

# 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 8, 1893.

Number 19.

## The Biblical Recorder.

PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY.

OFFICE:

113 (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. Pae, 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. E. Overby, J. M. Broughton, J. D. Huffman, J. C. Hinson, A. L. Ferrall, L. O. Louges, 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.

Anderson and Richmond Association, J. W. Wildman and L. Johnson; Ashe and Alleghany, James Eller; Atlantic, J. H. Edwards and J. C. Whitty; Alexander, D. W. Pool; Beulah, C. A. Rominger; Brier Creek, W. A. Myers; Brushy Mountain, R. A. Spaulner; 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. F. Meeks; Edin, J. S. Kilby; Flat River, R. H. Marsh; Green River, G. B. Jusco; King's Mountain, H. F. Schenck; Liberty, James Smith; Little River, J. A. Campbell; Mecklenburg and Cabarrus, C. Gresham; 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. P. Edgings; 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. Burris; Montgomery, W. M. Bostick; Bladen, W. S. Meekin.

BOARD OF EDUCATION—LOCATED AT WAKE FOREST.

W. L. Potat, President; W. R. Gwaltney, Cor. Secretary; W. B. Royal, D. W. Allen, E. Brewer, J. M. Brewer, J. B. Carley, L. Chapman, P. A. Dunn, W. B. Dunn, W. E. Edwards, P. W. Johnson, W. C. Lankford, 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. Ferrall, Dr. J. C. Fowler, E. W. Sikes and J. C. Maske.

BOARD OF MINISTERS' RELIEF—LOCATED AT DURHAM.

W. C. Tyree, President; W. A. Albright, Cor. Secretary; H. A. Reams, T. E. Cheek, J. I. 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. H. Gwaltney, Thomas Carrick, F. P. Hobgood, Noah Biggs, E. Frost, H. D. Fleming, J. I. Markham, T. H. Pritchard, W. T. Faircloth, J. H. Lassiter, A. J. Montague, H. F. Schenck, John Brewer and J. D. Bradford.

TRUSTEES OF WAKE FOREST COLLEGE—LOCATED AT WAKE FOREST.

J. M. Heck, President; R. E. Royal, 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. Foushee, N. Y. Gully, W. R. Gwaltney, F. P. Hobgood, J. N. Holding, J. D. Huffman, C. J. Hunter, R. H. Marsh, W. J. McJendon, John Mitchell, W. H. Mitchell, E. S. Moore, R. B. Overby, T. H. Pritchard, E. K. Proctor, Jr., J. B. Richardson, J. W. P. Rogers, G. W. Sanderlin, J. C. Scarborough, T. E. Skinner, J. H. Tucker, W. G. Upchurch, W. W. Vass.

WHERE the question, What is the fundamental difference between the Republican and the Democratic parties, put to the average American citizen, we dare say he would be utterly at a loss for an answer. This is not surprising in view of the fact that not a few citizens vote according to their environments—sectionalism;—others for men, not measures; others in the name of their fathers; and still others for the money that may be paid them, or the office in the distance; every one of whom are not worthy of their citizenship. A patriotic citizen votes according to his opinion of the platforms of the respective parties, with due consideration of the men who represent them, but without further regard to environments or inducements. This is ideal, but it can and should be made a reality.

The age of the parties is a question, coupled with the marked changes that have come over them, necessitating the growth of the country and the needs of another generation, has also a little to do with obscuring their fundamental differences. But let us see the reason. The question turns upon the ages of constitutional construction, particularly on the construction of the preamble, and that clause which says that Congress shall have power to . . . provide . . . the common de-

fence and general welfare of the United States." The Republicans viewed this as empowering Congress to enact any law which it may deem necessary to the common defence, or conducive to the general welfare. But further on in the Constitution, in addition to these general words, are certain clauses which set forth the especial powers of Congress. The Democratic statesmen held that the implied powers of Congress could be drawn only from the express powers, and not the general words referred to above. The former construction is general and lax, the latter specific and strict. One gave very extensive and indefinite power to the National legislature, the other restricted National legislation and claimed certain powers for the States. This is the difference simply stated, though by no means would we have the reader to understand this to be the difference to-day, or that the legislation of either party is conducted on these constructions of the Constitution, or that this difference is literally true in all instances; in fact we might name many in which both parties have acted directly contrary to their original construction of the Constitution.

SAYS Dr. Strong in "The New Era":

"The workingman of to-day may have, if you please, twice as much as his grandfather had, but he knows, say, ten times as much and wants ten times as much; hence his discontent."

