Mrs. Britts is a good writer for boys. We think she does better for them than when she enters a wider field. This story is one of her best. It is worthy to rank with "Honest and Earnest," published from her pen some time since. It is, indeed, one of the best stories for boys we have ever read. The book is thoroughly healthful and stimulating. It will make a welcome addition to the libraries of the young.

The Forum for December contains the second article of Archdeacon Farrar on Tolstoi's remarkable career, the October number having the first article on the subject by the same writer. The re-viewer criticises Tolstol's religious teachings and explains the religious meaning and the literary value of his great novels. Dr. Austin Flint will discuss the evidence that all infectious diseases, including yellow fever, are caused by bac-teria, and the possibility of eliminating all contagious diseases from the ills that flesh is beir to, Mr. George W. Cable, following the line of argument of his recent article on the Negro, will discuss the relations between the races at the South. Mr. Edward's Atkinson's conand Mr. Z. R. Brockaway, Superintendent of the Elmira (N. Y.) Reformatory, will write about prison convict systems to show the necessity of giving convicts self sustaining work. There will be six other timely articles.

The Wake Forest Student, for November, is thus spoken of by a correspondent: Among the interesting magazines that it is our good fortune to read, the Wake Forest Student deserves special mention. The November number contains several very thoughtful as well as interesting contributions. Among the ones especially admired by the writer, is that of Mr. D. A. Davis. "Laissez faire" is the true principle of govern ment. The subtle reasoning, the flow ing lar usge, the deep thought of this writer, clearly show that he has not much to overcome before he will reach the highest point of literary success. Another piece of merit is Mr. J. O. Atkin son's article on the "Public Schools of North Carolina." To the reader, it would at first appear that the author had taken rather a pessimistic view of the subject; but after closely following his line of argument and his impartial conclusion, we can say with him that "North Caro lina is not rightly providing for the education of her children." On the whole, the magazine is well gotten up and reflects much credit on its editors, as well as its contributors; and it certainly should receive the unanimous support of the patrons and well wishers of Wake

"A Manual of Dieteties for Infants and Invalids" is the title of a book recently published by Dr. W. B. PRITCH ARD, of New York. We call the attention of the medical profession to this work. The book will be found a compendium of very useful information and instruction upon the management and feeding of infants and the selection of food for the sick. The importance of proper food in its effect upon the progress of any illness has long been recognized, but it is only within the past few years that any definite effort has been made to systematize the subject from a scientific and practical standpoint. Dr. Pritchard in his Manual has taken up each disease separately, and has carefully and elaborately outlined the diet most appropriate in each affection, basing the selection of food upon the effects of the disease upon the system and the special organs and functions involved. It is a book that should be found in every family. The vexatious question, "What shall I give my patient to eat?" need not prove a source of annoyance to the physician or nurse any longer. With your Manual to refer to, you have a reliable and convenient hand. The book is a handsome volume of nearly 100 pages, neatly and substantially bound in cloth, and may be purchased for the nominal sum of 50 cents, or bound in paper covers 25 cents, post age prepaid (stamps may be sent). Ad dress "Dietetic Publishing Company, 115 Fulton Street, New York.

From Bro. Fulford.

Cleveland Church -- Pledges Needed. Permit me to say to the brethren and sisters who gave Bro. Hord pledges for Cleveland church, and who have not yet paid their pledges, that we are sorely in need of the money.

The noble little band at Cleveland

have worked hard to finish their house of worship. They have finished ceiling it, and have put in a good stove. But there is some debt remaining, which these unpaid pledges would nearly or quite liquidate. Now, dear brethren and sisters, won't

you respond promptly to this call, and make our hearts glad by relieving us from the burden that is resting upon us, and which is a hindrance to the general work of the church. Cleveland is a mission point and is

your God given work, and you eannot afford to let it suffer. The church at this place is not unmindful of the obliestions due the denomination for what has been done, and may yet be done for it. Its members give liberally and pay promptly all they promise to the general work of the denomination. They have even gone beyond their ability, but they do not complain.

and to some I have written private let-ters, but all without avail. Surely Bap-tists do not need to be urged in a matter like this, when they are able to

something to be overcome." It is not a thing to daunt us. Grapple with it. Send a quick cry to heaven for aid and hen lay on. Take it as a chance God

## BIBLICAL RECORDER.

The Organ of the North Carolina Baptists, Devoted to Bible Religion, Education, Literature and General Intelligence.

VOLUME 54.

RALEIGH, N. C., WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1888.

NUMBER 23

The Lord's Supper as Observed by Christ and His Apostles, and its Relation to Baptism.

BY REV. J. L. WHITE.

TEXT:—"Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers."—Acts 2: 41, 42.

