhood—issues that challenge the sober thoughts of trained minds, and which in one form or the other have wrestled with all the wisdom of past ages, treated here with childish peevishness. Is it a conflict involving ideas worthy of men, or is it a petty contest that must be settled by calling each other names after the snappish manner of a school boy quarrel? There has been a painful lack of manly dignity and christian courtesy from the beginning. Let us meet the issue like men; compare our views honestly like men, and if we cannot compromise our difficulties let us separate like men. There nothing to be gained by stooping to dirt flinging and dishonorable misrepresentation; or even to ill will and hatred. The Gospel is as free as the morning zephyrs, and the age of religious freedom is too high advanced to farge shackles to fetter the conscience. Intolerance is the flack specter of a heathen age, and illy fits the brow of a modern christian. If we are honest on both sides and our differences are of a vital nature, then divisions will come and we may as well face it like men. Honest men, candid men, will sacrifice life and limb rather than be coerced

into measures they conscientiously believe to be adverse to the cause of Christ. The only question is as to our real difference, and the bearing that difference has upon the plan of salvation. If we do not differ upon the plan of salvation, then is it as to church government, and how far has that difference any weight one way or the other with future evangelization, and such church discipline as will restrict no one worthy of church fellowship and yet debar all unworthy ones. The latter is not so essential, but the former is terribly so; for woe to the man that shuts the kingdom against, or offends the least of His "little ones."

If the Meyersdale church has sinned it should receive the punishment due its transgressions; but for brother Eshelman to dis-fellowship them, malign them, bejudge and jury all himself, is neither manly nor in accordance with the better sense of his peers purse in the conservative ranks. If they are worthy of punishment, let the proper tribunal, panoplied with legitimate power render the verdict of guilty, first; then brother Eshelman, you and I can safely dis-fellowship them if they do not repent, and we can do it, too, without disrespectful effrontery.

If Christ meant that religion dealt primarily with the external man, and commands and injunctions were given to be obeyed blindly without a thought as to their spiritual import, then we can excuse a war waged solely for external precision. If there are two opinions in the brotherhood relative to this matter sufficiently antagonistic to mar our future peace, and so inflexible as to preclude the possibility of adjustment, then a thousand times better part in peace than dwell together in strife.

But what an outrage to enumerate "napkins," "plates" for carrying the communion bread, and basest of all to suppose that they would soon have forks added, and then link in Brown, Bashor, Ridenour, *et al.*, and some other things equally unimportant for the mere sake, through specious reasoning, firing up the baser passions of the ignorant classes.

They may have gone to extremes, but why extend the list for the sake of creating bad blood in an unmanly and certainly unchristian way? Is it wrong to have napkins at a communion, is it wrong to carry the bread on a plate, to have a bell on the meeting house, for sisters to break bread and pass the cup, to have salaried ministry &c.? Will either or all of them of themselves debar any one from the kingdom of God? Who dare answer yes? No one. Then why dare dis-fellowship them in haste and anger? We would rather see it otherwise, but hesitate to usurp the power of heaven to pass sentence on them.

Feeling as we do that nothing but God's word and the immortal soul will survive the wreck of worlds, we care the less whether the brethren use napkins or sisters wear black caps, so that through intelligent obedience they fit the only part of their being that will outlive time, to meet the only laws that will exist then. We are sorry to see the law of kindness thus ignored, while charity, meekness, virtue, and piety go begging for recognition. Open war declared in behalf of "mint" and "anice," gnats strained out, camels swallowed, and the weightier matters of the law, judgment mercy and faith, so sadly neglected. With what crushing weight Jesus rebukes those that make strife over externals: "Wo unto you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess. Thou blind pharisee, cleanse first that which is within the cup and platter, that the outside of them may be clean also. Wo unto you scribes, Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whitened sepulchers, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and all uncleanness. Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within, ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity." Again: "Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye."

