

BIBLICAL RECORDER.

THE ORGAN OF THE NORTH CAROLINA BAPTISTS—DEVOTED TO BIBLE RELIGION, EDUCATION, LITERATURE AND GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

Volume 59.

RALEIGH, N. C., WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1893.

Number 18.

The Biblical Recorder.

PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY.

OFFICE:

118 (up stairs) Fayetteville Street, Raleigh, N. C.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION:

One copy, one year..... \$ 2.00
One copy, six months..... 1.00
Clubs of ten (copy extra to sender)..... 20.00

Anonymous communications will always find their way to the waste basket. No exceptions.

In sending letters of business, it is absolutely necessary that you give your postoffice address in full.

The date on the label of your paper indicates when your subscription expires, and also serves as a receipt for your money.

Obituaries, sixty words long, are inserted free of charge. When they exceed this length, one cent for each word should be paid in advance.

When writing to have your paper changed, please state the postoffice at which you receive the paper, as well as the one to which you wish it changed.

Remittances must be sent by Registered Letter, Postoffice Order, Postal Note, Express or Draft, payable to the order of the Publisher. Do not send stamps.

Our Boards for 1892-'93.

BOARD OF MISSIONS AND SUNDAY-SCHOOLS—LOCATED AT RALEIGH.

J. C. Scarborough, Chairman; C. Durham, Cor. Secretary; N. B. Broughton, W. H. Pace, G. M. Allen, C. T. Bailey, T. H. Briggs, J. M. Heck, J. N. Holding, W. N. Jones, J. D. Boushall, G. W. Sanderlin, R. R. Overby, J. M. Broughton, J. D. Huffman, C. S. Birdsong, A. L. Ferrall, L. O. Lougee, W. G. Upchurch, T. W. Blake, J. H. Alford, W. H. Holloway, J. W. Carter, C. B. Edwards, T. E. Skinner, E. McK. Goodwin, J. J. Hall, W. R. Gwaltney, N. B. Cobb, M. T. Norris, J. B. Boone, J. B. Martin, J. C. Caddell, F. P. Hobgood, J. C. Ellington, C. J. Hunter, C. W. Carter, J. M. Holloman, T. H. Pritchard.

Ansion and Richmond Association, J. W. Williams and L. Johnson; Ashe and Alleghany, James Eller; Atlantic, J. H. Edwards and J. C. Whittly; Alexander, D. W. Fowl; Beulah, C. A. Rominger; Briar Creek, W. A. Myers; Brushy Mountain, R. A. Spainhour; Caldwell, J. V. McCall; Cedar Creek, J. G. Fisher; Central, P. A. Dunn; Catawba River, Samuel Huffman; Cape Fear and Columbus, E. W. Wooten and Dr. A. W. Kennon; Chowan, E. F. Aydt; Eastern, L. R. Carroll and O. P. Meeks; Elkin, J. S. Kilby; Flat River, R. H. Marsh; Green River, C. B. Justice; King's Mountain, H. F. Schenck; Liberty, James Smith; Little River, J. A. Campbell; Mocklenburg and Cabarrus, C. Greenham; Mt. Zion, W. C. Tyree; Pilot Mountain, H. A. Brown; Raleigh, O. L. Stringfield; Robeson, E. K. Proctor, Jr.; Sandy Creek, O. T. Edwards; South Fork, J. Bridges; South Yadkin, J. B. Holman; Stanly, E. F. Edging; South Atlantic, J. M. Long; Tar River, C. M. Cooke, R. D. Fleming and R. T. Vann; Three Forks, E. F. Jones; Union, A. C. Davis; West Chowan, J. B. Brewer; Yadkin, J. G. Burrus; Montgomery, W. M. Boetick; Bladen, W. S. Meekin.

BOARD OF EDUCATION—LOCATED AT WAKE FOREST.

W. L. Poteat, President; W. R. Gwaltney, Cor. Secretary; W. B. Royal, D. W. Allen, E. Brewer, J. M. Brewer, J. B. Carlyle, L. Chapell, P. A. Dunn, W. B. Dunn, W. H. Edwards, P. W. Johnson, W. C. Lanford, L. R. Mills, J. B. Powers, F. M. Purefoy, Wm. Royal, C. E. Taylor, J. F. Lanneau, Elder John Mitchell, R. E. Royal, W. J. Ferrell, Dr. J. C. Fowler, E. W. Sikes and J. C. Macke.

BOARD OF MINISTERS' RELIEF—LOCATED AT DURHAM.

W. C. Tyree, President; W. A. Albright, Cor. Secretary; H. A. Reams, T. E. Cheek, J. L. Markham, T. H. Pritchard, F. P. Hobgood and W. N. Jones.

