RESTRICTED COMMUNION.

[A sermon preached at the First Baptist church, Halifax, on Sunday morning, April 9, by the pastor, Rev. A. C. Chute.]

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

This morning's discourse is to be a distinctively denominational one. Let none, however, allow the announcement to affect them unfavorably. It is due to our own people now and again to set forth, in becoming manner, the Scriptural grounds upon which our peculiarities rest; and it is proper, too, that those not of us should sometimes receive from us a statement of our position, for we are often wronged through being misunderstood. It is hoped that what is now about to be spoken will be examined by each individual in the light of God's Word, and of history, to see whether or not it is truth. In fact what is heard at any time, from any pulpit, should be subjected to this test by each one for himself, because that which we accept simply upon the word of man is of small value to us. Should any who are present on this occasion differ from us, after independent investigation, all we can say is, May the blessing of the Lord rest upon each, and upon us all, this day, henceforth and forevermore. Amen.

For a very little more than half an hour I will attempt to speak upon restricted communion. The time has not come, nor is it likely to very soon, when it is unnecessary to deal with this subject. Baptists bereft of backbone abound. That is to say, many who bear the name of Baptists are not such in a decided sense. The Baptist pastor often hears it said by a member of his flock: "There is only one thing I dislike about our denomination, and that is its exclusive attitude in the matter of the Lord's Supper." And to not a few, upon removing from one place of residence to another, it seems to be a thing of no moment whether they join a Baptist or a Pedobaptist church. Many who are outside our gates charge us with narrowness, while some who are within think the charge well founded. And we certainly owe it to our membership, and to others also, to set forth with all plainness what our position is on this communion question. For our attitude is not a thing of the surface merely, as is often supposed. It involves questions fundamental and vital. If Baptists stand for nothing distinctive, it matters not how soon they cease to exist as a separate body. The sooner the better. But if they do stand for something distinctive and important, it were well for them and the world that they give their principles clear and emphatic utterance. God demands just that of them.

NO OPEN COMMUNION CHURCH.

It is a mistake, let it be said in the first place, as is often said, to speak of Baptists as close communionists, and of other bodies as open-communionists. Among all evangelical denominations there is substantial agreement that regeneration and baptism (or what is called baptism) are essential to participation in the Lord's Supper. There are, of course, individual pastors to be found, who, departing from their standards, take it upon themselves, in supposed liberality, to issue invitations to the Supper to all lovers of the Lord, whether baptized or not; and we have even heard the invitation extended to any desirous of becoming Christians. But these cases are exceptional. Every evangelical church, as a whole, I believe, regards the two things named as indispensable to those who would come to communion. A man may be a Christian, but he is not eligible to the Supper unless he has been baptized. He may have been baptized, but he is not eligible to the Supper unless he has been regenerated. Therefore Baptists and Pedobaptists are both restricted communionists.

But there is a difference of opinion as to what constitutes baptism, and as to when the ordinance should be administered. Pedobaptists, as well as Baptists, say that immersion is baptism; and they immerse when unable to persuade candidates that something else will suffice. The Methodist, Presbyterian and two Congregational churches near me on my former field all borrowed the baptistery in our meeting-house; and as new Methodist and Presbyterian houses of worship were about to be erected, I took opportunity to suggest what the coming buildings would need above the old in order to completeness. Pedobaptists say immersion is baptism, pouring is baptism and sprinkling is baptism, though they usually prefer sprinkling because more convenient. Hence when the Pedobaptist pastor invites Baptists to communion he is acting consistently with his restricted communion views. He is asking only the regenerated and baptized to seats. But if the Baptist pastor acts consistently with Baptist principles, as every candid man will expect him to do, he cannot invite Pedobaptists, for he believes that none have been baptized except those who have been immersed. Just as Presbyterians do not invite those who have not been immersed, sprinkled or poured, even though some such are really Christians, so Baptists do not invite any who have been simply poured or sprinkled, even though many such are true disciples of Jesus. Those Christians who have never made public profession of religion, and have never been sprinkled, poured or immersed, do not find fault with Pedobaptist churches for not asking them to communion. They know they have not met all the Pedobaptist prerequisites. And why should Pedobaptists censure Baptists, or any Baptists censure their own church, for not inviting those who have not conformed to Baptist usage. If our denomination is wrong in its belief, that is another thing. But just as long as we believe as we do, we must act as we do, or court contempt and extinction.

