

COVERED.

by Rev. J. F. Vines
Anderson, Sunday
ber 1st.

tor of the First Bap-
-cellent sermon Sun-

"Be sure your sins
3-23. Below is given

ted among men, sin
We school ourselves
en we think we have
world. But alas, no
ur sin. Just as reas-
in the burning flame
hink you can confine
lent, secret chamber.
e as they thought, to
lit the veil and let
ives. They no doubt
v Him bow his head
aid in the tomb, tho
a guard could surely
ed to earth will rise
ow we fight, scheme
leton of our evil, it
our sin will find you
od is not mocked, for
that shall he also

forced by honorable
e to evade punishing
w often have we seen
er, after months and
ade to answer at the
s made and enforced
ctive in searching out
much more is the
punishment the being
pen book? Then let
ast God and man and
e some ways sin finds

Life.

ou meet daily and no
prove that sin finds
Contrast the face of
the fallen, a differ-
ne, which earth can-
you are painting in
sible, and the world
our soul will make a
related that as Wil-
pon the Alps, he saw
watched he saw the
and die. He fought
at as the bird rested
one weasel had fast-
y, sucked the heart's
poisons and pollutes,
ich devours all that
beautiful.
used bodies we behold
and honest toll, but
ible life. The mark-
er, rests upon men
convict known, so sin
our leading preachers
the practice of medi-
ne before him. In a
heants for cadetships
a young fellow who
at high, in looks per-
tor came to him he
o examine you." In
at the teeth, where
dark, dangerous, dis-
n. The young man
no have he felt

make in having the parents they must own. But no child can choose its parents. Children are marred or made by influences over which they have no control.

When the Duke of Kent, the father of Queen Victoria, was on his death bed, his infant daughter was placed before him at his request and he uttered a fervent prayer for her, particularly beseeching the Lord that if she should live to be queen of England, she might "rule in the fear of God." In the long life, the Christian character and righteous rule of Queen Victoria we may behold God's answer to the prayer of her dying father, with its encouragement to parents to commend Christ unto their children and commit them to the care of their heavenly father.

We need to preach and live such lives that posterity may be blessed and not blighted by our influence and inheritance. I endorse almost every word our papers in Anderson speak, they are clean and fair, but I noticed one remark I consider unsafe. A remark which seemed to endorse mob law as the remedy for the Negro brute and the nameless crime. Such teaching would kill law and encourage anarchy. Let your best men kill your bad men and soon your worst will be killing your best. Let your citizens kill by "mob law" for the nameless crime, and soon we shall have mob law for the men who do not agree with us, as has just been shown in Tennessee. We are ready to defend our white girls, which is right, by the safe means, but oh, for more to raise a protest that will save our poor ignorant black girls! Yes, for a protest that will save our white men and boys! The problem is not, shall the Negro rule, because he is unfit by nature for such a responsibility, but the problem is that two races may live side by side and not curse and blight posterity!

In Your Conscience.

I recall the advice of a teacher who would say "Young men never do anything that will make you think less of yourself." If we could hide our sins from men, we could not from ourselves. I do not believe in "haunted houses," but I believe in haunted souls. There are men haunted by the ghost of their own sins. Cain may kill his brother and hide in the earth but his blood will cry out from the ground.

David may rest secure now that he has slain Uriah, the only man who could expose his sin. But, oh, David, that sin will lie down with you at night, and rise up with you in the morning, will haunt you. Yes, your sin so well guarded, will look you in the face and say, "Thou art the man." We can't escape our consciences.

Writers have with burning words pictured the tragedy of an outraged conscience. Lady Macbeth may steal away under cover of darkness and slay Duncan, but all Niagara cannot wash the blood from her hand. Macbeth may slay Banquo but his ghost will rise up and sit before him, making the cheek burn and the heart to tremble with fear. There is perhaps no better illustration than an old heathen novelist gives us when he relates the case of a man who had murdered his father. One day the murderer was seen tearing the birds' nests from the hedge and cruelly killing the birds and when asked only said: "Why did they cry 'parricide, parricide,' at me?"

Be sure your sins will find you out in your souls.

In Judgment.

Were it possible to escape the consequences of sin in every other way, we cannot evade the judgment. We might go unwhipped here, but yonder our sin will find us out. "Rejoice, oh young man in thy youth, and let thine heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk

A SYSTEMATIC BENEFICENCE.

By Manly J. Breaker.

The Commission on Systematic Beneficence, appointed by the Southern Baptist Convention at Hot Springs in May, 1908, met and appointed a sub-committee of five consisting of E. C. Dargan, chairman; M. J. Breaker, secretary, and J. B. Gambrell, A. V. Rowe, and Livingston Johnson, who were (in the language of the report creating the Commission) "to devise a better system for raising funds for our missionary operations and make recommendations of same to the various State Conventions."

At the call of the chairman this committee, with Secretaries R. J. Willingham and B. D. Gray sitting with them, met at the rooms of the Sunday School Board at Nashville, August 20, 1908. After carefully considering data collected by Secretary Breaker and conferring together, the committee present the following recommendations:

1. The lack of systematic distribution through the year of contributions to Home and Foreign Missions which results in the strain and rush during the closing weeks of the conventional year, requiring the payment of a large amount of interest on borrowed money, as well as other evils, is greatly to be deplored, and the need of a change of method is generally recognized. The committee finds that, generally speaking, three conditions prevail: (1) In some of the States there is apparently no system at all; (2) in some there are rudimentary and inadequate systems; (3), in some there are some of less elaborate and carefully worked out plans, which, however, are only partially successful. In view of this state of things, the committee recommends to each State Convention that through a special commission, or otherwise, there be adopted a plan of collections which will secure regular, separate offerings for State, Home and Foreign Missions. To this end the following is suggested as illustration: That two months, at different seasons of the year, be devoted to each of the three Mission Boards—State, Home, and Foreign—the remaining time being left for other objects.