There are but two ordinances in God's Word obligatory upon us, viz: Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

These are God's positive institutions.
Therefore the obligation to observe

them rests not on our perception of their fitness, but wholly on the revealed will of God. Bishop Butler, the most profound scholar of his age, remarks: "Moral precepts are precepts the reasons of which we see; positive precepts are precepts the reasons of which we do not see. Moral duties arise out of the nature of the case itself, prior to exter-nal command; positive duties do not arise out of the nature of the case, but frem external command." (But. An., part 11, ch. 1.) This being the nature of these positive institutions, resting wholly on the revealed command of God, they require literal as well as sincere obedience. No authority but that of God can change a positive institution of religion in the least particular. The power to change involves the power to abrogate entirely. Who dare annul a command of God, except God himself? Hence obedience must embrace the literal doing of the specific action enjoined. Some other action than that commanded, or some other form observed as a substitute on the ground that no mere outward form can be in itself esseptial to salvation, is not, and from the pature of the case cannot be, obedience to a positive institution of Jesus Christ. Brethren, it doesn't matter whether we know why God gives such commands, but if they are given, it remains for us to literally obey them.

To obey literally, three things must be known: 1. The commands given: 2. The order in which given: 3. The form. ARE THE ORDINANCES OF BAPTISM AND THE LORD'S SUPPER GIVEN ?

Shall I impose such a question upon the intelligence of this congregation? We know that they are commanded, Jesus was baptized. He had all his followers bablized. He commanded the apostles to baptize all who should believe on him. The apostles did baptize. Jesus took the supper with the twelve

apostles. The apostles observed it everywhere they went. Christians observe it to-day. And Jesus said: "Do this in remembrance of me." Paul said: "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show forth the Lord's death till he come."

Are they important? Surely, the fact that our Lord Jesus Christ commanded ligent mind, much less a Christian. Brethren, these two ordinances are God's unchangeable symbols, in which He sets forth the two fundamental truths of His gospel far more impressively than in words, viz: Regeneration and atonement. Regeneration is expressed in the symbolic burial and resurrection in baptism. The atonement of Christ as the only means of justification and the only support of the new life, is with equal clearness symbolized in the Lord's Supper. And these divinelyappointed witnesses of these vital truths are to bear their impressive, unchanging testimony to the end of the world What mortal man, then, will be so presumptuous as to say that they are not

II. THE ORDER IN WHICH GIVEN. Jesus suffered only the twelve disci ples to be present at the Supper. These had all been baptized—making baptism precede communion. The following baptized: John 1: 35, 37, says, "And the next day after John stood, and two of his disciples; and looking upon Jesus as he walked, he saith, Behold the Lamb of God. And the two disciples heard him speak, and they followed Jesus.'

Verse 40, "One of the two, which heard

John speak, and followed him, was An-

drew, Simon Peter's brother." It is evi-

dent that the other one was John the disciple. These two had been baptized for they were disciples of John the Bap tist. Verse 41, "And Andrew first findeth his own brother Simon, and brought him to Jesus." It is to be sup posed that Simon Peter was also a dis ciple of the Baptist, and so had been baptized. Verses 43, 44, "Jesus findeth Phillip. Now Philip was of Bethsaids the city of Andrew and Peter." Since Philip was an acquaintance of Peter and Andrew, he had evidently seen the Baptist, and doubtless was a disciple and so had been baptized. Mark 1: 19 states that the fifth disciple called was James, the brother of John the disciple.

As John was a disciple of the Baptist it is also supposable that his brother James was, and so had been baptized.
Put the supposable cases aside. We
know that Andrew and John had been baptized, for they were discipled of the Baptist. John 4: 1, 2, states that Jesus had all his followers baptized. Jesus himself was baptized, saying as He did that it was necessary to fulfill all righ-teousness. It is clear that He would not have allowed the ten to remain unbaptized, if they had not been baptized when He called them. All circumstan tial evidences go to show that all of the twelve were baptized. It is a remarkable fact that the first called were John and Andrew, who had been beyond doubt baptized. Remembering John 4: 1, 2, they were evidently called first so

been baptized. Christ never contra-Let us hear from you. The unpaid pledges are in my hands for collection. Send the money by registered letter to my address, and it will be promptly acknowledged and your names marked from the list. This is the second time I have appealed through the RECORDER, and to some I have my interest to remain the second time I have my interest to remain the second time I have my interest to remain the second time I have my interest to remain the second time I have my interest to remain the second time I have my interest to remain the second time I have my interest to remain the second time I have my interest to remain the second time I have my interest to remain the second time I have my interest to remain the second time I have my interest to remain the second time I have my interest to remain the second time I have a present the second time I have a pres

The apostles carried out the commission just as given.

