

ry to themselves; they do mar the prospects of the speedy fulfillment of that prophetic vision, which exhibited the kingdoms of the world as becoming the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ. They do this by submitting to be called by names, which amount to a prohibition of that union and concert of action, so necessary to produce that glorious result.

We are informed that, even in the days of the apostles, schisms arose in the church. Some were admirers of Paul, others of Apollos, Cephas, &c. But the name *Christian* was still retained. This admiration of men made them no more than Christians. And even in that division, what is the language of the inspired Paul? 1 Cor i. 13. "Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you? Or were ye baptised in the name of Paul?" Chap. iii. 4. he says: "For while one saith, I am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollos; are ye not carnal?" Can that which was sinful at one time, be justified at another? That which was carnal once, cannot be spiritual now. Was not this said of those who merely expressed preference for one or the other of the Apostles, either as to their doctrine, mode of address, or ability in argument? With how much more point may it be said, "Ye are carnal," of those who, at the present day, not only differ on doctrinal subjects, but carry their preferences so far as to excommunicate all who will not defend their opinion.

We ask any candid brother to examine his own mind upon this subject. Are divisions in the church conducive to its prosperity, and the happiness of its members? If not, should they be perpetuated? Is there any other name by which the relationship of all her members can be so easily recognised? Are not other names based upon variance on minor points? Is it probable that all will ever unite upon any name of mere human origin? The history of the church is a deep lesson up-

on the woful tendency of names to produce a carnal feeling, coldness in the divine life, dissensions among brethren, and perfect paralysis in the efforts of those who would apply balm to the wound. How long this state of things shall exist, to the detriment of Christ's kingdom, we cannot pretend to say. Indications are sometimes favorable to a change. Several branches of the church differ so very little in any material point, that a union would not only seem practicable, but easy. And yet the attention of too few has been arrested by this vital question. Could we see the learning and talent which are daily vested in tedious and vain theological discussions, brought to bear upon the heavenly principle of union, we should feel revived, and begin to hope for better days.

How long will they delay? How far will they suffer the pestilence of divisions to spread its sway by their apathy? What more signal vengeance could an all wise God inflict upon his people, than to show them the unsuccessfulness of their efforts while in a divided state? Can the ancient remark of worldlings, "See how these christians love each other," be applied to the disciples of the present day? The time has come when to remain inactive is sinful. Having examined and found that which we believe the only ground where union can be effected, we take a position there,—in the word of God,—and call aloud for help. We would appeal to the various denominations to examine for themselves, whether this is not ground broad enough for all to stand upon. By coming there, no article of faith, not even the smallest, would be sacrificed. These they profess to have taken from the scriptures. There they should bring them, and there leave them. We love them in Christ. We admire many of their institutions. But the names by which they choose to be distinguished, we cannot re-