All this and many other passages of equal pertinence have weight upon the issue. The positive commands of Christ are almost ignored in certain places, and the bulk of contention goes on for things not essential to salvation. The church as a body believes that every one outside of childhood and the Dunkard church will be lost, and yet with her enormous resources contributes less than ten cents per member annually for missionary purposes. Many of her ablest ministers are too poor to preach the Gospel, according to Mark 16: 15, and yet when they desire to do their duty according to 1 Cor. 9: 14, they are slandered as "hirelings," making missionary work and frontier preaching an obnoxious task save for the wealthy, and they seldom have time nor inclination to go from home, and all this from brethren who wage open war for the golden calf of tradition.

Not a single point or issue between the contending brethren is of such a nature that the

able editors of the *B. at W.* will say is positively essential to salvation, and they only base their arguments upon tradition or church infallibility, while as a result it is surely undermining the fabric of our Brotherhood and alienating the members from each other.

The fraternal hand has been long extended to form an imperishable union upon the basis of the Gospel, but it has been spurned. Those who war for church usage refuse to define them, openly violate many of them themselves, and expel others for insisting upon the same privilege. This war had better stop; our better natures had better come forward, and the differences can be adjusted.

There is a doubtful propriety in making so many laws that no one can live up to them, and that has been the burden of our work for years. We have been excessively legislative, and as a result many have been expelled for no violation of the Gospel. No one of us desires to stand before the awful Judge and have the fingers of the purest members of the church militant pointed at us and say, "you are the cause of my ruin." "I obeyed the same gospel you did, I disobeyed no more church rules than you did, yet you turned me over to Satan and I am lost." Who will answer for the hatred that must ensue; for the spirit that causes a father to slight and chill his family, and plant the seeds of infidelity in their hearts; for the thousands that became disgusted with the Christian religion and spurn its wooings? Will it be those who contend for the untrammelled Gospel, and obeying it live holy lives, or those who contend for things at best but auxiliaries, and in their tenacity for forms and ceremonies of doubtful expediency, dis-fellowship whole churches? Call them "impudent" "rebels," and "secessionists."

Lancaster, O.

FOR THE PROGRESSIVE CHRISTIAN.
THE INSIDE TURNED OUT.

BY A. D. GNAGEY.

I have just finished reading an article in the *B. at W.* No. 4, current vol., under the above caption. In his introduction, the editor points out the duty of Christians to fight, and after having convinced himself that he must fight, he forms in line, and from the village of Mt. Morris, Ill., he opens up a heavy cannonade at the progressives of Meyersdale, Pa.

Brother E., is right in saying "there was a fault among the members of the Meyersdale church," but without investigating as to where the fault lay—on which side—and what it really was, he opens fire into one party, not knowing whether they are in the fault or not. If brother E. had come a little closer before he made a charge, possibly he would have set his "guns" in a different direction and sent a few deadly volleys at the other side.

Brother E., need not fear that we will fight with him for keeping the Brotherhood informed of the practice of the progressives. They may know what we are doing, and if only the Brotherhood would know. We want them to know, and if brother E., would have his columns open for a true statement of facts, we should gladly furnish it. In his article occur several gross misrepresentations, and through his columns the correction should be made, but as they are only open to one side, right or wrong, we will point out his errors through the *PROGRESSIVE*.

1 "The new sect hired a preacher—paid him a salary." The writer is the person referred to, and in justice to myself, I will say that I never asked a penny of the Brethren of Meyersdale for services rendered. But the Brethren are charitable, and gladly give of their carnal things to him who ministers unto them spiritual things. And then brother E. who commits the sin, the receiver or the giver? In an enlightened age like this, where all have access to knowledge, every one should know that a supported ministry is Gospel. But then brother E. does not say that it is not Gospel. He says it is not the fruit of the "old tree," and I am not quite certain what he means by it; but I suppose the conservative part of the church.

2 Whatever he may say about a supported ministry, when a few years ago he preached for the brethren of Meyersdale, he did not object to the Bishop stating that the congregation should hand in their contributions, though it was not taken up in a "basket."

3 "The church has a steeple, bell, organ, fashionable pulpit, stained glass," &c. What of it? In another column of the same paper he says, "For worship to be acceptable depends upon the motives of the worshiper, not upon the place in which he worships." Why then does he complain of our place of worship. If the place has nothing to do with it, is not one place as good as the other? The grandest palace in the world, the humblest cottage in the valley hinders no one from worshipping God aright.