These were men inspired, "filled with the Holy Ghost," and could not err in establishing the church. Therefore what they did is as important to us in order to obey as what they said. Did they ever commune with an unbaptized person? Let us examine their conduct

on the day of Pentecost, when the model church was organized.

Our text is a full explanation. Those who gladly received his word were baptized, and those who gladly received his tized, and those who gladly received his word and were baptized "continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." "Breaking of bread" refers to the Lord's Supper, or the occasion when they observed it. In all this the apostles strictly observed the order given by Christ, viz: believe, be baptized, and commune.

This was no mere accident, for they always did just this way. In Acts 8: 12, Luke says that the people of Samaria believed Philip preaching the gospel. After they believed, did the apostle first of all tell them to commune? No; they were baptized, both men and women." Here the order is observed. After Paul was convicted he was told to go to Damaseus, and there Ananias met him and commanded him as the Lord had directed. Did Ananias tell Paul to arise and commune? No; but "he re-ceived his sight forthwith, and arose and was baptized." (Acts 9: 17, 18.) These, and every instance in the New Testament, prove that baptism was the first command given and obeyed after the exercise of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Other exact examples of observing the communion are given. Paul went to Corinth and preached. "Many of the Corintbians hearing believed, and were baptized." (Acts 18: 8.) With these the apostle constituted a church; and in 1 Corinthians 11: 2, be commends this same church for keeping the ordinances as he had delivered them. In this same chapter Paul rebukes them for taking the Lord's Supper in an unworthy manner among themselves; for he is addressing only members of the church. In Acts 20: 7, are these words: 'And upon the first day of the week (our Sunday), when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them." Evidently only disciples

came together, only disciples brake bread, or communed. Brethren, God's Word is our only guide. That word declares unmistakably that faith precedes baptism, and baptism precedes the Lord's Supper. Therefore whoever communes without being baptized, or whoever invites the unbaptized to commune, violates the plain command of the Lord Jesus. An inversion of this order obliterates the distinction which God intended to make between his church and the world. Can

This apostolic order of observing the ordinances is further established by the great historians of the first centuries succeeding the completion of God's

Mosheim, of the third century, says: Those who had been solemnly admitted into the church by baptism were permitted to all parts of religious service. Those believing, not yet having received baptism, were not admitted to the sacred Supper." Neander also says: "No one could be

present at the Lord's Supper who was not a member of the Christian church, and who had not been admitted into the church by the rite of baptism." Again. Baptism is recognized by all evangelical denominations as prerequisite to communion. All the leading denominations of the world agree upon this one point. Some in all churches hold loose views, but all creeds require

Dr. Doddridge, of the Congregational church, in his Rise and Progress, says: "It is certain that Christians have always been spoken of as baptized persons, and as far as our knowledge of antiquities reaches, no unbaptized per-son received the Lord's Supper." Dr. Wall, of the Episcopal church

says: "No church ever gave communion to any before they were baptized. Among all the absordities ever held, none ever held that a person should receive the communion before being bap-Dr. Dwight, an eminent theologian,

says: 'It is an indispensable qualification to communion that the person be member of the visible church in good standing, and that he should have been baptized.

Dr. Dick, of the Presbyterian church. says: "As circumcision was indispensable" (to an Israelite) "for eating the passover, so baptism is requisite to entitle a person to ear at the Lord's table." Our Methodist friends who make much ado over "close communion" hold that only the baptized have a right to eat at the Lord's table, and so hold close communion. In their Discipline published in 1886, compiled by nine of their ablest men, and adopted by the M. E. Church South, contains the following, found on awaiting recognition), "Brethren, the church is of God and will be preserved to the end of time for the promotion of word and ordinances"-here ordinances are within the church) "the mainte nance of christian fellowship and disery age and station, stand in need of plies." ("It" refers to the church-since alone within the church.) "But as none who have arrived at the years of discresuming its obligations, it is my duty to demand of these persons present" (who had already been baptized, see car "whether they are resolved to assume the same—then the minister shall ad-

of October, 1888, a leading paper of the Methodists, edited by the Rev. Dr. Buckley, a learned and good man, ap-

who are in good standing in other churches, to invite all who love the Lord and desire to live a better life? There is no authority, scriptural or Methodistic, making the invitation general.

