

DON'T BURY ME DEEP.

It is said that the following touching lines were inspired by an actual occurrence. Years ago there lived in Toronto, New York State, a beautiful girl called Mary Means. Colonel Means was her father. He was a widower, and when his child began to gradually sink under the effects of the remorseless disease of consumption he spent much of his time at her bedside. Her female companions made the situation comfortable. She passed away as easily as possible. She made one request, and oft repeated it to her father in the presence of friends; and in the silent watch of him whose heart was bursting with anguish. It was "Don't bury me deep, papa."

Let me a bit in my bed, father, Press your warm lip to my cheek, Put your arm under my head, father— I am so tired and weak. I cannot stay long awake now— Many a night I shall sleep, Promise one thing for my sake, now— Don't let them bury me deep.

Cover my head with flowers, father, Those I so well loved to see, So, in the long lonely hours, father, They'll be companions for me. Would wake in the night, then, As I lie my sad face would weep, Make my grave cheerful and bright, then, Don't let them bury me deep!

Call on me whenever your pass, father, Where by your side I oft ran; Put your face down on the grass, father, Near to my own as you can. If I could look up and hear you, Into your arms I would creep, Let me sometimes nestle near you— Don't let them bury me deep.

Look, who has come for me now, father, Standing near to my bed I, Some one is kissing my brow, father— Mamma, I thought you were dead! See! Is she smiling so bright to you, Beckons for you not to weep, 'Tis not good by, but good night, to you— They cannot bury me deep!

"PROGRESSIVE"

The Bible Index for May, page 157 says, "In the April WOKEN is a notice from a correspondent at Toronto, dated April 16th, stating that a brother 'has been buried with the Lord in baptism and arisen to walk in the new life,' though the immersion did not take place until the 18th of that month." Was this penned as an item of interest to the readers of the Index? We think not; only as the writer desired to make it appear that I had penned a falsehood. The apparent discrepancy occurred in this way. In sending a remittance to the WOKEN a day or two previously, I stated that I would send them an item for next issue. In acknowledging my letter they said the item must reach them by noon of 18th April. The item was concerning an addition at the West End. We went to Louisa street on the 16th April expecting to attend to the baptism, we were then informed the pipes were frozen, and water could not be got into the baptistry. We then announced that we would attend to it on Saturday the 18th inst., determining that if we could not use the baptistry at Louisa street, we would accept the kind offer of the use of the Baptists' house and baptistry (made some time since), and attend to it at that date without fail. I sent the item along on the morning mail of the 17th, knowing that before it was in type the baptism would take place and the news would be correct. The printer inadvertently put the date of 16th April in, which was not so intended, but this proved sufficient to allow the writer of "Progressive" to misrepresent a very unkind and unbrotherly spirit by publishing such an item without first coming to me for an explanation. I have given him no just reason for such

a course; on the contrary, I have endeavored to cultivate a spirit of brotherly kindness and reciprocity between the "West End" and Louisa street congregations, hence it was I who expressed thankfulness to the friends at Louisa street for their kindness, appreciating their efforts to accommodate us as they had done. In reporting news from Toronto to the WOKEN, I only mention the "West End," as they are in sympathy with the co-operation, and aid in sustaining it, while "the brethren at Louisa street do not belong to the co-operation which supports the WOKEN," which co-operation consists of many of the churches in Ontario who also support the Index, and in reporting the "additions" I believe the "chief item" of news to be the glorious fact that sinners are turning to the Lord and obeying Him, not the place at which they may be baptized, or the trouble of attending to it. I deeply regret the occasion of this explanation, it should not have been caused by a Christian and would not if the golden rule had been observed.

Geo. J. BARCLAY.

"S." ON THE HOLY SPIRIT.

I have carefully looked over the last article by "S." in the WOKEN, and fall to find one position, taken by me on this question, set aside, by any Scripture produced bearing on the subject, or any argument not shown incorrect, hence my reply will be to notice the misapplication of Scripture and show some of the incorrect and absurd reasonings of "S." I said nothing about "an immersion of the Spirit with a reduced quantity." I did not call the "gift of the Spirit," (promised by Peter on Pentecost) an immersion, neither do the Scriptures, this hallucination belongs to "S." I still affirm that Paul did not receive any measure of the Spirit at the hands of Ananias, it is neither so stated, nor is it "very strongly implied," in the Scriptures. The Lord told Ananias to enquire for one Saul, for He "hath seen in a vision a man named Ananias coming in and putting his hands on him that he might receive his sight." What did he put hands on him for? "To impart the baptism of the Spirit," says "S." The Lord said it was "that he might receive his sight," this is sufficient for those who respect God's word. The Spirit was promised to the obedient as a "gift," not baptism, and followed the baptism in water, Acts 2nd 38. Here is where "S." founders in the darkness of tradition. Paul says there is "one baptism," and "we are buried with Christ" in that baptism, referring to immersion in water as the one baptism. "S." who is "perfectly in accord with Paul" says, "No! there are two baptisms," and says, "We are all baptized in one Spirit." Will "S." kindly give the chapter and verse where that is found, it is not stated in my Bible that "we are all baptized in one Spirit." In receiving the gift of the Spirit there is neither three, two or one baptisms. The Spirit was given without measure to Christ, John 3:34, but by measure to others, the apostles and first Gentile converts, the baptism on whom the apostles laid hands, a less measure, as they could not impart "as did the apostles. Peter says concerning the Gentiles, "as I began to speak the Holy Spirit fell on them as on us at the beginning." If all had been baptized in the Holy Spirit during the seven years since the day of Pentecost there was no meaning in Peter's language referring to the beginning (Pente-