2. It is further recommended most earnestly that more general, more liberal and more systematic giving be urged in all the Associations. Throughout the territory of the Southern Baptist Convention, in every District Association, Scriptural giving should have a large place in the deliberations of the body. In these meetings, it is easily possible to ascertain the condition of the several churches. It can be known which churches give and which do not. And it should be possible to adopt plans to reach all the churches in any Association with an appeal from every part of the Lord's work. In no other of our general bodies are there such possibilities of reaching and influencing the churches. There are near the churches, and nearness is a large element in influencing the human mind. Through the District Associations we may rapidly win to co-operation the thousands of churches now not co-operating and lead them to a systematic and liberal support of all the departments of our Lord's work. We recommend that in every Association practical arrangements be made by a corresponding secretary or an executive committee, or by a special committee on co-operation, to push the work of regular giving in all the churches the year round. If the District Associations are properly led, it will not be long before we may double the number of regular givers and easily double our aggregate gifts to the objects fostered by the denomination.

Helping Before Help is Needed.—Some people will help only when need is acute and the one to be helped is at the bottom. Others would rather help before the needy one has fallen to the bottom.

ter in this "just man," of which there has been only occasional and scant recognition. His thoughts by night as well as by day seem to have been occupied with what concerned the interests of the Holy child. Much has been written, and justly, on the eminent excellency and grace of Mary, the mother of our Lord, and of her influence on his early development; are not the nobility and devotion of Joseph, in every view we have of him, entitled to equal recognition, and especially when we remember that for at least twelve years of the Saviour's life Joseph was daily sharing in the exercise of that parental influence under which our Lord grew up from childhood? See Lu. 2:42, 51.

2. Another impressive circumstance is the use made of dreams in communicating the divine will. It was in this way that the Magi were influenced to disregard Herod's order, v. 12; and Joseph, having been thereby relieved of perplexity before the birth of Jesus (Matt. 1:20), was again and again instructed by the same means. And in this connection we are reminded of the earlier Joseph, the son of Jacob, in whose life dreams played an important part.

1. *The Flight*, vs. 13-15. The Magi having quietly departed to their homes, without reporting to Herod the result of their inquiry, the Lord made known to Joseph the real purpose of the cruel king, and directed him to take the child and his mother into Egypt, and to stay there till further information. His obedience was prompt and exact; for he appears to have set out that very night. Being regarded as a temporary sojourner in Bethlehem, his departure would excite no special notice. The journey to Egypt must have occupied several days, as it was nearly a hundred miles distant. The going down of Jews into Egypt was too common an event to attract any particular attention; and so the Holy family went thither unremarked. The connection of that country with the home of Israel was historic from an early period; as we have been lately studying; and the typical relation between the chosen nation and the Messiah was such that the writer of this gospel sees, in the historic deliverance of the people from Egyptian bondage, a foreshadowing of the call out of that same country of God's own Son. Prophets often said things, the full meaning of which they did not themselves understand,—their messages being interpreted afterwards for those on whose account they were more especially spoken. See 1 Pet. 1:12. It is evident that the New Testament writers "believed the whole end and meaning of the Old Testament to be Christ, and that Christ also, in a sense filled all parts of the Old Testament; so that whatever was in the line of development of the divine plan of salvation, and answered to the experience of Jesus, was regarded by them as applicable to him."

II. *Herod's Rage*, vs. 16-18. When Herod sent the Magi to Bethlehem, he thought he would shrewdly employ them for accomplishing his purposes without their being at all aware of them. When, therefore, they did not return, he concluded that he had been beaten at his own game, and was therefore correspondingly enraged,—as wicked men always are when paid in their own coin. Determining, however, not to be thwarted by their course, in his blind rage he gave orders for the slaughter of every male child, under two years of age, in Bethlehem and its neighborhood. Our Lord was at this time only a few months old; but Herod, to make sure of destroying him, included all the boys two years old, according to the time which he had carefully learned of the wise men. No doubt he congratulated himself on having provided himself with this information before his visitors left him, and felt certain of accomplishing the destruction of the child whose birth had filled him with alarm.

How many perished as the result of Herod's horrible edict, we are not told,—not more than twenty-five or thirty probably, as the village was always a small one; but the cruel wickedness of the inhuman monster was thus as clearly shown as if the number had been many times greater.

3. *Our Lord's Disposition*, vs. 33-37. Nazareth was despised, is seen very clearly in the words of even the guileless Nathanael, John 1:46. See also John 7:41-52.

For The Baptist Courier.
TO REV. G. H. CARTER.

Dear Brother: Some things in your dream seem right to one who is neither a Joseph nor a Daniel.

You dreamt aright when you dreamt that the prohibitions, in the first commandment, against the imitative arts arose out of the then nearly universal abuse of those arts. Since that abuse has ceased the prohibition has fallen into desuetude. Moses positively forbade, not only the worshipping of idols, but the "making of any graven image or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the waters under the earth." This entirely prevented the Israelites for a long time from the use of the arts of drawing, painting, sculpture. But Solomon disregarded the prohibition and adorned the temple with likenesses of beasts, of fruits and flowers. After the Captivity, though the Jews never became distinguished in the fine arts, they felt perfectly free to disregard this prohibition. Christians, perhaps the Iconoclasts, have never regarded it. We not only teach in our Christian schools that which Moses forbade Israel, but we fill our churches, Sunday school papers and even our Bibles with pictures of things "in heaven, in earth and in the sea." You certainly dreamt aright about this prohibition. It was manifestly temporary.

And you dreamt aright concerning the fourth commandment. The underlying principle of a weekly rest-day has never been regarded by Jews and Christians alike as universal; but some Jews and nearly all Christians have felt themselves free to institute another day for the day of the commandment. Moreover, the manner of observing the day was radically changed by our Lord who, by his "lax views" concerning it, incurred the bitter hatred of Jewish leaders of his day who insisted on Moses' rigid rules, intensified by some of their own. You dreamt aright, for there was manifestly much that was temporary in the fourth commandment, at least in the expounded forms in which it has come down to us.

But when you came to dream about baptism you ceased to dream aright. Our good and wise Lord evidently knew beforehand that you and Dean Stanley and some others would dream that way about that beautiful and solemn ordinance, and hence he took care to enjoin on all his disciples, in all ages and places, by a single, definite word, a simple, definite act. But with feet washing and the sacred Supper he did not so do. Therefore nearly all Christians have seen that the former was meant for the peculiar conditions of society prevailing in the time of our Lord, and they have changed the Supper from a full meal to a pinch of bread and a sip of wine. But Christ guarded baptism against the changes which have subsequently been made in it by using words which show clearly that he meant it as he gave it for all ages and nations.