TRUSTEES OF THOMASVILLE ORPHANAGE—LOCATED AT THOMASVILLE.

John Mitchell, President; A. G. McManaway, Secretary; J. C. Scarborough, C. Durham, W. R. Gwaltney, Thomas Carrick, F. P. Hobgood, Noah Biggs, E. Frost, R. D. Fleming, J. L. Markham, T. H. Pritchard, W. T. Faircloth, J. H. Lassiter, A. J. Montague, H. F. Schenck, John Brewer and J. D. Broadway.

TRUSTEES OF WAKE FOREST COLLEGE—LOCATED AT WAKE FOREST.

J. M. Heck, President; R. E. Royall, Secretary; C. T. Bailey, Noah Biggs, G. W. Blount, John B. Brewer, H. A. Brown, N. B. Cobb, C. M. Cooke, W. E. Daniel, H. C. Dockery, P. A. Dunn, C. Durham, W. T. Faircloth, A. R. Fousshee, N. V. Gulley, W. R. Gwaltney, F. P. Hobgood, J. N. Holding, J. D. Huffman, C. J. Hunter, R. H. Marsh, W. J. McLendon, John Mitchell, W. H. Mitchell, E. S. Moore, R. R. Overby, T. H. Pritchard, E. K. Proctor, Jr., J. B. Richardson, J. W. F. Rogers, G. W. Sanderlin, J. C. Scarborough, T. E. Skinner, J. H. Tucker, W. G. Upchurch, W. W. Vass.

Among other measures that have received more than usual attention from the public recently, is that which proposes the levying of a direct tax on the incomes of the more wealthy classes, i. e., those who have incomes of \$5,000 or more per year. There is, as far as we can see, only one objection to this measure—the fact that it is obviously unfavorable to the wealthier class—and that is only technical, and, in our opinion, should have little bearing on the question. All legislation must necessarily be unfavorable to one class or the other, for the simple reason that our interests are so diverse that that which benefits one will be unfavorable to another; and we are sure that all good citizens will agree that if legislation must be unfavorable to any class, that class should be the wealthier. In the first place, they are better able to suffer slightly unfavorable laws; but more than this, the fact that they are wealthier is good evidence that past legislation has generally been in their favor; and, if this admitted, we can see no good reason why they should resist a movement to favor the poorer man, who has been at a disadvantage for half a century.

Something must be done to prevent the concentration of wealth and to discourage the accumulation of unnecessarily large fortunes. The fate of the great nations of antiquity is our warning. The direct tax

would be so graduated as not to affect the happiness and prosperity of the rich man in the least, and would be a glorious boon to the wage-earner—and none will say that the sweat of his brow does not make the largest contribution to the millionaire's coffers—whose income can ill afford even moderate taxation. The other benefits, among them the decrease of the tariff, and increase of school funds, are obvious. Now, with these beneficial results guaranteed, and the assurance that it will not be a hardship to the more fortunate classes, we cannot see why the direct income tax should not be speedily incorporated in the National Statutes.

This has always been a world of dissatisfied people, and consequently of carpers and critics. But we believe that seldom in our history has the earth been so populous of this special class as to-day. Journalism, no less than all else that is exposed to the public gaze, is having its share of the sweeping tide of deprecation. In fact, nothing—whether good or bad—that is actively before men, has escaped. There is no doubt but that there are certain species of journalism that are a stench in the nostrils of honest people, which are worthy the abuse that has been heaped upon the entire genus. But we feel constrained to remark that the printing press, and the enterprise of modern journalism has been, and is to-day, the great civilizer of mankind and preserver of the public weal. There are badly conducted and unworthy papers in the land; there are papers published in the interest of corporations that pose as guardians of the people; there are others that are published for money alone, and there are others utterly devoid of principle or backbone, that cater to every whim of their patrons in order to increase and maintain their subscription lists, all of which are a menace to the welfare of the country. Such as these are unworthy the name of journals, and are both a reproach to the profession and a disgrace to their subscribers, though they are usually the loudest and the boldest in their declarations of the "degeneracy of the press," and all other things that are dangerous to the existence of frauds and deceptions. We admire an editor who is equally above the "machine," the corporation, and the people, who maintains his principles, though his sheet be reduced to the size of a postage stamp. Such as these are the true journalists, and should not be included in the deprecation that is applicable only to a small and special class of newspaper harpies.