In the main, then, there is agreement in evangelical churches that a man must be regenerated and baptized before partaking of the Lord's Supper; so that all are restricted communionists. But communion in Baptist churches is restricted to a smaller number, because nothing save immersion is accounted baptism.

NO SUBSTITUTION FOR IMMERSION.

What constituted baptism in the early days of Christianity? Immersion, and only that. Who say so? The most noted scholars in all denominations. Just examine into the matter and see if this is not so. Four years ago a correspondent sent a question to the *Christian Union*, an able Pedobaptist paper, asking the name of some book refuting the Baptist view that immersion is the only apostolic baptism. In reply the editor said with all candor that there was no such book now. "There used to be such," he said, "but the world has moved and they are antiquated." How then came the remarkable change from "the ancient bath" to "the ceremony of letting fall a few drops of water on the face"? Dean Stanley, in his famous article, first published in the *Nineteenth Century*, says that "it was effected, not by any decree of council or parliament, but by the general sentiment of Christian liberty." And he speaks of it as "a striking example of the triumph of common sense and convenience over the bondage of form and custom." But Baptists would say that it is a striking example of human arrogance in dealing with Divine commands. A continuation of such a method of treating what God has enjoined would eventually thrust the whole Word of God out of doors.

And to whom was baptism administered in the early days? To believers only. Who say so? The same noted scholars who say that baptism was immersion. Two errors, then, have crept in in later times—the substitution of something else for immersion, and the practice of that upon unbelievers. And so much efficacy came to be attached to baptism that the idea of baptismal regeneration arose; and then, of course, people made haste, because of life's uncertainty, to administer the ordinance to infants. But how any one who was sprinkled, or even immersed, in his infancy can afterwards say that he once obeyed the command, "Be baptized," when he then knew nothing of what was going on, is more than I can ever hope to comprehend. We Baptists are often charged with making too much of baptism; but it is seen at a glance that we make much less of it, in a way, than others; for while others have use for water long before conversion occurs, we have no use for it until afterwards. Others hurry off to have it applied after the birth of the body, while we wait until there is a birth of the soul. Baptists heartily believe in infant baptism, but in the baptism not of physical but of spiritual infants.

In a few brief questions and briefer answers one comes directly to the point in this fashion, as follows: "Is there any mention of the baptism of believers in the New Testament? Yes, a number of cases. Is there any distinct account of the baptism of a babe in the New Testament? Not one. Is there a case in which it was evidently by immersion? Undoubtedly, there are a number. Is there a single case at which it was clearly sprinkling? Not one. Will all the allusions to baptism suit believers' immersion? Yes, every one. Is there one allusion which will suit infant sprinkling? No. Are there any clear commands given to believers to be themselves baptized? Yes. Are there any commands to bring unbelieving children to be baptized? No. Then, if all the incidents, and all the allusions, and all the commands, point to believers' immersion, and if no incident, and no allusion, and no command suits infant sprinkling, what is the duty of Christian men?" Search the Scriptures and see if these things are so.

Now, the denomination of which we form a part stands for retaining the primitive and apostolic baptism intact. Nothing else is baptism. Something else may go by that name, but calling it that doesn't make it that. And the outward act, even though performed after primitive fashion, has no significance whatever apart from previous inward cleansing. But if done at the right time and in the way it was meant to be done, how pregnant it is with meaning! The old sinful nature has received its death wound, and the life of the Son of God Himself has been imparted to the believing one. And these facts are strikingly set forth by the burial in water and the up-coming therefrom. And not only so, but to all onlookers the necessity of birth from above is proclaimed. Make any substitution for the original, and a dumb and meaningless thing is put in the place of one of the mightiest preachers God ever sent out to publish most vital truth. And as for the sprinkling of physical infants—a double-headed error—it were well if we could say no more against it than that it is meaningless. But history compels us to affirm that it has drawn in with it a whole train of evils. For one thing it has done much to obliterate the distinction between the church and the world. Noble men have practiced it, indeed, and are practicing it, though not so much as once—men who have done, and are doing, magnificently for their own and other generations; but had they been rid of this, their work would have been still more and better.