Pardon a closing word out of my own experience. I have found that a careful, patient, loving, reverent study of God's precious word is a better way to ascertain its meaning than to dream about it.

Yours in the love of Christ,
MANNY J. BREAKER.

For The Baptist Courier.
THE GREAT EVIL UNDER THE SUN.

BY REV. I. DONT.

Among the persecutions that have befallen the saints in these latter days of increasing calamities and rigid testing of the laws of politeness, there is nothing that is so exquisitely torturing to nervous, sensitive persons, nothing that so strains the principles of common urbanity as the chewing gum habit. It is a recent invention, an evil that has been permitted to enter the universe, or a small corner of

it may be that Satan has invented this as the next best thing to the inquisitorial rack. In this way has the Devil come down in great wrath upon the saints, knowing that his time is short.

Now, what is the remedy for this great and sore evil? This depends upon circumstances. Wise church discipline recognizes the fact that circumstances alter cases. If the offender be the small boy, as is not unfrequently the case, he can be interviewed privately, and, if need be, the matter can be adjusted according to the old Scripture method suggested by the reference to the spoil rod. The small girl may be cured in a similar manner. But what shall be done with church-members, young men and young women? They should be excluded after a second or third admonition. If any persons not members of the church are guilty of the vice in question they might be reported to the grand jury as disturbers of public worship. Let them reckon with the law, and feel the rigors of civil justice. The case is desperate and demands heroic treatment. Unless some remedy mild or drastic is applied who can tell what will be the result to Christianity? It might be well to hold a Pan-Christian council at an early day to consider what ought to be done in this great crisis. It seems to me that it would be well for the representatives of the Christian world in this great council to consider the case of the tobacco-worm as well as the gum-worm, especially that class of the tobacco-worms that are in the habit of befooling the floors of church buildings.

For The Baptist Courier.
MY BROTHER CARTER'S DREAM.

I have read Bro. Carter's article twice carefully. He says it was the result of a dream. It must have been. In one of the books in my library I once saw a statement concerning dreams that is now verified by the article of my brother from Georgia. The book said that in dreams the reflective powers of the mind are present and active, while the reasoning powers are dormant and inactive. It must be so, or else so astute a man as Bro. Carter could not reach such foreign conclusions. His dream easily led him to show us how it would soon be possible for us to throw aside the Bible on the ground that it was written for an ancient day and time. To avoid this calamity, he would have us believe that no part of the book should be construed as inapplicable to this age. All of it is to be accepted as binding upon us now—as much so as it ever was upon any people. If the advocates of this theory would be perfectly consistent, I might be willing to join hands with them; but they are not, and I think I can name a case or two in which my brother from Georgia has changed the interpretations, or ignored them, in order to make them suit this present age and its customs.

1. He believes in total abstinence. Some of his friends once threatened to ride him on a rail for this belief. His faith is a good one; but I see no possible chance of getting this doctrine from the New Testament after once reading the story of the wine that Jesus made at Cana. In fact, the Lord's Supper itself stands in the way of absolute and total abstinence. Still, this is what Bro. Carter preaches and practices in the face of the New Testament teachings to the contrary, and I am driven to the conclusion that, for some good reason, he has changed the doctrine of the Bible with reference to this matter. Occupying my position, I see well how this can be done; but I am at a loss to know how he can do it.

2. Jesus washed his disciples' feet, and plainly told them that they should wash each other's feet. The words are as direct and the injunction as unmistakable as language can make it. But my brother Carter ignores the whole thing, and does not wash the feet of his brethren. Then he must have changed the New Testament teaching a second time.

3. Among the apostolic churches there was a custom of greeting each other with a kiss. Paul told them to do so; but Bro. Carter has gone off from the New

what heroism abroad and what at home have distinguished its annual very continuity of its existence in order of divine Providence; its unsuccesses, in spite of pecuniary and martyr deaths, are witness to principle grander than that which makes any secular organization is ing power. That principle is of Christ. Shall we commemorate achievements of our Missionary and not stand in awe before the energy that has wrought them all asked you a year ago to contemplate decrees of God as the great element to missions, so I ask you now to contemplate THE LOVE OF CHRIST. GREAT MOTIVE TO MISSIONS. Love to Christ, for that is a very uncertain thing. Nor even Christ to us, for that is something still to us. Each of these leaves a space between Christ and us, and fails a moving power within. I speak larger love of Christ, which includes these. Just as God's decree furnishes great encouragement to missions it involves and brings in its church's decree to preach the gospel the perishing, so Christ's love is the constraining motive to missions cause it involves and brings in the church's deathless love for those for whom Christ died. Not sin love to Christ, not simply Christ to us, but rather Christ's love in us toward the lost, is the motive founded and sustained our Union past, and that will deliver and prosper in years to come.

I bring to you the old communion which you have had from the beginning but I would make it a new communion to you this morning by showing you the law of love is a law of life, and no arbitrary demand but is grounded in nature of things, that it is only precession of the organic relation Christ sustains to humanity and he sustains to Christ. And I lay down the truth of Scripture the statement Christ and humanity are bound as one organism. I mean nothing more than this, that all men everywhere and sinners, Jews and Gentiles, since incarnation and before the incarnation bound to Christ, and Christ is bound to them, by the ties of a common life are familiar with the thought that is the head of the church, that all create souls constitute his body, lives and dwells in every true life. But there is a prior union with which Scripture declares to us but we have strangely neglected. Christ the natural head of universal humanity in him, the image of the invisible first born of all creation, all things created—all the physical and all the angelic hierarchies, all the man—and in him, who upholds all by the word of his power, all things including humanity, consist or together, from hour to hour. The race is one in Christ. Have we of Christ's life as animating only ours? That is true of Christ's life. But there is a natural life of also, and that life pulses and throbs men everywhere. All men are or Christ, before they are recreated. The whole race lives, moves and being in him; for he is the soul of life of its life. There is an organic humanity as well as an organism church, and Christ is the centre of the one as he is the centre and the other.