Now that the majority has all but demonstrated its inability to effect an unconditional repeal of the silver Act of 1890, it is probable that a compromise will be agreed upon. In a recent speech, Senator Vance stated that every measure that had ever been incorporated into the statutes, from the Constitution down, was a compromise. The statement was a surprise to us, and we still believe that it should be qualified. At the present writing it is very doubtful what the compromise will be, or when it will be enacted, but the last statement given out by the daily press was that the Act of 1890 was to cease operating in eleven months, and meanwhile the silver purchased under the present law, the seigniorage thereon, and the seigniorage now in the Treasury, are to be coined into dollars at the usual ratio. Moreover, all notes under the denomination of ten dollars, except silver certificates, are to be retired and coin and certificates substituted therefor. We candidly believe that such a measure would have no other effect, for good or evil, than to remove the doubt and suspense as to what the Senate would do, that has so disturbed the business world. The measure will not increase the currency, because notes are to be retired for the coin and certificates issued. Moreover, there is not enough silver in sight to materially increase the per capita. Again, the measure amounts to unconditional repeal in less than one year. Now, if the Senators believe in coining bullion into "cheap dollars" during that time, why stop at all? Surely if "cheap dollars" were the cause of the panic, this great addition to their number cannot but prolong and aggravate the trouble. The truth is, "cheap dollars," so-called, had little to do with the panic. But we hope and believe that this is only a temporary measure, and if enacted at all, will be replaced before next October by an enactment by which silver will be restored to its full and worthy use as a part of the standard currency of the country. We believe the country may well rejoice that the Senate has concluded to cease cavilling and to go to work.

Two days since, the World's Fair, which has indeed been the crowning glory of this century, and which will be unrivaled for many years in the next, was closed. In a few more days those magnificent structures which have excited the admiration of the world, will be destroyed forever, and the exhibits which they contained, no less magnificent and admirable, will be removed and

scattered over the earth. It does seem a pity that this, the grandest display of man's handiwork ever collected, and the greatest testimony of modern times to God's goodness, should be brought to an end, when scarcely 20,000,000 people have beheld them. But such is the decree, and those who have not been so fortunate as to see the Fair must resign themselves to the inevitable. They may learn some lessons from it through representation, but its grandeur and magnificence can never be adequately expressed by this means. How can words express the beauty and wealth represented by \$150,000,000? No more is it possible than it is to obtain an idea of the Liberal Arts Building, which has a flooring of forty-four acres, by a 10x12 inch photograph. We believe, with the editor of the Century, that the equal of this Fair will not be reproduced in the life of any one living to-day. The time, the place, the occasion, and the circumstances, combined most favorably for the success of this colossal undertaking in a manner that will hardly be repeated. Yet the Fair may only be an earnest of what man can do, and two decades may not pass before the present exhibition will be relegated to the realm of the common-place, as it has overshadowed the almost forgotten Centennial Fair of 1876.

A Divine Canon Applied to the Ordinance of Christian Baptism.

PREACHED ON SUNDAY BY THE LATE REV. A. W. PRICE IN THE LAURINBURG CHURCH BEFORE THE BURNING OF THE BUILDING.

"Whoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven." Matt. 5: 19.

Christ seems to recognize here that while none of the commandments of God are unimportant, yet there are some of more importance than others. Anything which the infinite God commands, however non essential it appears to finite man cannot in itself be of non importance. This was to charge infinite wisdom with foolishness and maintain that the infinitely great Lawgiver trifles with his moral creatures. But while every command coming from the great Lawgiver of the universe is great and important, the Saviour himself recognizes that some commandments are greater than others, that some are fraught with more serious consequences and involve higher obligations than others. He recognized this fact on another occasion when a lawyer, with the view of tempting him, asked him, "Which is the greatest of the commandments?" And Jesus replied, "The first commandment is this: Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord, and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy mind, with all thy soul, and with all thy strength. And the second is like, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. There are no commandments greater than these; for upon these hang all the law and the prophets." These two commandments, as the broad, underlying principles and motives of the whole law are, of course, of more importance than any specific precept which may grow out of them. Then Jesus recognized the same fact that some commandments are more weighty than others when he said to the Pharisees, "Ye pay tithes of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith; these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone." He did not say that tithing mint and anise and cummin was unimportant or unnecessary. On the contrary, he intimated that carrying out of the tithing law to the most scrupulous exactness was in the highest degree important and commendable; yet he plainly stated that obedience, however scrupulous in these ceremonial precepts, could not atone for the neglect of the weightier matters of the law, justice, mercy, faith. "These things ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone." So that the distinction which he seems to set forth here is that moral precepts are of more importance than ceremonial precepts, though these when divinely commanded are not to be ignored or rejected. This is not only in accordance with the Supreme Court of Heaven, but is the verdict of universal reason and common sense.