The man who will not subject himself to the Christian church, and ally himto the Christian church, and ally him-self with its members, has no right to ask or receive the communion at its hands. The course pursued by some ministers degrades the church and the sacraments. Every person should be formally recognized as a disciple of Christ; it should not be left to his own judgment. Years ago a minister said: 'We sit in judgment upon no one. If in his heart he feels that he loves the Lord, he can come and commune with us.' he can come and commune with us.' And the meanest loafer in the town, in debt to half the church for money spent on his vices, unkind to his heart-broken wife, and expelled from another church, marches forward with a smirk on his face to take the communion. After what the minister had said, he could not consistently refuse him, but nearly every important member of the church expressed his disapproval in such a man-ner that the experiment was not tried again." Hence the absurdity of free communion. We had just as well disband the church and have a gay time around the Lord's table, even if it does

bring dishonor upon a sacred ordinance! Baptism, therefore, is the grand point of difference as to the participation of the Lord's Supper. Baptists cannot invite Pedobaptists, for immersion is only scriptural baptism and therefore those who have been sprinkled or poured have not been baptized. Let Dr. Hibbard on baptism, a recognized theological text-book among the Methodists, speak for the Baptists. Dr. Hibbard says: "In one principle Baptist and Pedobaptist churches agree. They both reject from their communion at the table of the Lord and deny the right of church fel-lowship to all whe have not been baptized. The only question that divides us is, what is essential to baptism. The Baptists have only acted upon a principle held in common with other churches, viz., that baptism is essential to communion, but it is equally evident, that they can never return the courtesy, and the charge of close communion is no more applicable to Baptists than to us." This is the decision of a fair, unprejudiced mind. We separate on baptism. Therewe are wrong in our restriction.

III. I NOW PROPOSE TO PROVE THAT IMMERSION IS THE ONLY BAPTISM GIVEN AND COMMANDED BY CHRIST AND PRAC 'baptize," was never originally used ex-

cept when it undoubtedly meant to dip, to plunge, to immerse. The most eminent Greek scholars affirm, as the origi nal shows, that in all standard writers, as Polybius, Plutarch, Hippocrates, Homer, Josephus, Diodorus, Siculus, Plato, Xenophon, this word baptize is used hundreds of times and always in the sense of immerse and never in the sense of sprinkle or pour.

Dr. Conant, after an elaborate exam ination of the word through the whole compass of Greek literature, says: "The grand idea expressed by baptizo is to put into or under water, so as to immerge or submerge." Dr. Anthon, the eminent prinary meaning is to dip or immerse. Sprinkling, &c., are entirely out of the question.

Professor Moses Stuart, of Andover, a Congregationalist who carefully studied the subject, seeking to prove that baptizo meant to sprinkle or pour as well as immerse, is forced to say that the only classic meanings of the word are, "to dip, immerse anything in liquid; second, to overwhelm, literally or figuratively." The same Prof. Stu art affirms that "all lexicographers and critics of any note agree that baptizo means to dip, plunge or immerse in any liquid." If we accept the testimony of man on any subject, shall we not also accept this testimony as to the correct meaning of baptizo, since it is given by great and learned men of unquestions

ble piety? The most celebrated Hebrew scholars affirm that the Hebrew equivalent of baptizo is only used four times in the Septuagint, and each time it means to dip, to overwhelm. 2 Kings v. 14-Naaman "dipped himself seven times in Hebrew for dip is the Greek baptizo. Isaiah 21: 4-"Iniquities overwhelm me." Hebrew for overwhelm is Greek baptizo. So with the other two instance found in Judith 12: 7, and Si-

Baptizo in the New Testament is lways used withithe idea of immersion, and only when immersion is clearly meant; and this is the only word used by Christ and the apostles in connection

with baptism. Now I submit, had our Lord wanted to enforce sprinkling or pouring, he would have used the words meaning that. The Greek language is the richest in the world, and capable of expressing the most delicate shades of meaning. When sprinkling is meant, rantizo is always used; to pour, ekkeo is used; to wash, louo is used; and the word that meant general use of water, was kathairo, but baptizo always with the idea of dipping or plunging. Jesus always used baptizo, likewise the apostles, in others. To say that the Holy Spirit and Jesus selected a word meaning only one thing, immerse, to express either sprink-Christ and the Holy Ghost. Our transtizo to sprinkle or pour, nor have they ever translated rantizo, louo, or ekkeo, to baptize, but always to sprinkle, to pour, to wash. Baptizo and these are no more interchangeable than born and

One says, "I know that Mark 7: 4, says that when they come from the marthe gospel church, which should ever continue as first organized.

The great commission establishes the candidates—"for recognition, not baptism, for all had been baptized,") as follows: "Do you solemnly, in the portion of the great commission establishes the continue as first organized.

The great commission establishes the profession of the great commission of trouble when many other things there be, which they have received to the profession of trouble when many other things there be, which they have received to the great commission establishes the profession of the great commission of the gre Leviticus 11th and 15th chaps., you will find that the law required complete immersion of the body whenever the person had come in contact with anything unclean. Mark refers to the Pharisess

table general: thus instead of inviting all members of our church, and those gian of the twelfth century, says: "If who are in good standing in other the Pharisees touched but the garment of the common people, they were defiled and needed immersion, and were compelled to it; and in water, they dipped all unclean vessels. A bed that is defiled is dipped part, by part. Meyer, the greatest German commentator, says: "Mark 7: 4, is not understood as washing of hands, but the immersion of the body, which the word baptize always means in classic and in the New Testament." Therefore since baptize in the means in classic and in the New Testament." Therefore since baptize in the New Testament always means to dip, to immerse, is it not pure logic and common sense to say that in order to be scripturally baptized, you must be immersed; and that immersion is essential

to baptism?