But we must not conceive of this of all men in Christ as a merely unity. This would be repeating the of Herbert Spencer. He believes humanity as an organism. But since man is free-will, the life of this organism virtually nothing but physical life individual members passively execute impulses communicated to them from inscrutable power of which they partial manifestations. Since, if thing be possible in the system, a very, the natural consequence of both necessitated, and there is no remedy. There is no eye to pierce arm to save. We shudder at this

Dr. terian, says: "The word baptism is light on the these verses." indefinitely

in the New that the ordie river, Mkerson "went to the baptister, Acts 8: ing in a cer- much water gument from from the re- rial, is con-

es in which a poured, for tant particu- among the

in a Chris- e subject,— is one who n of person in the New administer- n of faith disciples in repentance, leosts, Acts Corinthians ized, Acts ing requires lizes has oc- and death to

(that infant who are be- also proper

ngs at least case of in- out in the ages which mention of s that speak ntion of in- s of infant ground on for it. As le of infant if at all, as from the ; and insist re were in Of such only five ; 33; 18: 8; ; and they to be note- ces of the ise, house- en the gen- vould have nfants are as may be y commu- lar house- res as bap- that shows fants. See ; 18: 8; 1 its 16: 14), against her

for infant tity of the mic Cove- has come This sub- in full; it ie fact that person sub- of the Is- expressed apism, on ion of the therefore it

temptation to follow great expositors as it is to take a pride in too great straining after and show of independence of them. And notably so, perhaps, in the very matter of the question now under consideration. Let us not stand up so straight as to lean over the other way.

Now, as to the reference to the order in the creation of Adam and Eve, etc., it seems plain enough that the apostle designed to show that the prohibition was not particular but general, not limited to Paul's time but extended to all time and places. The reason why the Lord made the injunction may not, however, be perfectly understood. We might indulge in questions and suggestions of difficulties on this line to a great extent and yet to little or no profit. Speculative and metaphysical dissertations involving the "whys and wherefores" back of the apostle's prohibition will not satisfy. We see two risks, at least, there. One is the danger of becoming too rationalistic in the interpretation and application of Scripture; the other, of never being satisfied after all our earnest search for the unfolding of mysteries. We would not say it is "impertinent to ask why women are not allowed to speak in mixed public assemblies." But once seeing that Paul as an inspired writer so taught, we do not see that much is to be gained by trying to explain why the Lord so directed. It would doubtless give us pleasure to know, but even if we cannot or could not know, the duty of compliance with the prohibition is not affected. Let it be a *malum* prohibition or not, and let us see or not see the reason for the existence of it, yet if it is there, duty is plain. Let it be (to use terms employed by Bishop Butler in his Analogy) a "moral precept," i. e., a precept "the reasons of which we see," or a precept "the reasons of which we do not see," still if the precept is there we must render it willing obedience.

In other words, go according to the Lord's word, though we may or may not be able to tell why it was so commanded. Duty is unquestionable whether it be viewed as a "moral duty, arising out of the nature of the case itself, prior to external command," or as a "positive duty," arising purely "from external command."

We can sympathize with any one wishing to have explained many things that may be classed as the "unknowable." We could ask numerous questions about Paul's reason in Timothy for the prohibition as founded on God's order in creation. One might even inquire why Adam, and not Eve, was first formed?

When an old woman was asked what the world rested on she said "a rock." "What then does the rock rest on?" Answer, "another rock." Again, "And what does that rock rest on?" Answer, "on a third rock?" And still again, "What does that rock rest on?" Answer, "There are rocks all the way down." And so, while we earnestly desire to know many things and the reasons for their existence, there are sometimes questions all the way down.

Of course, we cannot desire to know too much, if we desire it reverently. But we may allow the desire to know more than we do and can know about some things to interfere with our obedience and submission in the things that we do know. Who can understand God's mind and purpose in the order of creating man and woman, and how that mind and purpose, in his infinite wisdom and fore-knowledge, may have gone to determine some subsequent minor questions, so to speak, that were to be afterwards settled as to man's superiority and woman's subordination?

In putting in some words on this subject, the writer did not expect in what he might say to satisfy everyone. Some few are perhaps hard if not impossible of sat-

following: "One other point. Some will say, 'If we undertake to carry out such strict views, they will be found to conflict with the work which some women are almost everywhere doing as teachers of male Bible classes, as professors in co-educating colleges, and sometimes as missionary workers in foreign fields.' I shall not now inquire how far these practices conflict with the apostle's prohibition. But if any of them do thus conflict, then instead of being relied on as precedent to set aside the apostle's authority, they ought themselves to be curtailed and corrected."

Now, in conclusion (if it has been reached yet), allow this writer to say that no one will feel more deeply than he does the incompleteness of his humble work in the line of his understanding. And yet he does feel confident and satisfied upon the main question under debate. His effort may be subject to the charge of being not "complete" and not "scientific" because it seems to some to "end with no synthesis of previous analyses and explanations;" yet, if the principle of obedience to the divine word in every particular in which that word is known to be acted upon, the writer sees no difficulty in the way of applying Paul's teaching to the work of God in our churches. We hope what we have said will be received in the same sincerity and honesty in which it has been given, and may the Holy Spirit bless it to all who are concerned.

For The Baptist Courier.
WHAT PAUL FORBADE AND WHY.

BY MANLY J. BREAKER, D.D.

I have been much interested in the discussion in THE COURIER of the Apostle Paul's restriction of woman's privileges in Christian assemblages, and I beg leave to add a word or two.

First, what did he forbid? Let him speak for himself (I quote Hovey and Broadus' version): "Let your women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted to them to speak; but let them be in subjection, as the law also says. And if they wish to learn anything, let them ask their own husbands at home; for it is shameful for a woman to speak in church." (1 Cor. 14: 34, 35.) "I will, therefore, that men [masculine] pray in every place. . . . Let a woman learn in quietness, with all subjection. But I permit not a woman to teach, nor to have authority over a man, but to be in quietness." (1 Tim. 2: 8, 11, 12.)