But Christ in this text shows the estimate which he puts upon the least of the divine commandments. "Whoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven." Now then the text is a canon or rule, used by Christ himself in reference to the least or less important commandments. I want on this occasion to apply this divine canon or rule to the commandment to be baptized. In more formal statement: *This canon of Christ applied to Christian Baptism.*

"Whoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven." Baptism may with propriety come under the head of "these least commandments," because a positive and ceremonial ordinance and not a moral precept. It is not as important as repentance and faith, because upon them depend eternal salvation. And while baptism is to follow repentance and faith in close succession, and while it is intimately associated with them occurring in the same sentence and spoken with the same breath with which the command to believe was spoken,

yet from the very nature of the command and the position of the duty, baptism is not as great in importance and issues as repentance and faith are. This much is true that by the common consent of the Christian people, with few exceptions, the ordinance of baptism is relegated to the realm of the least of the commandments. There are some, it is true, who make baptism not one of the least, but one of the greatest commandments. By attaching an importance which the Scriptures do not attach to it, by erecting it into a saving ordinance and declaring that by its conscious adults and unconscious infants are regenerated and made heirs of eternal glory, some people make baptism not only one of the greatest commandments, but the greatest. Because, if it is a saving ordinance, it is so simple, so easy and so mechanical, that not to embrace it were not only fatal but foolish. This, however, is not the position and importance that the Scriptures attach to Christian baptism, nor what the majority of evangelical Christians attach to it. Compared, then, with repentance and faith and love, the command to be baptized is "one of the least commandments." And yet we are to ignore it or reject it with impunity? Nay; the Master says, "Whoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, the same shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven." Mark you, he does not say, "Whoever therefore shall break one of the greatest commandments shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but who shall break one of these least commandments, shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven." The comparison is between breaking the "least of these commandments" and being "least in the kingdom of heaven." This may mean that they shall be least in the estimation of the kingdom of heaven, but it more probably means that they shall be least in Christ's kingdom in point of dignity and knowledge.

Applying the text to the question of Christian baptism, the question naturally arises, how may we break the command to be baptized?

I answer, we break the command to be baptized by changing the form or mode of baptism. This is something in which you cannot separate mode from substance; indeed, the mode is the thing itself; so that if you change the mode you destroy the thing. What led Prof. Moses Stuart to write his work on baptism—a work in which he candidly admits and perseveringly proves that the meaning of the Greek word *baptizo* means immerse and nothing else, was a proposition which some one put to him. The proposition was this: "Baptism is nothing but a rite; a rite is nothing but a form; therefore, if we receive the baptism, we must submit to the rite, and if we submit to the rite, we must observe the form." And the burden of Prof. Stuart's book was to prove that, notwithstanding that immersion was the original mode of baptism, yet we are justified in adopting some other mode. Prof. Stuart was Professor in Andover Seminary and was not a Baptist, but was a ripe and candid scholar, and he plainly admitted that immersion is the meaning of the word which is translated baptize. He says: "The mode of baptism by immersion, the oriental (Eastern) church has always continued to pursue even down to the present day. The members of this church are accustomed to call the members of the Western churches 'sprinkled christians' by way of ridicule and contempt. They maintain that *baptizo* means nothing but immerse, and that baptism by sprinkling is as great a solecism as immersion by sprinkling." And so it is. To say baptism by sprinkling is as much a contradiction in terms as to say "immersion by sprinkling." But Prof. Stuart closes his discussion with this concession: "But enough; it is a thing made out, viz., the ancient practice of immersion."

Now in this discussion, it would not be wise for me to quote Baptist scholars, for their prejudices are naturally in favor of the Baptist position; but Pedobaptist scholars are naturally supposed to be prejudiced on the other side, so that if they give testimony in favor of the Baptist position, it must be out of their love for and loyalty to truth. Hence I have taken some pains to collate some of the concessions which eminent scholars, not Baptists, have made concerning the mode of baptism. All of these authorities I have not personally consulted; but have taken their declarations from published works which have long been before the world and whose faithfulness has never been called into question.

Let us notice some of the Greek Lexicons. In order that these children may understand what I say, I will say that a "Greek Lexicon" is a dictionary of the Greek language, which is compiled by eminent scholars, who find the meaning of the Greek words from the usage of the language as seen in Greek literature. Of course you need not go to an English dictionary to find out the meaning of the word baptize, for the English dictionaries give the meanings which have attached to the English word; but we must go to a Greek dictionary and find out what the word meant when Christ and the Apostles used it; for whatever it meant then, it means now.