"What matters it whether much or little water is used?" the undiscerning ask. But it's not a question of much or little water. It's a question of obeying or disobeying God. Christ has commanded the doing of a specific thing, and there is no obedience thereto unless that specific thing be done. True, the thing of supreme importance is that we accept Christ, but we must be far from inferring that what Christ tells us to do next is of no moment whatever. "As it is one of the peculiar weaknesses of human nature," says Bishop Butler, "when, upon comparison of two things, one is found to be of greater importance than the other, to consider this other as of scarcely any importance at all, it is highly necessary that we remind ourselves how great presumption it is to make light of any institutions of Divine appointment."

The man who declares immersion to be of no consequence ventures farther than he knows. He charges his Lord with *doing* a needless thing in submitting to that Himself, and with *commanding* a needless thing when He told others to take the same step as soon as they had become joined to Him by faith. And of such venturesome souls methinks I hear the Master ask: "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" It's a great disobedience that refuses to do a little thing.

As for Baptists they stoutly stand for close observance of New Testament directions. In the first place a man must, before partaking of the Supper, be a Christian. In the second place, he must be baptized, that is immersed. Hence *the Bible*, as we understand it, shuts us out from asking those of other religious bodies to communion. It is not a choice of our own, but simply adherence to apostolic doctrine. Our feelings sometimes prompt us to act differently. But it's a sorry day for any when feelings are sent to the forefront and Scripture is driven to the rear.

There are some of our Pedobaptist brethren who appreciate our position. I came, for instance, upon the following from a Methodist pastor of New York: "A Baptist minister maintains," he writes, "that only believers are to be baptized; hence infant baptism to him is nonsense; baptism is baptism by immersion; baptized believers only have any right to the Lord's Supper. How can they therefore," he asks, "consistently invite or allow me, having only been sprinkled, and that in infancy, to commune with them? Do *they* keep me away from the Lord's table, or is it I who am responsible for neglect of the sacrament, having refused to comply with the essential conditions of its reception? Close communion, as it is generally termed," he adds, "is the only logical and consistent course of Baptist churches to pursue. If their premises are right, the conclusion is surely right. Let us honor them," he concludes, "for stern steadfastness in maintaining what they believe to be a Bible precept, rather than criticise and censure because they differ with us concerning the intent and mode of Christian baptism, and believe it to be an irrepealable condition of coming to the Supper." Surely it is refreshing that now and again we are spoken of in this just manner by those not of us. And I am sure we would be thus spoken of more frequently if we were more faithful, and more kind also, in setting forth our views. And besides, our own people would have their backbones bettered, as many of them need to have, and our numbers would be enlarged from those now following the traditions of men. If we possess the truth we are derelict if we do not spread it.

IMMERSED BELIEVERS IN OTHER CHURCHES.

But the question arises, Why is it that Baptists do not invite immersed believers in Pedobaptist churches to the table of the Lord? In answer we must first notice a third qualification which all evangelical bodies regard as needful to communion, namely, *an orderly walk*. A man may have been regenerated and baptized, but he is not eligible to the Supper if his actions are grossly out of conformity with his profession. He must be walking orderly as to conduct. And he may have been regenerated and baptized, and may be exemplary in conduct, but he is not eligible to the Supper if he is giving strong support to doctrines diametrically opposed to the beliefs of the church to which he belongs. There must be a doctrinal continuance in the ranks. Or at least there must not be an open and aggressive upholding of what his church considers grave error.