From this it is clear, all learned exegesis aside, that the apostle allows to women no right of speech in Christian churches, where men are present (and he thinks of no churches, where they are absent). He prohibits woman from praying, speaking, teaching, asking questions, and requires her always and everywhere to be quiet and in subjection. It is not clear whether she may sing with her husband; but as this privilege is not here accorded her, and as it was denied her in the synagogue, the presumption plainly is that it is not granted her by the apostle. Thus in a church of which the Apostle Paul was pastor there would have been no relation of Christian experience by female converts, no lady teachers of mixed classes in Sunday school, no lady clerks of Sunday schools, and, of course, no lady teachers in high schools and colleges, no lady editors or authors. For incontestably if it be wrong for a woman to "have authority over a man" in a Christian assembly, and that having authority be manifested in teaching, it is equally wrong for her to do the same thing elsewhere. Thus the apostle intended to restrict to men all speaking, teaching, leading of men and

leave to the young people the decision of the question whether or not they shall marry; but who will claim that the apostle means to teach for all ages that the father and not the lovers is to decide this important question? Likewise in dealing with polygamy and slavery, he gives directions adapted to the conditions then prevailing; but no one thinks now that he meant thereby to crystalize those conditions forever. Likewise with this question. He lays hold of and emphasizes the great truth that God meant man and not woman to rule the world and the church, and therefore he strenuously objects to those acts which in his age were commonly regarded as infringing that right and duty of man; but it is to do the apostle gross injustice to insist that the particular acts which he condemns must always and everywhere be regarded as violations of the relation God has established for the sexes. "Circumstances alter cases." "The letter killeth, the spirit giveth life." There is, therefore, no cast-iron rule to determine what part a modest, pious Christian woman may take in a Christian assembly or in the world at large. Generally, piety, modesty, refinement can be depended on to do right.

Gallatin, Mo.

For The Baptist Courier.
REBECCA AND HER SONS—No. 5.

BY REV. P. S. WHITMAN, D.D.

Did Jacob deceive his father? Here let it be granted that Isaac supposed he was conferring the blessing upon the one to whom it rightfully belonged. It turned out that he really did this. Jacob following his mother's directions, had only assisted his father in getting at the right person. As heretofore stated in these articles, Isaac, we believe, became satisfied that the rightful son had received the blessing. The just cause of complaint on his side was, not that he had been deceived, but that he did not himself sooner see a release from the family dilemma in a process of substitution.

And still does any one say, "Isaac was deceived; he supposed he was blessing one person when it was not that person." Now, mark—if, just at that time, perfect sight had been given him, what would Isaac have seen? He would have seen just this—Jacob standing before him, the substitute of Esau, the venison prepared for him, the hair on his wrists and neck, the scent of his garments, all declaring only what was the fact in the case—just what Jacob asserted, "I am Esau, thy first-born." All that he said and did declared him very Esau by substitution. There was no deception about it.

Did Jacob defraud Esau? This question may be considered as already answered; and yet so commonly the expositors speak of "Jacob's fraud" as a fact accepted by all Christian people; "Jacob's fraud," indeed, being upon almost every one's lips, that we feel it enjoined on us to give the question further consideration.

In the matter of receiving the blessing he could not have defrauded Esau. He thereby received nothing that belonged to Esau. Esau had sold his right here to Jacob. Besides, if he had not sold it, he had forfeited it twice over. He should be considered entirely out of question here, as much so as if he were dead. There was nothing of Esau's that Jacob ever became possessed of through that blessing.

But that very purchase, it is maintained even from the pulpit, was a swindle. Wherein? we ask. Was it not a straight bargain? "No," we are told; "he did not pay for the birthright anything what it was worth—it was a prodigious swindle." Here is a fallacy. Honesty does not require that a man pay for everything

spoken within twenty-four hours of Saul's conversion, and a recent conversion is no reason why you should not be a chosen vessel. Indeed, the young convert in the fresh fervor of a new-found hope is often the most favored, like Andrew to Peter.

Another reason given is: "I am not gifted like some." But that is no reason, either; for, if you thoroughly understood God, you would know that he gave power to the weak, and before he gives it away he must have a weakling to give it to. It is too sacred a deposit to give to anybody that is strong. If therefore you are weak, you are the man most likely to get the largest share of God's power. "To them that hath no might, he increases strength." You will find that illustrated in 2 Cor. 4: 7. The earthen vessel is most easily crumbled and broken, and that is yourself. You cannot get God's treasure in anything but an earthen vessel, that the excellency of his power may be of God and not us.

The third reason that might be alleged is that you have so spoiled your life by unfaithfulness during the years of the past. Some of you have been bitterly regretting past years this week, saying: "O that I had known these things years ago, or that, having known them, had lived up to them; but it is my grievous sorrow that I have marred God's plan." It is very bitter, when you get past middle life and look upon an ill spent past. Yet that is no reason why you should not be helped, for he says: "I will restore the years that the canker worm has eaten." Read Jeremiah 18: 14. Jeremiah went just outside the city wall to the old hut or shanty where a potter was at work. His wheels were revolving, the clay was in his hand. The prophet stood watching; and as he wrought, the clay in his hand fell to bits, not because the potter had failed in his designing or skill of manipulation, but because the clay would not take on his idea. There is many a man here who has thwarted, so to speak, the purpose of God in his life, and God has not been able to make that man what he meant. Is that man therefore to despair, and to think that God cannot use him again? The potter might have thrown the clay away, but he took it and made it another vessel, as it seemed good to the potter. O, Christian, you have lived a worldly life, have come short of the glory of God and his ideal; but God is willing to make you yet into a vessel, if not so fair as the one he originally intended, yet one that may yet do good service, and therefore the fact of looking back to day upon a broken and marred life is no reason why you should henceforth not be used by him.—Rev. F. B. Meyer, in *Christian at Work*.

—If we pray for any earthly blessing, we must pray for it solely "if it be God's will," "if it be for our highest good," but for the best things we may pray without reservation, certain that, if we ask, God will grant them. No man ever yet asked to be, as the days pass by, more and more noble, and sweet and pure and heavenly minded; no man ever yet prayed that the evil spirits of hatred and pride and passion and worldliness might be cast out of his soul—without his petition being granted, and granted to the letter.—F. W. Farrar, D.D.

—On the side of God there is none but God Himself. Every man, almost, is more or less directly for himself, and against God. The godly man is therefore perfectly alone. Thy cause, O brother, is the cause of one against the whole world. Yet be thou faithful to the end.

—No man can see the beauty of the divine character until he has been born of the Spirit.

of e hom thro trea O for i of al solv wor worl hear nobc that soul. selve easy the t ing t ours the tram puri four upon It to th owe Men a livi for i be a pum shbi it wi The wher stanc is ru with all tl epon: eple in bu or M usury to ge lent, fy hi To ou divid help lives not e with made let liv dence and t ment live : Georj if not body on the good untru the le much these To to Go ing th God t wind. no fai fourq mean: life ta seekin up int itself not av throu into it "that Wh symm his ow that o we ha how k aggers that w

contd

BAPTIST COURIER.
PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY.
TERMS, IN ADVANCE:
CITY, \$2.00.
OTHER, \$1.00.
THOMAS, Proprietors.