Let us go to some of the standard Greek dictionaries. Liddell & Scott: "*Baptizo*, to dip repeatedly." Donegan: "To dip repeatedly into a liquid." Robinson, Lexicon of the New Testament Greek, "To dip, in, to sink, to immerse." Smith's Bible Dictionary: "Baptism properly and literally means immersion." Neander, in his Life of Christ, says: "As John's followers were en-

tirely immersed in the water, so the Messiah would immerse the souls of the believers in the Holy Ghost." Lange says on Matt. 3: 6—"And were baptized, immersed in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins." Neander says in his Church History, page 167, "Baptism was originally administered by immersion, and many of the comparisons of St. Paul allude to this form of administration." John Calvin says in his Institutes, Article on Baptism: "The word baptizo means immerse, and it is certain that immersion was the practice of the primitive church." Dr. Wall, author of the History of Infant Baptism, says: "Baptism by immersion was the practice of the primitive church. This is so plain and so clear that one cannot but pity the weak endeavors of such Pedobaptists as would maintain the negative of it. It is a great want of prudence as well as of honesty to refuse to grant to an adversary what is true, and may be proved so."

Barnes, a Presbyterian commentator, says on Romans 6: 4—"Buried with Christ in baptism, that like as Christ rose from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so should we walk in newness of life." "It is altogether probable," says he, commenting on this passage, "that the Apostle in this place had allusion to the custom of baptizing by immersion." Dean Stanhope says: "The ceremony of immersing the body of the baptized in water, represents the burial of the dead underground." William Burket says: "The Apostle alludes no doubt to the ancient manner and way of baptizing persons in those hot countries which was by immersion." Dr. Chalmers: "The original meaning of the word baptism is immersion." Conybeare and Howson, Life of Saint Paul, "This passage cannot be understood unless it be borne in mind that the primitive baptism was by immersion." Fairbairn's Hermeneutical Manual, "Liddell and Scott, in their Lexicon, beyond all reasonable doubt, give the fair import of the word as used by profane writers and Josephus, when they represent it as signifying to dip under water, to sink, to bathe or soak." Dean Stanley says, in his work on baptism, "Baptism was an entire submersion in the deep water." Philip Schaff says, "The baptism of Christ in the Jordan, and the illustrations of baptism in the New Testament, are all in favor of immersion, as is freely admitted by the best exegeses, Catholic and Protestant, German and English." Bassuet, the distinguished French Catholic, says: "John's baptism was by plunging. In fact we read not in Scripture that baptism was otherwise administered, and we are able to make it appear by the acts of councils and ancient rituals that for thirteen hundred years baptism was thus administered throughout the church as far as possible."

Dr. A. A. Hodge of Princeton Theological Seminary, in his Popular Lectures on Theological Subjects, says: "Though the root-meaning of *baptizo* and *bapto* is to immerse in any liquid, have come to mean generally the producing of the effects for the sake of which the liquid is applied, that is, to wash, or to tinge, or to dye, no manner in what form the liquid may be applied to the subject operated upon."

I would like to ask Dr. Hodge if the root-meaning of the words was to immerse, when did they come to mean anything else? If they have come to mean anything else, it has been since Christ issued the command to be baptized. The wisdom of God is most signally displayed in his giving the New Testament in a dead language. The meaning of words in a living language are susceptible of change, in fact do change. Almost any of you can call to your mind English words, which have changed their meaning in a single generation. For instance, the word "rascal" used to simply mean "slave," so that the expression of Paul, "I am the servant of Jesus Christ" might have been translated "Paul, the rascal of Jesus Christ." But we now attach a different meaning to the word "rascal." But when a language becomes dead, its words do not and cannot change their meaning. They are as unchangeable as the fossil remains of extinct species of animals which lie embedded in the strata of the earth's surface. And as soon as the canon of Scripture was completed and God had completed his revelation, he locked it up in dead languages, which cannot change, so that the words of inspiration will mean the same when Gabriel's trumpet will blow, as they did when they came from the pens of the inspired writers. What the word meant when the New Testament was written is exactly what it means now, and it cannot "have come" to mean anything else.

These are but a few of the many quotations which I might make from eminent Pedobaptist scholars, giving their testimony to the meaning of the word *baptizo* and the practice of the early church. Why these eminent scholars write one way and practice another, I shall not attempt to say. They have some plausible, and to themselves satisfactory, reasons for not conforming their practice to their acknowledged convictions on the subject of baptism. To them might be applied the saying of the Master, "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." It is enough for us to know that honesty and candor compel them to concede the truth of our position, though they do not follow our practice. To their own Maker they stand or fall, and however we may deplore their lack of candor, we rejoice in their candor and honesty. The consensus of the world of scholars

[CONTINUED TO THE FOURTH PAGE.]