Now Baptists regard infant sprinkling as a two fold departure from Scripture—a departure which has been, and still is, working damage. Of course those who practice it do not like to hear us say this about it, nor do we, if courteous and Christian, like unnecessarily to wound their feelings by saying it. Indeed this desire of ours not to make any feel badly often deters us from uttering what ought to be spoken. There are Baptists, not a few, who harp too much upon immersion, and make the fact that they are members of Baptist churches much more conspicuous than that they are joined to Jesus Christ. It is one of the devil's devices to get the advocates of a truth to hackney it. But there are also Baptists who carefully avoid touching upon what is distinctively Baptistic for fear of giving pain, thereby forgetting loyalty to God and the truth. The very best we can say of infant sprinkling is that it is the parent of a whole brood of evils which, ever since the thing broke in to displace a Divine appointment, have been eating at the very vitals of Christianity. And certainly there is no true charity either in holding our tongues about it or in rummaging our vocabularies for softest words to use respecting it.

But look well now to what is being done by the immersed believers connected with churches where infant sprinkling is practiced. They claim to be throwing influence upon the side of the immersion of believers; but by holding membership where they do they affirm in loudest way that they consider baptism may come before conversion, and that in lieu of what is really baptism something may be put which is not baptism at all. They are giving decided support to what Baptists look upon as serious withdrawal from Scripture precept and example. If a man has been immersed himself upon profession of faith, so far so good. But he cannot be said to be throwing his influence on the side of immersion of believers, and hence, as we believe, not throwing it on the side of steadfast adherence to the infallible word, if connected with a body wherein there is more of the sprinkling of babes than of the immersion of those who have been born again. Therefore we cannot bid him come to the Lord's table with us. If we did, we would become a party to his defection and assist in propagating the error we profess to deplore. Conformity to the Bible is assuredly more admirable than conformity to the wishes and wanderings of our fellowmen.

Restricted communion, to the extent we practice it, is a silent, yet eloquent protest against human innovation. And such a protest is ever needed. In the course we take we by no means make ourselves offensive. We simply do not invite. The table is the Lord's, and we dare not issue invitations to it on our own account. No persons are received anywhere for church membership entirely upon their own views of themselves. They are put to what are deemed to be Bible tests. And why should people be left to judge entirely for themselves as to their preparedness for communion? If the Lord's church should have a care in the Lord's name as to who should be received as members, why should it not also have a care as to who should come to the Lord's table? But the pews in our churches are not guarded on communion Sabbaths by an ecclesiastical police. We have done our duty in the matter when we have enlightened people as to the essential qualifications. And we say to no one of another denomination who takes it upon himself to come, that he must leave. It will be rare that any individual belonging to another body will care to remain to the ordinance with us. But whenever any such one does so the affair is entirely his own. The responsibility is then his and not the church's where he chooses to take a seat.

BAPTISTS SOLID ON THE QUESTION.

Occasionally a prominent preacher goes off from the Baptist hosts out of sympathy with so-called open communion beliefs. And the question comes up: Are such beliefs gaining ground among us? Some think they are; but have they good reason for the thought? Now and again a good and gifted man like Dr. Pentecost or Dr. Dowling turns away from us; but the cases are very rare, and when such men do go, they go almost alone. The *Examiner* informs us when a certain well known pastor went off, not a great while ago, that not a single officer of the church sympathized with him; and the majority of the members were as staunch Baptists as could be found anywhere. If there were on this side of the Atlantic, as is sometimes insinuated, a growing dissatisfaction with restricted communion, as we practice it, this would surely transpire in the utterances of our leading religious journals and in the instruction given in our foremost colleges and theological seminaries. But it does not, as I can find, appear in any of these. The old views seem to be held more firmly than ever before. Cases of departure from us come along about often enough to stir us up to a re-examination of our position, and after every new investigation we stand still more fixedly upon biblical foundation. It is not long since the religious press on the other side of the Atlantic, and on this, was occupied with what was known as the "Down Grade Controversy" in England. There were in that country wide departures from apostolic doctrine; and it can be confidently affirmed that the weak hold which many of our own denomination came there to have of the atonement and of future punishment is the logical outcome of the looseness which has existed among more than half the English Baptists upon this very communion question. If we begin tampering with the Scriptures there is no telling where we will end. Those who leave us saying, when they leave, that they are with us in everything but this one thing, are soon apart from us in many things, just as must ever be expected.