ON SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSONS.
PREPARED BY CHARLES MANLY.

Lesson 13, June 17
1st Cor. 12: 1, 3; 1-3; Mat. 28: 18-20.

Christian Baptism.

periodicals issued by the Sunday school of the Southern Baptist Association, Christian Baptism is presented for the lesson of this Sunday. It is proposed to take the same subject in a somewhat substantial treatment in the Advanced Quarterly. The first passage given above, the emphasis is that baptism is an impressive symbol of our faith as believers with Christ in his burial. The union of the believer must result in death to the oldness of life. The sage teaches that baptism immersion—a fellowship with his new life, expressing itself in those things which are above, is set forth on the right hand of the third passage gives the high sanction to baptism as a duty of allegiance to the triune

Christian Baptism is. It is the water of a believer, in the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. As to its being immersion.

The meaning of the Greek word baptism. Our English words baptism are transferred from the Greek, just as our word immersion is transferred into our language from the Greek. The New Testament is originally. The meaning of the word, therefore, is to be sought, if we are to what is intended. Words transferred into other from the Greek, may, in process of time, undergo various modifications that do not belong to the original. Hence our English baptism is defined in an English dictionary as the Greek word, baptism, is derived, would be defined dictionary. The Greek word baptism, which comes from baptizo, immerse. If the testimony is, as shown in the best dictionaries anything, it settles this, or, or its equivalent, is the only word suited to all the passages where the Greek word occurs. Anybody test this, in the New Testament, in the place of baptism, immerse, pour, sprinkle, and so on will suit all the places, first one.

ferences to baptism as a burial; 1 Cor. 12: 13; Col. 2: 12. This is plain enough for any body; and, the following language is Rom. 6: 3, 4 by commentators of Baptists, viz: "by immersion and of the Church of England, say, are cannot be understood as immersion in mind that the primitive was by immersion." John the great Methodist, says, "immersion—alluding to the ancient baptizing by immersion." Dr. a learned Presbyterian, says, "the meaning of the word baptism, is to immerse." We guard to this pose of throwing light on the act is instituted in these verses. testimony might be indefinitely

examples of baptism in the New Testament. When we read that the Lord administered in the river, Mark at the baptized person "went down into the water," and after the baptism "up out of the water," Acts 8: 38, at John was baptizing in a river because there was much water in 3: 2, 3, the argument from the word baptism, and from the reference to baptism as a burial, is conclusive.

There is no circumstance in which baptism occurred, for baptism, in all important particular, is not easily found among the

does express a definite spiritual state, in every one who has been properly baptized. Those who were naturally the male descendants of Abraham received the sign of the ancient covenant; those who by faith, without regard to race, become spiritual children of faithful Abraham, receive the sign of the new covenant, Gal. 3: 26-29.

If baptism has come in the place of circumcision, why did not the apostles so teach—especially when a serious disturbance and controversy would have been avoided? See Acts 15: 5, 10, 19.

Is it possible that Paul believed that baptism came in the place of circumcision? Could he, had he so believed, have written as he did to the Galatians? See, especially, Gal. 5: 2, 3. Is it indeed true that if we be baptized, Christ shall profit us nothing?

Well has the German scholar, Schleiermacher, said: "All traces of infant baptism which one will find in the New Testament, must first be put into it."

For The Baptist Courier.
"SHOULD WOMEN SPEAK IN MIXED ASSEMBLIES?"—No. 3.

BY REV. R. W. SANDERS.

It is not the wish of the present writer to have too much to say on any question, and it may soon be time for him to "hush up" on the above subject. He may or may not be heard from again. That depends. But there are some things which he begs to say further and somewhat in the way of mere remarks.

The "exegesis," if it is worthy of that name, appearing in THE COURIER, May 24th, was nearly all ready for the printer before the writer's first article of date May 10th, and the editorial on "The Woman Question" in the same paper came out. A paragraph or so was added to the article (No. 2) after reading THE COURIER of May 10th. So that the expressed wish of THE COURIER that should attempt to "supplement" Dr. Broadus' tract, taking up certain "questions and difficulties," had little or no effect in shaping what I said in my second article. So far as a "supplement" to Dr. Broadus' tract is concerned, it seems far better that he should be requested to give us that. Let us hope that he may at once do so. Why not ask him to put his supplement before the readers of THE COURIER?

Our object in article 2, found in THE COURIER of May 24th, was not to try to exhaust the subject in hand, or to make the discussion complete in all its bearings or details. Our aim was to help on, if anybody needed help and we might possibly give it, to an understanding of what Paul really taught. We were not dealing with the "whys and wherefores" but the facts. The inquiry was, what did Paul by inspiration really teach as to public speaking by women? That is or should be the first and main question. Settle that, and it does seem that the guiding principle at once appears, viz, implicit and loving obedience to the expressed will of God.

In the effort to reach a conclusion as to Paul's meaning, we considered something of the use of *laiein*, the Greek word used by the apostle, and some expositions of able exegeses whose works happened to be at hand. We think it wise to weigh carefully the views of such writers as were quoted. To be led away by them as *idola theatri* might be to be misled, but of that danger we hope the readers and writers of THE COURIER need not be warned. Our great risk is probably not so much in the temptation to follow great expositors as it is to take a pride in too great straining after and show of independence of them. And notably so, perhaps, in the very matter of the question now under consideration. Let us not stand up so straight as to lean over the other way.

Now, as to the reference to the order in the creation of Adam and Eve, etc., it seems plain enough that the apostle designed to show that the prohibition was not particular but general, not limited to Paul's time but extended to all time and places. The reason why the Lord made the injunction may not, however, be perfectly understood. We might indulge in questions and suggestions of difficulties on this line to a great extent and yet to little or no profit. Speculative and metaphysical dissertations involving the "whys and wherefores" back of the apostle's prohibition will not satisfy. We see two risks, at least, there. One is the danger of becoming too rationalistic in the interpretation and application of Scripture; the other, of never being satisfied after all our earnest search for the unfolding of mysteries. We would not say it is "impertinent to ask why women are not allowed to speak in mixed public assemblies." But once seeing that Paul as an inspired writer so taught, we do not see that much is to

infatuation. Certainly they appear very uneasy and unsettled about the matter.