Again, the prepositions used with baptize further prove beyond a doubt its true meaning, and the circumstances attending the baptisms further establish

John 8: 23, tells us that John the Baptist "was also baptizing in Enon near to Salim, because there was much water there." Where in the history of the world has it required much water to sprinkle or pour? One little well or spring would afford sufficient to sprinkle thousands, yet John selected a certain place, "because there was much water there." Matthew 3: 6, says that they "were baptized of him in Jordan." The New Version puts it more emphatic, "in the river of Jordan." John always preached where there was much water. He lingered at Jordan, because it afforded the greatest convenience for immers-

ing the multitudes. Matthew 3: 16, Jesus was baptized of John. Certainly the Lord was baptized just like all the others "in the river Jor dan." "And Jesus when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water" or from the water, as some con-

tend. Since baptizo means only to dip or plunge, it is evident that Jesus went up from the water into which he had been dipped. Dr. George Campbell, Presbyterian and best Greek scholar of modern times, says: "The word bap tizen, both in sacred and in classica authors, signifies to dip, to plunge, to immerse. Accordingly the baptized are said anabaienien to arise, emerge or ascend. Let it be further observed that the verbs raino and rantizo, used in Scripture for sprinkling, are never used in this manner. It is to be regretted even good and learned men allow their judgment to be warped by the sentiments and customs of the sect which they prefer. The partisan always inclines to contract the diction of the Spirit by that of the party." But in Mark 1: 9. 10, the Spirit is still more specific and plain than in Matthew. "Jesus came." says Mark, "and was baptized of John in (eis) the Jordan. And straightway coming up out of (ana-ek) the water be saw the heavens rent asunder." The marginal note of the New Version translates "in the Jordan," "into the Jordan. Baptizo is here used with the Greek prepositions eis "into" and ana-ek "up out of." Eis, under certain circumstances, may mean at, near, or up to. Since baptizo only means to dip or immerse how would it sound to say, "He was dipped at, near to, or up to the river of Jordan?" But the Greek prepositions eis and ana-ek used together give to each a definite and contrasted meaning, viz., eis is thus only into and ana ek only up out of or from within. This is a law given by all leading Greek grammars of the New Testament. Therefore these prepositions thus used define beyond a shadow of doubt the meaning of baptizo.

For granting that baptizo means to sprinkle (which it never does), you would make John sprinkle Jesus into the Jordan, -which on its face is ridiculous. Certainly the Greek verb baptizo with its attendant prepositions eis and ana-ek proves conclusively that Christ was immersed, -which the scholars of the world are now, and ever have been agreed upon. Also the old and new versions differ nothing in translating the word describing this baptism. The word of God is correctly translated, and needs no adding to, nor taking from. Who-ever attempts this from personal or other reasons, is very presumptuous, if not impious, or must profess to have more brain and learning than the world has

ever possessed, more even than Christ and the apostles had. I am aware of the report that Baptists have been charged with translating and publishing a Bible to suit their peculiar views-a Baptist Bible, of the Baptists,

for the Baptists, by the Bapsists! I want you, my brethren and hearers, to know the whole truth of this: Several years ago the American Bible Union appointed certain able men to revise porwas then much agitated, and the result was that there appeared a revision of Matthew's Gospel in which occurred "John the Immerser," &c., instead of "John the Baptist." Dr. Conant, one of the principal revisers, gives a full exwrites under date of April 21st, 1886: "This Society had been aided in de ers of Alexander Campbell. This sect ment in which it is expressly taught. Their aid was willingly accepted, though they were not fellowshipped by Baptist "In my revision of Matthew's gospe

form "John the Baptist," as a proper name;—the term Baptist being con-stantly used in the New Testament as

these men hastened to his remote residence, and returned the following day, bringing his oral decision in their favor.

"How they represented the case to him I have never known, nor have I any reason to suppose that my grounds for the position I held were communicated to him. Hence the absurd rendering, John the Immerser, which designates nobody."