4 "Their services are closed with benedic-

tions. The Brethren church bears no such fruit." Christ's church in the time of the Apostles did, and "whether it be right to follow God or man, ye may be judge." The same benediction is used that the Apostle Paul used, and he is good authority.

5 "No salutation during feet-washing." The Brethren did pass the salutation once at the feast, and Christ never said whether it shall be passed at all at that time. Show us the commandment and the progressives will not drop it. To repeat the salutation several times is "vain repetition" which is forbidden by Christ. The bread and cup is also passed but once.

6 "Some of the females wear white caps, some white veils and some black." Where is the verse that says it shall be a cap at all? Brother E., let's have the verse in the Bible that describes the color and shape of the covering. If you show me one little verse that describes the form and color of the covering, I will lay my pen down and give it up.

7 "Ridenour baptized 12 applicants, and in the evening H. R. Holsinger laid on hands in the house." Did brother E. ever hear of any thing like it? Let him read Acts 8th carefully. Philip preached at Samaria, many believed and were baptized, and when the Apostles (Peter and John) at Jerusalem heard of it they went down and prayed for them that they might receive the gift of the Holy Ghost,—mark they were baptized—then they laid their hands on them. Brother E. objects to it, because the "old tree bears no such fruit." The gospel does, and with us it is Gospel before "order." Who that can read does not see that the laying on of hands out of the water was practiced by the Apostles? Did they not practice it at Samaria?

8 "There is an active Justice of the Peace held as a member." Yes, his soul is as dear and valuable as any other. "And more, he permits his son to sell whiskey on his premises." Another pervarication. The Justice of the Peace has no son over 8 years old, and he has no whiskey about him; sells none, buys none, and makes none. Every man in Meyersdale knows that my statement is right. If he does not correct this through his columns he must stand before the public as a man who has no respect for truth. Let him inform the public what we are doing, but let him first remove the mote from his eye, so that he can see distinctly what it is.

In all his remarks, he does not say "the Gospel bears no such fruit," but "the old tree" which is, as I have said, the conservative party. It is not his aim to prove what he says by the Gospel, but by some other document. He cannot prove our position wrong by the Gospel. He closes by saying that we "hold members who administer oaths." The "old tree" of which he speaks has lots of such.

Let him come and see. An old deacon, prominent among them, not over a mile from town held the office of assessor, and in our county he is empowered to administer the oath, and he did it too, and we need not go far to find a Justice of the Peace. I know some who held the office twenty years ago. Now, is it wrong, only for progressives, if wrong at all?

9 "Members who sell whiskey, does the old tree bear such fruit?" Much worse. In the congregation where I resided a year ago, a minister in the second degree, ripe from the "old tree," bought whiskey and sold it by the gallon, and that without license, thus cheating the government, and violating not only the moral and religious law, but the civil law also, which, had the case been executed, would have landed him across the "Iron bridge" at Alleghany city. The same minister declared to me, that if he were put on oath, he would make use of a stratagem to avoid the payment of tax on money that he had on interest. That is a ripe apple from the "old tree." The Bishop of the same church declared in open council that he will follow the order if it is contrary to the Gospel! Does brother E. still wonder why we have disunion?

The Bishop of the "old tree" of Meyersdale advanced me to the second degree as a minister, and told me to go and preach wherever I am called. I did just as he told me, and for doing it, he made the church believe they must disown me. Some more fruit from the "old tree" Is it any wonder we have strife and discord? There are plenty of ripe apples hanging on that "old tree" in this country, some weighing over 200 lbs, and are rotten to the core. A prominent fruit of that tree is dishonesty, and its limbs hang down, loaded with it, and unless props are secured it will break in pieces. We have no objections to brother E. presenting that ripe progressive apple to the Brotherhood, but we do not want him to stick it full of thorns, gathered from his own tree, and then send it out.

If brother E. expects to reap a great harvest, he had better reap it now, for not only is the fruit decaying but the tree itself is fast on the decline in these parts.