But why is it that any prominent Baptists ever do get out of accord with strict Baptist views? The answer is not far to seek, and has already been suggested. Our feelings dispose us to invite all to the Supper. We love our brethren and sisters in Christ, whatever name they bear and whatever the differences of belief between us. We do not set ourselves up as superior to them, as we are wrongly charged with doing. Our Christian fellowship is not limited, if our church fellowship is. And it is in connection with this very warmth of feeling that our strongest temptation comes to invite all Christians to sit down to the table of the Lord with us, without regard to the prerequisites which we consider Christ has enjoined and expects us to conserve. All the feeling and all the sentiment are on the side of so-called open communionists, while with so-called close communionists are logic and Scripture. And feeling and sentiment are sometimes so strong and so little held in place that at length they get the lead. But, as one of our robust writers has said, "the trouble with the sentiments as sovereign of conduct in religion is that they are very apt to rule too much in the interest of indulgence toward self, and of complaisance toward others, and too little in the interest of simple obedience toward Christ." And he says, in speaking of the woman who broke the alabaster vase of costly spikenard, that she sacrificed what was her own for Christ's sake. But when Baptists, led by their own and others' feelings, and because it appears charitable and friendly, give indiscriminate invitation to the Supper, they sacrifice what is Christ's for their own sakes. They pay out the price of the approval of God in order to purchase so small a thing as the favor of men. Anyway, there is much too much thought of communion with each other in the ordinance, and not enough thought of communion with our Lord. "It is certainly wrong," as one has remarked, "to pervert this priceless institution from its original and single sublime purpose of holding up Christ before us for our contemplation, to the lower purpose of signifying and expressing our relations and attachments to each other."

SUMMARY.

But the time allowed me for speaking has expired. Give me a moment, however, for the summing up of what we have tried to present:

1. There is no such thing, in a strict sense, as an open communion church. All denominations restrict in some measure. In the main it is agreed that the new birth and baptism are essential qualifications for the Supper. Some believe baptism may come before the receiving of a new heart, and may be administered in more than one way, and some that it must come after and only in the original mode, but there is general concurrence that the two must precede communion.

2. Pedobaptists consider baptism to be immersion, pouring or sprinkling, so that they can, consistently with their restricted communion principles, ask those of other bodies to join them in the communion service. But Baptists believe nothing is baptism save immersion, so that they cannot, consistently with *their* restricted-communion principles, invite to communion those who have been sprinkled or poured instead. The Scripture order is, first, the new birth, and second, an act which not only expressively proclaims that the one baptized has experienced it, but also that this birth must be known by all who would enter the kingdom of God. Baptists protest against any substitution for immersion, knowing well that if a change may be made in this, changes may also be made in other Divine injunctions, and such a method of dealing with the Bible tends to its renunciation altogether. Now if we invite Pedobaptists to the Supper we virtually affirm that either sprinkling or pouring is baptism, thereby putting our belief and our action at variance, and so incurring the disapproval of our consciences and our God, and bringing upon ourselves the merited contempt of all candid men.

3. Besides conversion and immersion, there is one other qualification generally regarded as needful to communion, to wit, an orderly walk. And an orderly walk not only means good moral conduct, but also a steadfast continuance in the apostles' doctrine. Those who have been immersed and joined Pedobaptist churches upon profession of faith, are giving their support to what we consider a human substitution for a definite Divine command, and are, therefore, according to our way of thinking, walking in a disorderly manner. Hence we cannot consistently ask them to the Lord's table, nor accept their invitations, for if we do, we help to maintain and extend what we deem to be grievous error.

4. Our denomination is not breaking up on account of the strictness of its views. It was never more united, and never more aggressive in its onslaught upon the powers of evil, than to-day. And instead of the occasional outgoing of some good, strong brother from our ranks bringing any hurt to the body itself it is rather promotive of a more healthy condition.