We see they are not satisfied, not settled. That seems to be the case with THE COURIER, or at least with some parts of it, judging from some editorials on the question. It may be that some persons will not become settled as to the matter. But it does seem to some of us that there is no reasonable ground for doubt. Paul's teaching is plain as to the fact of the prohibition, and the application of his instruction seems to me to be simple and easy enough, if every one only wishes to know and do the will of God in the case. Of one thing let us be certain, viz: we cannot depend upon metaphysical speculation and the like to bring us a satisfactory decision of Paul's meaning in the prohibition under consideration. Our dependence is that we shall see his meaning from the text itself and abide by the teachings of the holy word of God.

The application of too much of other things outside of the Book may result in weeping away the text and leaving only those other things. We know how it was said to be with the man who purchased a cure advertised for a deformity on the neck. He bought it and put on the whole bottle at one time. When he got up next morning, the story goes, his neck was gone but the wart was still left!

I close this scrawl with an extract from Dr. Broadus as to the origin of the tendency to have women speak or teach in public: "From the best information accessible, it may be stated that the present active movement in favor of the practice we are discussing originated among the Methodists, especially in the Northwest. Mr. Wesley's 'class-meetings' consisted of a small number of persons of both sexes, under a 'class leader,' and in these meetings, which were strictly private, the female members were expected to speak of their recent experiences, as well as the men. This is probably the historical origin of the claim now made in some Baptist churches, that women may properly 'testify.' The practice of women's speaking in mixed assemblies was greatly strengthened by the zealous efforts of the 'Women Crusaders' for temperance in Ohio and elsewhere, some twenty years ago, and afterward by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. It is well known that Quakers have always encouraged women to speak in the public meetings when they felt moved thereto; also that Universalists and Unitarians have sometimes encouraged women thus to speak—those bodies not acknowledging that they owe strict and minute obedience to the requirements of the New Testament. A good many Congregationalists now hold loose views of inspiration, and some of them have been ready to set aside the apostle's prohibition.

"In the zealous and honored temperance work above mentioned, some Baptist ladies have united, through fervent sympathy with the objects, and usually without consideration as to the exact requirements of Scripture. More recently some women's missionary societies have allowed the presence of men at their meetings, but other societies have strictly excluded men, the latter class still showing a desire to obey the Scripture prohibitions. It cannot be questioned that the great majority of Baptist ladies who have been gradually drawn into this movement for women's speaking in mixed assemblies, have been influenced by unreflecting sympathy, or by mere considerations of supposed expediency."

Dr. Broadus' concluding remark is the following: "One other point. Some will say, 'If we undertake to carry out such strict views, they will be found to conflict with the work which some women are almost everywhere doing as teachers of male Bible classes, as professors in educating workers, and sometimes as missionaries in foreign fields. I shall not now inquire how far these practices conflict with the apostle's prohibition. But if any of them do thus conflict, then instead of being relied on as precedent to set aside the apostle's authority, they ought themselves to be curtailed and corrected.'"

Now, in conclusion (if it has been reached yet), allow this writer to say that no one will feel more deeply than he does the incompleteness of his humble work in the line of his understanding. And yet he does feel confident and satisfied upon the main question under debate. His effort may be subject to the charge of being not "complete" and not "scientific" because it seems to some to "end with no synthesis of previous analyses and explanations," yet, if the principle of obedience to the divine word in every particular in which that word is known to be acted upon, the writer sees no difficulty in the way of applying Paul's teaching to the work of God in our churches. We hope

prohibited women from any function which looked towards these things.

Secondly, what reason does he give for this restriction? He mentions three: 1. "The law also says [let her be in subjection]." He seems to allude to Gen. 3: 16, "He shall rule over thee." 2. "It is shameful for a woman to speak in church." His meaning here seems to be, as in 1 Cor. 11: 6, "It is a shame for a woman to be shaven or shorn;" and in 1 Cor. 11: 14, "Does not even nature itself teach you that, if a man have long hair, it is a dishonor to him?" In these passages the meaning evidently is that that is a shame or a dishonor which the instinctive proprieties of the race culture condemn. Jews and Greeks alike felt that it was a shame for a woman to make a conspicuous show of herself or to cast aside any of the marks of her sex which the race-customs had fixed. This reason, then, has in it nothing eternal, and if race-customs should so change that it was no longer a shame for a good woman to do any of the things forbidden by the apostle, his prohibition would so far be relaxed. 3. The apostle's third reason is given in these words: "I permit not a woman . . . to have authority over a man . . . for Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived; but the woman, being deceived, has fallen into transgression." In other words, he prohibits women to pray, teach, speak, ask questions in church, because to do these things is to have authority over men; but God gave the man authority over the woman, not contrariwise, and hence the woman was made first; moreover, when the woman led rather than followed she led into sin, and hence is too poor a guide to be followed. Therefore the apostle says that "the head of the woman is the man," as "the head of every man is Christ." Thus the apostle's position is plain: he objects to women doing anything in church that removes her from her position of subjection to man, because God meant that position to be her condition as long as she was in the world. This reason is the same as that just quoted: as the law also says.

Granted that God meant woman to be subject to man, does it follow that the marks of that subjection may never change? It seems to me that there can be but one answer to this question. The Arab women are subject to the Arab men, and therefore they do all the drudgery which their lords put on them; are our wives and daughters therefore in rebellion against God, because they are not similar drudges? The Apostle Paul demanded of these ignorant women, some of them formerly dissolute, living in an age when almost the only educated women were bad women, and when the great work of virtue was to hide from the sight of men, that they prove their subjection by abstaining wholly from praying, teaching, speaking, asking questions in Christian assemblies, does it follow at all that cultivated Christian women, in an age and country wondrously blessed by their presence in all the great attributes of life, Christian women, superior as a rule to the men among whom they live, shall be compelled to prove their fealty to God by the same marks of subjection which were given for an age vastly inferior? Let no one recoil from the thought that the Apostle Paul had not in mind any other condition than that under which he wrote. He could not have written otherwise and have written intelligibly. Hence when he discusses the question of marriage, he nowhere intimates that a man should leave to the young people the decision of the question whether or not they shall marry; but who will claim that the apostle means to teach for all ages that the father and not the lovers is to decide this important question? Likewise in dealing with polygamy and slavery, he gives directions adapted to the conditions then prevailing, but no one thinks now that he meant thereby to crystallize those conditions forever. Likewise with this question. He lays hold of and emphasizes the great truth that God meant man and not woman to rule the world and the church, and therefore he strenuously objects to those acts which in his age were commonly regarded as infringing that right and duty of man; but it is to do the apostle gross injustice to insist that the particular acts which he condemns must always and everywhere be regarded as violations of the relation God has established for the sexes. "Circumstances alter cases."