The Bible Union published this work, but the Baptists have never adopted it, nor do they use it. I do not use it, as has been alleged, and have seen but one copy in North Carolina. A dozen opies will not be found among the 27,000

charge us with having and using such a
Bible ought to blush at such a gross
misrepresentation, or feel humiliated at displaying such appalling ignorance No. Baptists are no sticklers. Th authorized version is good enough for them, because it is the pure and simple Word of God. This old Bible is their creed, is their faith and practice. And the Baptists are the only denomination in the world who are willing to give a young convert, or any one else, the Bible, and leave to his judgment and to the guidance of the Holy Spirit the question of baptism, and abide by his decision without a murmur. This is the way Baptists proselyte. If extraneous influences were withdrawn, if people were allowed to read and hear the doc trines as given by Christ and the apos tles, there would be still a greater turn ing to the Baptists. It is alarming that in this age of liberty people are forbid-den to hear the gospel. Alas! is not such conduct a confession that somebody fears that some will see the truth, and obey the truth? Or are we Baptists heretics and preach strange doctrines? I advise every one to read the Word for himself. It speaks in no uncertain terms of the manner in which Jesus was bap-tized, viz: That he was baptized into the water, and come up out of the water. I urge every one to follow Christ, If this be heresy, Christ was a heretic and I am not as good as my Lord.

[TO BE CONTINUED.] Mr. Spurgeon and the Canada Baptists.

The Convention of our brethren in Canada passed resolutions similar to those of the General Association of our State, assuring Spurgeon of their sym-pathy with him in the stand he has taken for the Baptist faith, and their hearty agreement with him in doctrine. We give his reply in full below, as we know all our readers are interested in our great preacher, and will be glad to learn his position in his own words: "Dear Brethren in Christ :- I beartily

hank you for the words of cheer which on have sent me. Such a resolution, from such brethren, at such a time, gladdened me greatly. From the depths of my soul, I thank all the brethren, and I pray the Lord richly to you have not misjudged my action in reference to the English Baptist Union, from which I have felt bound to sepa rate myself. I have not acted from sudden impulse, much less from any personal grievance; but I have been long protesting qu'erry, and have been at ast compelled to make a stand in pub lic. I saw the testimony of the churches becoming obscure, and I observed that n some instances the testimony from the pulpit was very wide of the Word of God, and I grieved over the state of things which is sure to follow upon defection from the gospel. I hoped that the many faithful brethren would be aroused to the peril of the situation. and would earnestly endeavor to cleanse their Union of their more flagrant offenders. Instead of this, I am regarded as trouble in Israel by many, and others feel that, important as truth may be, the preservation of the Union must be the first object of consideration. Nothing could have more fully proved to me that my protest is rather too late than

"On surveying the position, I per-

ceive that the basis of our Baptist Union

afforded nothing to work upon if a re-

form were attempted, for any person who has been immersed is eligible for membership. So far as anything found p the printed basis is concerned, every immersed person has a right to join it. Within its bounds there is neither orthodoxy nor beterodoxy, for all have an equal right of place. This does not appear to me to be the right condition of matters, and therefore I quitted the confederacy. Altogether, apart from the soundness or unsoundness of individuals, the compact itself is on wrong grounds, and can never produce real unity. There are numbers of faithful, honored and beloved brethren in the countenance, are bolstering up a confederacy which is upon a false foundation. It is not for me to censure them, any more than it was for them to censure me; but I cannot but feel that a more decided course of action on their part would have secured for our country a testimony to the truth which is greatly needed in these evil times; whereas their shielding of the false and erroneous has given a sanction to evil teachers which they are not slow to perceive, . The pain I have felt in this conflict would not wish any other man to hare; but I would bear ten thousand times as much with eagerness, if I could see the faith once for all delivered to the saints placed in honor among the Baptist churches of Great Britain. I resolved to avoid personalities from the very beginning; and though sorely tempted to publish all that I know, I have held my peace as to individuals, and thus have weakened my own hands in the conflict. Yet this also I had rather bear than allow contention for the faith to degenerate into a complication of personal quarrels. I am no of the Lord, and I will be in no fellowhip with it.

"Nothing has occurred to eause in my mind the least alienation from Bap-tist brethren, who hold the doctrines taught in Holy Scripture. Far other-I have never had a doubt as to of baptism; and I rejoice that with the mass of those who obey the Lord in this matter I am still in hearty union. Asuredly I am one with you, and all the more consciously so because you have not hesitated to stand by me in the hour of trouble when many shun my company

evil. You love the truth, and therefore do not shun the light. May the Holy Ghost be with all your ministries, and dwell in all your members! Peace be to you and grace!

"Unable to write all that I feel, I turn to prayer, and beseech our God in Christ Jesus to bless you exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or even thick

"Yours most gratefully and lovingly,
"C. H. SPURGHON."

Where I was First Forgiven. The following lines were given me some years ago by a Christian woman who sang them very sweetly. She did not know the author, and I have never been able to ascertain. I quoted them

in my sermon at the recent Baptist State Convention at Greensboro, N. C., and as a number of the brethren asked me for copies, I must beg the RECORDER to help me comply with their request.