Very true, as is often remarked, all who love the Lord Jesus will sit down together on high. But then all errors, by whomsoever held, shall be brushed away, and all will see alike. As long, however, as we remain below, we must severally act up to our light. If the different bodies of Christians should cease to uphold their respective points of difference, at the same time that they dwell most upon points of agreement, there would be little advancement in knowledge of the truth. Let each, then, faithfully proclaim its views without abusing the others. And let us as Baptists be ambitious not only to be faithful but to be kind, and not only to be kind but to be faithful. "I cannot fall out or contemn a man for an error," said Sir Thomas Browne, "or conceive why a difference in opinion should divide an affection; for controversies, disputes and argumentations, both in philosophy and in divinity, if they meet with discreet and peaceable natures, do not infringe the laws of charity." Or, to the same effect, and more briefly, is that noble sentence which Jeremiah Burroughs would have his brethren write upon their study doors: "*Variety of opinions, and unity of those that hold them, may stand together.*"

BOOK REVIEW.

CRIMINOLOGY, by Arthur MacDonald, specialist in education as related to the abnormal and weakling classes, United States Bureau of Education, and United States delegate to the International Society of Criminal Anthropology at Brussels, 1892, etc, etc, with an introduction by Professor Cesare Lombroso, founder of criminology. Funk & Wagnalls, 11 Richmond St. West, Toronto. 416 pages; price $2.

This is a book of especial value, and for which we prophesy an extraordinary success. Though the writer is a man of science who has taken exhaustive courses of study at no fewer than eight universities, American and European, and has studied in seminaries theological and otherwise, the book is written not in technical terms, but in a plain, easy style, intelligible and deeply interesting to any thoughtful reader. Dr. MacDonald has had an extraordinary preparation for his work. He paid special visits to the principal prisons and charitable institutions in England, France, Germany, Belgium, Switzerland, Austria, Italy and America. He has studied the habits of criminals and their peculiar cast of mind with the most watchful care, interviewing them and their keepers, and even going so far as to be locked up in the cells with those cases of which he desired to make a more extended study. The results of his course of careful observation and inquiry are of wonderful interest. The knowledge of the science of crime and criminals has been too much confined to the student in that particular department, and to the legal profession. Not until the general public appreciates the far-reaching and awful effects of crime will a reformation in the care and treatment of criminals be brought about. After intelligent accounts of the aspects of special and general criminology, Dr. MacDonald points out the way to remove, as far as we can, the causes of crime. The most important conclusions he arrives at may be briefly stated as the proper care of the children of criminals and the proper care of the criminals themselves. As for the latter, no matter how hardened, how confirmed in crime they may be, they should find themselves, when sentenced to a prison, not in a prison solely, but in a reformatory as well. Every jail should be a house of reform, for every criminal is capable of a degree of improvement. As for the children of the vicious and criminal, they should be taken from their evil surroundings, in which it is almost impossible for them to do otherwise than go astray, and be placed in institutions where they will be properly brought up. This should not be done at the age it usually is. To leave a child in a vicious atmosphere for the first few years of its life, and then place it in a reform school, is almost hopeless. At a tender age, the earlier the better, the children of hopelessly depraved parents should be taken away. Following hard on this advice of Dr. MacDonald's come the criminal statistics of Canada for 1892, now in press. In a monograph on crime, Mr. George Johnson, summing up the results obtained from the study of the criminal statistics, states that crime has decreased in Canada, but that it is on the increase among boys. Nothing could be better for all who have to do with the reformation of those Canadian boys than this excellent book of Dr. MacDonald's. It should be sent to every reformatory, to the boards of management of jails and asylums for the poor and insane. Clergymen, lawyers, doctors, in short all classes of sober, thoughtful citizens should possess this book, for in reading it they will obtain the latest results as to the discoveries and conclusions in this most interesting field of research, and learn how they may best serve the interests of their poor, depraved fellow men.

— K. D. C. cleanses the stomach and sweetens the breath. Try it. Guarantee and testimonials sent to any address. K. D. C. Company, Ltd., New Glasgow, N. S., or 127 State St., Boston, Mass.

— Use Skoda's Discovery, the great blood and nerve remedy.

R. R. R.

RADWAY'S READY RELIEF.

THE CHEAPEST AND BEST MEDICINE FOR FAMILY USE IN THE WORLD. NEVER FAILS TO RELIEVE

PAIN.