"The letter killeth, the spirit giveth life." There is, therefore, no cast iron rule to determine what part a modest, pious Christian woman may take in a Christian assembly or in the world at large. Generally, piety, modesty, refinement can be depended on to do right. Gallatin, Mo.

For The Baptist Courier.

he resolves just what it is worth to him. If a man gets his head broken, he never thinks of paying the surgeon what it is worth to him to have his bones put to rights. You may have a tract of marshy land worth nothing to you; I may offer you a mule for it and you take it—be glad to take it. And if I make a valuable rice field of it, am I a swindler?

Now, the birthright could be of no value to Esau, for it was only a forfeited birthright that he had. Besides, it was not possible for a sensual nature like his to value it. Indeed, his profanity lay, presumably in the boast that it was worthless. Profanity has some reference to speech—speech in regard to sacred things. What were the sacred things in Esau's case, but the family promises? He was in the habit of speaking derisively of these and of the character of the family as chosen of God. He cared only for present and sensual gratification; he wanted no restraint put on his sinning with the Canaanites; he saw in the birthright no charm whatever. It only chafed on his recreant propensities; and his speech, repeated no doubt over and over, must have been to the effect that, as for the birthright, it was nonsense to pay any respect to it—it was valueless. Now, when Jacob took his opportunity to say, "Sell me thy birthright," it was only taking him at his word—sell it for this pottage. Esau only abided by his habitual profanity in accepting the proposal, and with an oath binding the sale. Jacob sought only what Esau despised. But for a legal force he might have said, "Give me thy birthright," then, as now, probably it was understood that something must be named as a consideration in order to make a legal transfer of interests. It is under all these considerations, so manifestly to the contrary, that we hear it ringing on every side from the lips of how Jacob "defrauded Esau."

The fact in the case is that it was essentially the reverse. Instead of Esau's being the fraudulent man, it was Jacob. He was fully intent on robbing Jacob. When he came before his father and, with the view of receiving the birthright blessing, declared, "I am Esau," that was a lie, a most wanton and ignoble attempt at robbery. We have long been tired of hearing Jacob derided by educated Christians as "unscrupulous and dishonest." That was Esau's character. Jacob was thoroughly honest. Children and all people should understand this. Indeed, the sacred narrative is so plain no one would think of anything else, but for commentators and preachers discounting from time to time on "Jacob's fraud!"

UNUSED CHRISTIANS.

Three reasons are sometimes alleged why Christians are not used. A man may say, "I am not used because I have been recently converted." That is not a good reason (Acts 9: 15). Here is a man who had been the ringleader in the devil's service, and who had suddenly been brought to know Christ. From that moment till the moment when he lay in prison expecting to die, these words, "chosen vessel," rang in his heart. O, to be a chosen vessel in the hand of the woodman, a chosen brush in the hand of the artist, to have been a chosen obelisk in the hand of the Carpenter at Nazareth! O, to be a chosen vessel in the hand of the ascended Christ, that when he wants a choice piece of work done he may come to you or me in the doing. This was spoken within twenty-four hours of Paul's conversion, and a recent conversion is no reason why you should not be a chosen vessel. Indeed, the young convert is the fresh fervor of a new-found hope is often the most favored, like Andrew to Peter.

Another reason given is: "I am not gifted like some." But that is no reason, either; for, if you thoroughly understood God, you would know that he gave power to the weak, and before he gives it away he must have a weakling to give it to. It is too sacred a deposit to give to anybody that is strong. If there fore you are weak, you are the man most likely to get the largest share of God's power. "To them that hath no might, he increases strength." You will find that illustrated in 2 Cor. 4: 7. The earthen vessel is most easily crumbled and broken, and that is yourself. You cannot get God's treasure in anything but an earthen vessel, that the excellency of his power may be of God and not of man. The third reason that might be alleged is that you have so spoiled your life by unfaithfulness during the years of the past. Some of you have been bitterly regretting past years this week, saying: "O that I had known these things years ago, or that, having known them, had lived up to them; but it is my grievous sorrow that I have marred God's plan."

"THE CITY LIE
BY REV. T.

St. John gives us a glimpse of the man in the view of heaven upon the earth. It is a realized life equalling in nothing.

It is self-evident, that our character exaggeration. We of virtues and vices, specialize on certain of others. The old man knew. Venus and perfection of can who possess Symmetry and perfection of the other. Few themselves in the developing themselves in wholeness strong at one point. In our great gymnasium of the body a man's weakness is required normal. In certain vocational work if he is strengthened in one matter; if he is a musician, he is a musician, in instance the ender man. Christian everywhere to strives to counter at every point so metry of his nature touches a plane plane rests upon a construct man after design where the and the height of rests foursquare would build out. rests with the in reason together as the premises of the satisfy the most c "Christianity is c

It rests upon the power to the life, tenacity, while it is in loving service in surging tide

It enters the rewards, motives to parallel it with it with the eternal

And thus in its Christianity rests not upon the intellect lead us to a system the feelings alone as the will alone for fatalism; not on that would bring an end and bigotry, all four in order prevent exaggera

There is no ph not touch. It every calling, glo of every service home, consecrate throws its bow of (treating storm) for us to stand for of all that we are selves. Cardinal words said, "Ma more than to the hear it said of no nobody harm exc that exception m soul. Festus say selves and after t away. We begin the sanctities of (ing the temples c ourselves in an the world. Non trample upon h purity in the m four-square. So upon all fours.

It means also, to the world. W we something t Men who believe a living and go for it do not str be a parasite or pump. Already shing the world. It without getting The world is no r