J. WM. JONES. There is a place to me more dear Than native vale or mountain;
A place for which affection's tear,
Springs grateful from its fountain.
'Tis not where kindred souls abound,

Though that were almost heaven— But where I first my Saviour found And felt my sins forgiven. Hard was the toil to reach the shore, Long tossed upon the ocean; Above me was the thunder's roar,

Beneath the wave's commotion.

Darkly the pall of night was thrown Around me faint with terror, In that lone hour how did my groan

Sinking and panting as if for breath, I knew not help was near me, Save me, O Lord, I cried, from death, Immortal Jesus hear me! Then, quick as thought, I felt Him mine
My Saviour stood before me,
I saw His brightness 'round me shine,
And shouted glory! glory!

Oh, sacred hour! O, hallowed spot, Where love divine first found me, Wherever fulls my distant lot,

My thoughts still hover 'round thee! And when from earth I'm called to soa Up to my home in heaven, Down will I cast my look once more Where I was first forgiven.

Relative Guilt.

The Old Testament saints were very mperfect saints. Many of them, most of them, fell into sin; it was not very uncommon for them to fall into grievous sin. Noah, Abraham, Lot, Jacob, David, Solomon, and how many more we know not, were guilty of gross immoralities. But the Lord forgave them all. We he be as lenient with us? The blood of Christ is as efficacious now as it was then, and has power enough now, as it always had, and will always have, to wipe out any sin. Still, there is people. Increased light brings with it, in the very nature of things, increased obligation; and the violation of a great obligation involves deeper guilt than the violation of an obligation not so great. Hence, what would be a great rime in this, our noonday of revelation and privilege, would have been a comparatively venial offence in the early dawn of divine light in the world. Noah would not be guilty of drunkenness now, nor Abraham of deceit, nor l)avid of his numerous crimes. On the other hand, we who lead what are called irreproachable lives now, would have com-mitted as great sine if we had lived

Take the patriarchs and prophets, with the light that they had, and compare them with ourselves, with the light that we have, and it may be that while their overt acts of wrong are far grosser than ours, their guilt was nevertheless far less than ours. Those who lived long ago found great forgiveness for great sins; but we must not infer from this that we shall be dealt with as graciously, if we should do the same things. While the evil deed might be the same, the degree of sin would not be the same. God knew how to make allowance in those early days for the want of light, and for the influence of evil surroundings. He knows now how to hold us responsible for our greater light and increased advantages. If one of us has committed grievous sin, let him not expect the same forbearance that was vouchsafed to sinners who lived forty centuries ago. An excuse four thousand years old which was good at the time, is out of date now. We often wonder that God was so long-suffering with those who have gone before us; the greater wonder is that he should be so long suffering with ourselves. There is one saying which is appropriate in any age of the world: "If theu, Lord, shouldest mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand?" Ps. 130: 3.—Christian

three or four, or five thousand years

ago, as any of those of that date now on

Revival at New Bethel.

I held a meeting at New Bethel, com nencing the second Sunday in October and continuing eleven days. There were forty professions during the services, from among whom there were twentysix accessions to the church. During the year just ended, this church

has given more liberally for missions than ever before during its history of seventeen years. I have, since last August, baptized into my churches eighty new members. To God be praise and thanks for his mercies and grace.

G. W. COPPEDGE.

A carpenter who is at work on a loft; scaffold, does not keep looking down ward, measuring with his eye the dis did, he might soon become dizzy and ose his balance; but no, he goes quietly about his work, occupying his mind with its details without the thought of falling. It should be so with the Chris Christian work, which is the best cure for spiritual hypochondris.

Take the place and attitude that belong to you, and all men acquiesce. The world must be just. It allows every man with profound unconcern to set his own rate. Hero or driveller, it med-dles not in the matter. It will certainly ascept your own measure of your doing and being.—Emerson.

Music, in its bighest and noblest form, is devotional. "All inmost things," says Carlyle, "are melodious; naturally utter themselves in song. See deep enough and you see musically." There is something sacramental," says Charles Kings. ley, "in perfect metre and rhythm.

They are outward and visible signs of an inward and spiritual grace."

Four things come not back—the spo-ken word, the sped arrow, the past life, the neglected opportunity.—Hazlitt.

The Biblical Recorder.

ADVERTISING RATES.

of charge. When they exceed this length, one nt for each word must be paid in advance

A Christmas Entertainment.

Christmas is coming! The question with all children, loving workers in our Baptist Sunday-schools, is, "How shall we bring a bit of Christmas joy down into our Sunday-schools?" All wishing to find the solution to this question may obtain it by sending their names to Miss Fannie E. Heck, Raleigh, N. C., who will send them, free of all charge, a complete plan for an interesting and delightful Christmas entertainment, &c.