It surpasses all other remedies in the wonderful power which it possesses of curing

RHEUMATISM and NEURALGIA.

Thousands have been relieved and cured by simply rubbing with READY RELIEF, applied by the hand, the part affected and considerable of the adjoining surface; at the same time several brisk doses of RADWAY'S PILLS will do much to hasten the cure.

MALARIA, CHILLS and FEVER, FEVER and AGUE CONQUERED.

There is not a remedial agent in the world that will cure Fever and Ague and all other Malarious, Bilious and other Fevers, aided by Radway's Pills, so quickly as Radway's Ready Relief.

INTERNALLY.

From 30 to 60 drops in half a tumbler of water will in a few moments cure Cramps, Spasms, Sour Stomach, Nausea, Vomiting, Heartburn, Nervousness, Sleeplessness, Sick Headache, Colic, Flatulency, and all Internal Pains.

The True Relief.

RADWAY'S READY RELIEF is the only remedial agent in vogue that will instantly stop pain. Instantly relieves and soon cures—

Sore Throat, Inflammation, Lumbago, Neuralgia, Toothache, Colds, Coughs, Sciatica, Rheumatism, Headache, Influenza, Difficult Breathing.

25c. per Bottle. Sold by Druggists.

BE SURE TO GET "RADWAY'S."

RADWAY'S PILLS,

Perfect Purgatives, Soothing Aperients Act Without Pain, Always Reliable and Natural in their Operations.

Perfectly tasteless, elegantly coated with sweet gum, purge, regulate, purify, cleanse and strengthen.

RADWAY'S PILLS

For the cure of all disorders of the Stomach, Liver, Bowels, Kidneys, Bladder, Nervous Diseases, Headache, Constipation, Costiveness, Indigestion, Dyspepsia, Biliousness, Fever, Inflammation of the Bowels, Piles, and all derangements of the Internal Viscera. Purely Vegetable, containing no mercury, minerals or deleterious drugs.

DYSPEPSIA

DR. RADWAY'S PILLS are a cure for the complaint. They restore strength to the stomach and enable it to perform its functions. The symptoms of Dyspepsia disappear, and with them liability of the system to contract the diseases. Take the medicine according to the directions and observe what we say of "False" and "True" respecting diet.

Observe the following symptoms resulting from diseases of the digestive organs: Constipation, inward piles, fullness of blood in the head, acidity of the stomach, nausea, heartburn, disgust of food, fullness or weight of the stomach, sour eructations, sinking or fluttering of the heart, choking or suffocating sensations when in a lying posture, dimness of vision, dots or webs before the sight, fever and dull pain in the head, deficiency of perspiration, yellowness of the skin and eyes, pain in the side, chest, limbs, and sudden flushes of heat, burning in the flesh.

A few doses of RADWAY'S PILLS will free the system of all the above named disorders.

Sold by all druggists. Price 25 cents per box, or on receipt of price, will be sent by mail. Five boxes for One Dollar.

Send a letter stamped to DR. RADWAY & CO., No. 419 St. James Street, Montreal, Canada, for "False and True."

BE SURE TO GET "RADWAY'S."

Weak Children

will derive strength and acquire robust health

by a persevering use of the great

Food Medicine

SCOTT'S EMULSION

"CAUTION."—Beware of substitutes. Genuine prepared by Scott & Bowne, Belleville. Sold by all druggists. 50c. and $1.00.

HAWKER'S TOLU AND WILD CHERRY BALSAM

WILL CURE THAT COUGH

TRY IT!

IT HAS CURED HUNDREDS

of cases considered hopeless after all other remedies had failed. Do not despair, take courage, be persuaded, and try this truly wonderful medicine.

IT WILL CURE YOU.

For sale by all Druggists and general dealers. Price 25 and 50 cts. a bottle.

Manufactured by

HAWKER MEDICINE CO., Ltd.,

St. John, N. B.

BUCKEYE BELL FOUNDRY

Best quality Pure Copper and Tin. CHIMES, PEALS AND BELLS. Most favorably known for over 50 yrs. The VANDUZEN & TIFT CO. Cincinnati, O.

June 21.

Sabbath School

BIBLE LESSO

THIRD QUARTER.

