

(ADDITIONAL SAYS), and soon requires a habit of strong drink. The moral influences about him are of the very worst, so that by the time he has spent a few years in Tokio he is well along on the road to ruin. I did not escape. "It seemed almost impossible for me not to fall in with student habits, to which there was scarcely an exception. I remember well my shame the next day after my first night of immorality. I became hardened to it, and would turn it off with a laugh and a jeer. At heart I did not really want to be vile. I could easily have been led in the right. It was all because of evil influences. He that will throw good environment around student life by establishing homes for them will be a great benefactor.

## Campbellites.

HAROLD HAWLEY.

A few days ago a certain sectarian "pastor," on being asked for the use of an empty church house, promptly refused, and in rather abusive language proceeded to tell "what he thought" of us. Among other things he referred to us as "Campbellites." This is not at all surprising, since the sectarian world seldom honors us with any other appellation. But the frequency with which that name is applied to us leads us to inquire for the cause. Why are we burdened with a name which we do not desire to wear? Of course any one who will take the trouble to investigate will see the absurdity in applying such a name to Christians. He will find that A. Campbell never established any new church, but simply attempted to restore the primitive church. He will learn that Campbell simply preached the gospel, as did Peter and Paul and Apollos, and as many earnest disciples are doing to-day; and the preaching of the gospel never produced "Campbellites," nor anything else but Christians. And for us, to wear the name of Campbell or any other man would place us under the same condemnation with the Corinthians, who were "of Paul," "of Apollos," "of Cephas," etc.

But the world will not stop to investigate. They are rather inclined to jump at conclusions. And I am not sure but that we are partly responsible for the conclusions they have reached. Alexander Campbell was a great and learned man, and we do well to remember him with gratitude; but he was only a man, uninspired, like the rest of us, and as such it is both unwise and unscriptural for us to consider him as our "authority." Nevertheless we frequently hear preachers quoting the language of A. Campbell. We see leaflets and tracts purporting to give his "views" on various Biblical questions. And even prominent religious journals quote him with a frequency that can hardly fail to create the impression that they consider him authoritatively. In view of this fact, it is surprising that the unthinking world sees in Alexander Campbell only the founder of a new denomination, and that, to them, our quotations from him are on a parallel with the Calvinist's refer-

ences to John Calvin, and the Lutheran's to Luther?

The matter of a misapplied name is bad enough, and should cause us to use caution in speaking or writing. But this in itself is not the worst feature of the question. To be called Campbellites not only implies that we are followers of Campbell, but it also implies that we are sectarians, and consequently places us on a level with the denominational world. And here again we are partly to blame, and have helped to bring about this misunderstanding by our careless manner of speaking. We often hear disciples of Christ speak of "our church" and "our people," as if we were the originators of a church which is separate and distinct from all other churches. We seem to lose sight of the fact that Christ said, "On this rock I will build my church," not ours. We forget that we "have been bought with a price" and we "are not our own." We forget that we were "added to the church" upon our obedience to the gospel, and that every one else who has "obeyed from the heart" has also been "added," even though he may afterward have erred in the matter of a name or a creed. How great an error of this kind will be required to blot out one's name from the Book of Life is not for us to know. But who will presume to say that an error in doctrine will exclude a baptized believer, while an error in practice will not? The church of God is not composed of those whose names are written upon church books, but whose names are "written in heaven." Who can tell the number that belong to that host? None but those who have access to the "Lamb's Book of Life." Then let us not be too exclusive.

Another expression which we frequently hear, and which is almost as misleading as "our church," is the term "our belief" or "our teaching," as if we had a peculiar and unchangeable "belief," fixed by the wisdom of men. What is more natural than that the sectarian world should think of "our belief" as the interpretation of the Bible by some man or body of men, and differing from their "belief" only in so far as we are unable to "see alike"? Occasionally I receive a letter asking for "my belief" in regard to certain doctrines current in the world. I generally reply by saying that it makes little difference what "my belief" is, but if they wish to know the Scriptural teaching on the subject, I'll try to help them.

Such expressions as "our church," "our belief," "our teaching," etc., are all misleading, if not wholly unscriptural, and the sooner we discard them from our vocabulary, the sooner the world will begin to recognize us as simply Christians, disciples of Christ. While we persist in speaking the language of Babylon we can hardly expect the world to concede that we have "come out of Babylon."

Ludington, Mich.

It is a great thing when our Gethsemane hour comes, when the cup of bitterness is presented to our lips, and when we pray that it may pass away, to feel that it is not late, that it is not necessary; but divine love for good ends working upon us. — Chapin.

18 Sept 81  
Vol 4-25  
The Way

5-93