This is in a degree true. To-day men are capable of more, know more, and want more, than they have since men were. But we do not believe, nor do we believe that Dr. Strong intends to convey the idea that man's wants increase in proportion with his knowledge. If such is the case, we are assigned to a life of discontent; for as the years come and go progress is made in almost every department of human activity, and not the least in the means of communicating knowledge. In fact such a theory would lead us to believe that each man will finally "want the earth." Men's wants do increase with his knowledge to a certain extent, but there is a degree of knowledge which broadens the healthy intellect, leads it to a deliberate view of human affairs, convinces of inability and unworthiness, and content ensues. But such is more often the exception than the rule. Avarice destroys the lives of hundreds of men each year. Our business centers are crowded with men who throw away health, destroy conscience, kill themselves and others in a vain attempt to possess and enjoy more than they need or can use. The time will come when such men must be restrained both for their own sake and for the protection of the less fortunate who lose their share of the world's goods to the rapacity of the strong. Human law is powerless to restrain, and divine law is our only resort. We believe with Dr. Strong that the simple mandate of Jesus, "Love thy neighbor as thyself," is the only remedy for discontent and "hard times." Men will always be unhappy and unfortunate, just as human capacities for labor and pleasure and natural opportunities vary. All may be well situated, but many will cry "hard times" as long as others seem to be happier than they.

IN the preceding article we have discussed a species of discontent that arises from dissatisfaction rather than actual need. It is unnecessary to say that that discontent which rises from the latter cause, while less general, is more dangerous, threatening and pitiable than that which finds its origin in dissatisfaction. The winter is fast approaching, and we are told that it will fall upon thousands and thousands of unemployed, though worthy and willing, laborers in our greater cities. In the summer their necessities were few, and they have been supplied by charity, but in winter the cost of living increases, thicker clothes are needed, and shelter is necessary to life. Can charity supply all these? We know it will not; so it appears that there is great suffering ahead and increased danger to our government. It is, indeed, a sad state of affairs when men cannot find work, and though worthy, must suffer. To day men are begging for work, not bread, but actually for the privilege of executing God's law, "In the sweat of thy brow thou shalt eat bread," and they esteem themselves fortunate if not turned away as beggarly tramps. No wonder that discontent becomes anarchy in such conditions. It should not be said of any country or any age, which claims to be civilized, that men begged for work in vain. Whose is the fault, is a question that is often asked, and meets with as many different answers. Some say party, some tariff, others silver; but none know. And it strikes us that if each of us were to consider many such evils, and especially this one of poverty, as ours to prevent and alleviate, that there would be fewer parties and fewer evils to lay at their feet.

THE unexpected turn in the political tide which landed Repeal safe in harbor, and left many fond hopes high and dry on the rocks of disappointment, was a surprise to the na-

tion. Every newspaper in the land had announced that repeal could not possibly be effected unconditionally, and that a compromise of some sort would surely result. In his recent address at the State Fair, Senator Vance declared that anything but a compromise was impossible, and taking his word for it, with the additional assurance of the press that the requisite number of Senators had agreed in writing to a compromise, the Recorder set forth its views on the subject. But the tide unexpectedly turned, and left us, with many others, in the lurch.

The repeal, as passed by Congress, has pleased the North and sorely disappoints the South and West. It was effected, we are told, in the name of harmony. There may be harmony in the Senate, but severe discord is rife in this part of the land. A sacrifice of principles in the name of anything is crime. There is but one result that will bring harmony now, and that is the prosperity which the repealers have promised. A majority of the legislators favored unconditional repeal, and voted for it. None can take exceptions to this, as the legislators were elected by the people on certain platforms. If the legislators betrayed their covenant with their constituents, the score will be finally settled when they face the people for re-election. We candidly believe that the majority of the Senate deemed unconditional repeal necessary to the general welfare, and are not among those who think the country was sold to Wall street. Think, reader, what a crime that is to bring against the guardians of our rights! The repeal bill promises that the coinage of silver shall be resumed. We shall see if faith is kept in this respect. The repealers claim that this action will eventually result in bimetalism, the hope of the South and West. It does not seem so to any one now, but time will tell. We know that many of the Senators who voted for repeal are in favor of silver money; we know that nine-tenths of the citizens of the South and West, and at least one-half of the North, are avowedly opposed to an absolute gold standard; and knowing this, we have good hope that the present legislation is only temporary, and may be changed in a moment to a more promising relation to silver coinage.

But few of us understand National finance; the subject is clouded in mystery; but all of us can have the consolation of knowing that we were right or wrong, after a year has settled this one phase of the question. We can surely learn whether a cessation of silver coinage is conducive to prosperity or not, and having learned this much, we will know in whom to place our trust when this or any other question is brought up again.