Lesson I. July 2. Acts 16

PAUL CALLED TO EU

GOLDEN TEXT.

"Go ye, therefore, and teac tions, baptizing them in the na Father, and of the Son, and of Ghost."—Matt. 28: 19.

CONNECTION.—Six months we closed our studies in the time, we left Paul and Ba Jerusalem, where they had story of their first great tour to the Gentiles, with its success, as a proof of the prese Holy Spirit and the Divin ment of their labors. The vit plexing question of receiving tiles into the church without coming Jews had been wisely settled. This was a great e history of the church. It some time in A. D. 50. We no the narrative from this point.

EXPLANATORY.

Paul and Barnabas, with two from the Jerusalem church, re Antioch, bearing with them of the council. They remain tioch for a time. Then Paul to Barnabas that they re churches which they had f Asia Minor during their fir ary tour. Barnabas agreed But there arose a practical Barnabas wished to take with cousin John Mark, who st them on their former journey them and returned home, began to enter upon the dang difficult part of their tour. fused to take him with them difference of opinion was so decided that the two friends and went different ways, neve again on earth. This brief very instructive. The narr plies some degree of imper these good men. But while acknowledge the imperfecti let us make it greater than it It was a "quarrel, bitter an Barnabas took Mark with henceforth drops out of the but not out of the work. Silas, one of the delegates from salem church, and leaving An northward through Syria, t west through his native Cilic reversing the order of his first

6. *Now when they had gone t Phrygia.* An undefined reg about Antioch of Pisidia to east and west. *And the region* The great central tableland, east of Phrygia, but its boun undefined. *Forbidden of the H* Their plans were to preach in they were prevented by the H How? Either (1) by som providence, or (2) by direct co tion of the Holy Spirit. order to lead him into a wider important field, the very hea lized heathendom. God sh from one field of work becaus other greater work for us to Asia is of course not the co that name, nor Asia Minor, Ægean sea, but the Roman sena province bord Ægean Sea. In the New Tes phrase is always thus used to this particular province. The of Mysia, Lydia, and Caria cities Ephesus, Smyrna and S the other "seven churches of included in it.

7. *Come to Mysia.* A provin Ægean Sea, north of Asia. *sayed* (they planned, proposed sired) *to go into Bithynia.* A province of Asia Minor upon Sea, north-east of Mysia. *But* Rev. Ver., "the Spirit of J Spirit sent by Jesus according promise. *Suffered* (permitted) In the same way as in ver hedged up the ways He did them to go, and so gradually them in the right way.

8. *And they passing by My* it aside without remaining there. *Came down to Troas* fully Alexandria Troas, on th pont, about four miles from the ancient Troy.

9. *A vision.* This was the th natural revelation. It was person, but a vision, but not imparted in a dream. *Come and help us.* This vision rightly recognized by the chur terpreting the unuttered cry o dom for help. And it has been ly shown that it is death to a c Christian, either not to hear t having heard it, not to heed *donia.* This most celebrated lay to the north of Greece. T ca was its capital. It had flourishing cities, of which Thessalonica, Amphipolis, and Berea are mentioned in It now constitutes a part of and notwithstanding the opp the Turks, Christianity, though condition, exists to this day.

LUKE JOINS THE COMPANY at we see from the change of the narrative from "he" and "we."

10. *We endeavored.* By se a ship. *Assuredly gathering.* has the sense of "coming to a c from putting things side by sid henceforth had no doubts as God would have him preach.

11. *Samothracia.* An islan Ægean, between Troas and *Neapolis.* "New city," "Na seaport of Philippi. It was from Troas.

12. *Thence to Philippi.* A miles from Neapolis. *Which* city of that part of Macedonia. was built by Philip of Maced of Alexander the Great, who after himself. The city has lo peared, and its site is occu small village named Filiba. Rome. A Roman colony wa ture of the Imperial City—a Rome itself transplanted to vinces. Some of the inhabita colonists and the descendants o were Roman citizens, and wer rolled in one of the tribes, and ed the privilege of voting at Ro events which befell the apostle pi were directly connected privileges of the place as