Apply at once, Address Apply at once. Address

MISS FANNIE E HECK, Raleigo, N. C.

Christ's Need of Us.

That we need the Lord Jesus Christis a religious axiom that certainly no Chris-tian will dispute. But it is equally true that in order to the fulfillment of His glorious scheme of the world's redemption, He needs all of us who profess to be His people. Jesus Christ is our Pro-prietor; all that we pretend to own is a lease from Him, and to be used not for self, but in His service. We do not even own our own ourselves "in fee simple."
We are bought with Christ's precious
atoning blood; therefore are to glorify
Him with our bodies and our souls, our

time, our money, and our influence.

There is a side-light thrown upon this important truth by the little includent that occurred before our Lord's remarkable entry into Jerusalem. He sends two of His disciples into the village of Bethpage with certain explicit instructions. "Go your way into the village over against you, in the which, as ye enter, ye shall find a colt tied whereon no man ever yet sat; loose him and bring him." Their omniscient Master predicts not only just where the beast shall be found, but that they will be asked, "Why do ye loose the colt?" The sufficient answer was to be "The Lord hath need of him." That was the claim which they were to pre-sent, Sagacious old Matthew Henry (the prince of practical commentato remarks that our Saviour "went to sea in a borrowed boat, rode on a borrow colt, and was buried in a borrowed sepulchre." It seems presumptuous to dissent from any of Henry's bright expressions; but there is an important sense in which our Lord never "borrowed" His hands. He owned the sea and commanded it to be quiet at His bidding; He put even the fish in the sea under get one with a half shekel in its mouth. He owned the trees, and smote a fig-tree with perpetual barrenness when it was playing impostor. He owned the temple, and scourged out the sacrilegious hucksters who were turning it into a house of merchandise. That ass's coll was really Christ's property; He required it for His own use, and was only asserting His sovereign claim when He said that

He "had need" of it. Jesus Christ describes Himself under the figure of a Shepherd coming to seek and to save His wandering sheep. That the poor forlorn vagrants needed the Shepherd's restoring love, and needed to be brought back and fed and sheltered, is very true. It is equally true that the divine Shepherd hath need of His flock; His infinite heart of love could only be satisfied by their recovery. A sick child requires a mother's care but still more does the mother's heart require the darling of her love. If Heaven would not be Heaven to us, were Jesus not there, neither would it be such a Heaven as Jesus desires, if a multitude of redeemed souls were not there also to chant His praise. Rever-ently be it said that the glorified Reor else He could not "see of the travail of His soul and be satisfied." That was the joy set before Him, for which He endured the cross and bore all its sham

The true idea which every Christian

and agonies.

should keep in mind is, that he does not own himself. Christ owns us, and has a perfect right to put us just where He chooses, and to demand of us just what He wants. He has a right to the firstlings of the flock, to the brightest sons and daughters of our families. The best brains and highest culture are none too good for His service. If His pulpits and His mission fields need them, then in God's name let them not be confiscated to mere money-making, or office-seeking, or earthly ambitions of any kind. What we call our property really belongs to Christ; we only surrender to Him His own when we pour it into His treasury. Jesus has the first claim—a claim to the best, and is not to be put off with the candle-ends and the cheese parings. Is this great principle acknowledged by those church-members who squander their thousands on fine houses and equipage, and then dribble out stingily what "they can afford" (!) to Him who has purchased for them an eternal salvation? Ah, let such remember that they canno is His own. It is no sin to have money, but it is a sin to let money have us. If we put the chest of gold on our own shoulders, it may crush us into selfish ness and ruin: if we put it under our feet, it may lift us up to usefulness and the smile of our approving Lord. How much of my time and money and talents does Jesus Christ need! That is the way that Christians should look at

Christ allows him to take away from us whatever He will, and when He will. A merfield, a McCheyne, a Nott, a Dudley Tyng is called away to heaven, and a bereaved church wonders why they are bereft. "The Lord hath need of them" somewhere else. That is enough. Our bright son sickens and dies; our lovely daughter droops away and vanishes from our arms. Why is thisf we cry out in our agony. The Master was only taking His own; let us open not our mouths, for He did it. He needed to do it; there was a divine purpose of wisdom to be served; God's dealings are often great mysteries, but they are never mistakes. He puts His own where He needs them most. He gives us the discipline that we most require. Then, good friends, it our divine Lord once had need of a little bit of a beast in Jerusalem let us comfort ourselves with the though that He puts honor on such humble creatures as we are when He conde scends to use us or ours for His blessed service.—Dr. T. L. Cuyier, in N. Y. Beanyelist.

I have seldom known any one w deserted truth in trifles, who could trusted in matters of importance