### The Higher Education of Women and the Education of the Sexes—No. 1

BY T. H. PRITCHARD, D. D.

Dear Recorder:—I propose by your favor to write several articles, in which I shall endeavor to show, first, the need of educating our women more highly, and the wisdom of educating the sexes together; and then I shall adduce the considerations which satisfy me that the best place for us to establish a school of higher learning for our girls is at Wake Forest, and in direct organic connection with the College already in prosperous operation there.

I do not suppose that a majority of the brethren will agree with my conclusions at the first, but I believe them to be amenable to reason, and hope that a careful and unprejudiced examination of the facts in the case will affect a revolution in their views, such as has been wrought in my own.

A few years ago, I regarded the co-education of the sexes with exceeding disfavor: it seemed to me to be unreasonable and contrary to the natural fitness of things. After a time such facts came to my knowledge as somewhat weakened my opposition, and latterly, a still further investigation of the subject has satisfied my mind that this is the true theory of education, and that the very best results can be secured to both sexes by its adoption. I have no selfish end to subserve. I am old enough and ought to be mature enough to form a just judgment in the premises, and as the matter is one of much practical importance and of pressing interest to the Baptist public, just at this juncture, I beg a candid hearing at the hands of my brethren.

In doing so, let me present, as an introduction, a word as to the history of

#### THE HIGHER EDUCATION OF WOMEN.

Why it should have been so is a profound mystery to me, but it is nevertheless a fact, that while liberal provision has been made by every State in the Union for the higher education of young men, no such advantages of liberal culture have been provided by the States or by the Christian denominations of the country for young women. A hundred years ago the State of North Carolina established by law an University for the training of our sons. She has never founded a school of like grade for our girls, and only a little more than a year ago did the State, in the erection and equipment of the Normal School at Greensboro, do anything at all corresponding with the demands of the case.

The whole movement for the higher education of woman in this country reaches back only some thirty years when Matthew Vassar, after maturely considering how he

could confer the greatest benefits on his adopted country by the use of his large estate, built and endowed, near Poughkeepsie, N. Y., Vassar College, the first institution in this country, which afforded young women the same advantages of culture provided for young men at Harvard, Yale, Brown, the Universities of Virginia and many other States. All honor to this man of Baptist faith, who was the first to conceive the idea, and the first to put it into practical operation in the founding of this noble school of learning, the pioneer and precursor of several others since established of like dignity and character. If I remember aright, Vassar was opened in 1865. Smith and Wellesley followed afterwards in New England, and still later, about 1890, Bryn Mawr near Philadelphia was opened to the public. If I mistake not, these are still the only four schools, in the whole of the United States, which supply for girls what may be called an University grade of education.

#### CAN OUR WOMEN ATTAIN THIS HIGHER EDUCATION?

Let the wonderful rapidity with which the number of female students has increased within the past twenty-five years, and the multiplication of colleges for their accommodation, and the splendid record they have made in scholarship, answer this question.

A few years ago, the best Greek scholar and the best mathematical scholar at Ann Arbor, were women; last June, at the University of Iowa, in the honor roll, made on the basis of scholarship, five out of the first seven were women; in 1886, at Cambridge University, England, the finest scholar in modern languages was a young woman; at the same school, in 1884, and 1887, the best scholars in moral science and the classics were women, and in 1890, at the famous University of Oxford, Miss Fawcett ranked above the best honor man in mathematics. I believe women to be the equals of men in natural endowments, though there are certainly differences in their mental and moral characteristics. These differences, however, do not seem to me to be so great as to justify the variant methods and degrees which have prevailed in the training of the two sexes. While I am hardly prepared to say that there is no sex in education, I am persuaded that it would be better for our women if they were subjected, not only to a wider and more thorough mental training, but along the same lines that have been prescribed for the education of their brothers.

#### WHAT STATISTICS SHOW AS TO THE EFFECT ON THE HEALTH.

From reports received by the Massachusetts Bureau of Labor Statistics from twelve colleges, nine of which were co-educational, in 1885, the following conclusion was reached: "It is sufficient to say that the female graduates of our colleges and universities as the result of their studies do not show any marked difference in general health from that of an equal number of women engaged in other kinds of work." In 1890 an investigation was instituted in England as to the history of the graduates of the four colleges connected with Oxford and Cambridge, and the report concludes thus: "There is nothing in a university education at all specially injurious to the constitution of women, or involving any greater strain than they can ordinarily bear without injury; women generally pass through it without its affecting their health one way or the other." Now, I grant that the experiment has not been tried sufficiently long to furnish data entirely satisfactory on this point, but so far as we have the results of investigation they are not such as to furnish any argument against the highest education of women.

#### 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.

"Whosoever 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.

[Concluded.]

Then, as another test of the correctness of the three respective words by which baptism is translated, that is the correct one which can take the place of the word "baptize" everywhere it occurs and make sense every time. Now take the words *sprinkle*, *pour*, and *immersion*, and see which one stands the test. "In those days came John the Baptist preaching with the wilderness of Judea and saying, Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. \* \* \* Then went out unto him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were sprinkled or poured of him with Jordan, confessing their sins." This is the Pedobaptist translation, according to their definition that baptism is an application of water to a person. Or take Romans 6: 3, 4—"Know ye not that so many of us as were sprinkled into Jesus Christ were sprinkled into his death! Therefore we are buried with him by sprinkling into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so should we rise and walk in newness of life." Col. 2: 12—"Buried with him in sprinkling, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God." Well have Conybeare and Howson said of these two passages: "They cannot be understood unless it be borne in mind that the primi-

tive baptism was by immersion." No other conception than immersion will give them any sense or signification.

In many passages the word *sprinkle* or *pour*, when substituted for the word *baptize*, does not make any sense at all. But in every passage you may substitute the word *immerse* with perfect good sense and propriety. Which, then, is apt to be the word the Master intended? The one that does violence to the sense and connection of the passage, or the one which in every case agrees with both? If there is any one point in theology which scholarship and common sense have settled, it is that the baptism commanded by Christ, and submitted to by Christ, was immersion. Mr. Moody asked a negro in Richmond, Va., "Why are all you colored people Baptists?" And the old darky replied, "Cause we are all ignorant, boss, and can't splain away the Bible." To find anything in the Bible but immersion requires a great deal of "splainin' away."

Now, then, if immersion is the rite, then they who change the form break the commandment. Many good people say that the quantity of water makes no difference, that a drop is as good as an ocean—that a little drop of water may seal the fullness of divine grace in baptizing as well as a small piece of bread and the least tasting of wine in the Lord's supper. But, my friends, it is not with us a question of much water or little water, but purely a question of obedience to a positive precept of Christ. And so far as the supper is concerned, the two cases are not analogous. They both are subject to the limitations which Christ the lawgiver has put upon them. Christ has left it discretionary as to the amount of bread and wine which we may take in the communion so long as we eat not to gluttony and drink not to drunkenness, and so we obey the command, however small the amount we may take of the elements. But were we to change the wine for water and the bread for meat, we would then break the command in about the same way that we break the command to be baptized by substituting another form other than the one prescribed.

3. The command to be baptized is broken by changing the subjects of baptism from those prescribed in the Scriptures. In other words by baptizing those whom the Lord has not commanded to be baptized. "The mention of one is the exclusion of all others" is a principle of common law which holds good here. Christ has commanded only *believers* to be baptized, and therefore this excludes *unconverted adults* and *unconscious infants*. The one who is baptized in infancy though the mode of his baptism were valid, has not obeyed the command to be baptized. Obedience implies choice, but how can that be an act of obedience which was imposed in the passiveness and unconsciousness of infancy?

Now, then, unbelieving adults and unconscious infants are excluded by the very terms of the great commission from the ordinance of baptism. This is true of the commission as given by Matthew and Mark. Matthew put it, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." The better rendering, according to the best authorities, is "Go ye, disciple all nations, and when they are discipled, baptize them." Then in Mark, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; and he that believeth not shall be damned." Here belief must come before baptism. Then how did the Apostles interpret the commission of their Lord? In strict accordance with the interpretation I have given it. On the day of Pentecost, when those who were "pricked in their heart" asked, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Peter replied, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." And to encourage them, he continued, "For the promise is unto you and to your children, and to all afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." This promise says nothing of the "infant seed of believers," but simply those of their posterity, as well as those who were afar off in point of relationship whom the Lord our God shall call. And the result was that "as many as gladly received the word were baptized," which implies that only those who gladly received the word were baptized. Infants can't gladly receive the word. It does seem that if the Apostles had baptized infants, they would have left some record of it. In Acts 8: 12, it is said, "But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both men and women." If there had been any infants baptized, surely here was the place to mention it. It distinctly says that men and women were baptized, but not one word about infants. If they just had included infants with men and women, what a world of controversy they would have saved the Christian church. But so; for while the writer of Acts takes especial pains to say that men and women were baptized, but not one word about infants.

But one of the proof-texts relied upon to prove infant baptism, is where Christ says, "Suffer little children and forbid them not to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." But there is no baptism in this passage. Mark says in 16: 16, "They brought young children to him that he should touch them," not baptize them.

[CONTINUED TO THE FRONT PAGE.]