cost), as it would have been a repetition of what had occurred during all that time. After the Spirit had come upon the Gentiles (the baptism) they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, the one baptism of Eph. 4:5. Those baptized in the Holy Spirit spoke with tongues, worked miracles, etc., the cause produced the effect then, and would do so now. We have no miraculous manifestations now, for the reason that we have no baptism of the Spirit or impartation by laying on of hands now. "S." cannot discriminate between the miraculous, to confirm and establish the new covenant, and give us through the apostles the Gospel of our Salvation, and the gift of the Spirit as a comfort. I do not deny that Christians receive the gift of the Spirit, but I do deny that all Christians are baptized in the Spirit, as the Scriptures do not so teach. The attempt of "S." to show that more than the apostles were baptized in the Spirit at Pentecost is an utter failure. The showing of himself alive &c., by the Saviour proves nothing in this matter. "S." claims that Jesus did not purpose to give the apostles any pre-eminence. Did he not say to them, "whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted?" Was the world not to "believe on him through their word?" The promise of special qualification and power, for the great work of proclaiming the Gospel to all nations, was to the apostles only, this was certainly pre-eminence.

I still firmly maintain that "they," Acts 2:1, refers only to the Apostles, as the antecedent is the word Apostles, Acts 1:26. Peter stood up with the eleven, not with one hundred and nineteen. The case cited by "S." as a parallel to show "the absurdity of claiming 'they' as referring to apostles on any grammatical grounds is not a parallel, as 'transgressors' is not the antecedent of 'they' in Luke 22:37 38; as the latter part of verse 37 in which "transgressors" is found is a quotation from Isaiah, and hence does change the subject, "They" of the 38th verse has no reference to the 37th verse whatever, as the sense is perfect if the 37th verse be entirely dropped. This is like much of the absurd reasoning and application of Scripture by "S." The reader will also notice that "S." has taken the latter part of verse 16, chap. 1, Acts, and placed it after the 1st verse of chap. 2, in the vain and hopeless endeavor to establish a false issue. Many Scripture quotations used have no reference whatever to the baptism of the Spirit. The question as to how the remaining 108, or how the Apostles got into the kingdom is neither discussed here nor in the Scriptures. I am satisfied to deal with what is revealed. When "S." shows whether all flesh means all flesh, human, beasts and birds or not, and whether all the signs and wonders named in Acts 2nd. 19, 20, actually took place that day. I will answer question No. 2. Neither the ordinary measure nor any other measure of the Spirit was ever given to "transform" saint or sinner. This is the modern idea; close up God's word and pray to him to "send down converting power just now, baptize these wicked souls with the Holy Ghost and with fire!" Thus setting aside the Gospel as the "power of God unto Salvation." Let "S." show that the deacons or the "Disciples throughout any region" were baptized in the Holy Spirit; it cannot be done. The passage, Acts 2:39, does not say that Peter gave "those convicted Jews to understand most distinctly that if they renounced their sins and

turned to the Lord they would receive the very same measure, etc." Neither does any other Scripture say so; no such promise is contained in all the sacred writings. The statement that "the baptism of the Spirit is what every Christian must have," is as eccentric as that men were chosen to judge in such cases, and if to their best men. Then this is a stem in the ruling. The nearest approach to the work of a New Testament eldership that we can find in these days is the committee of management, or council of capable men, or directors which every society elects from its own members, to do the daily-occurring work of such society. The work done is charged to the society, and is said to be done by the society, although done by its officers and committee; so in like manner is much of the work in Church matters to be done by the eldership, who being qualified or appointed to rule, and what is done by them is done by the Church. Business meetings of the elders. Some qualification is necessary to render Christians capable of doing church business; and the history of churches everywhere goes to show that trouble is ever arising out of so-called business meetings at which every brother, whether a novice or otherwise, is equal. Nothing tends more to poison young minds, of intimate them in their early career than this calling them together to do work which belongs to the eldership and for which they are not qualified. In most churches at the present time the elders' duties involve no ruling. Elders may preside at meetings and have their say like any other brother, but ruling they do not. Is not this the cause of much of the trouble experienced by our churches at the present time? Can we improve upon the Apostles' teachings? Confessably we cannot; then let us elect qualified seniors to rule and order our affairs in the fear of God in the light of His truth, and let the churches everywhere submit themselves accordingly. Rebellion rather than submission is often shown now, and nothing comes of evil but evil.—Christian Pioneer.

G. J. B.

RULING.

"Let the elders that rule will be counted worthy of double honor—says the Apostle Paul to Timothy—especially those who labor in the word and doctrine." What is this ruling? Evidently it is something requiring obedience, for Paul in writing to the Hebrews, says, "obey them that have the rule over you; and submit to them, for they watch for your souls, as they that shall give account; that they may do this with joy, and not with grief, for this were unprofitable for you." Ruling is then a work and a responsibility; and it may be done well or indifferently. That there were many indifferent rulers in the early days is manifest from Paul's words, in writing to the church at Philippi when he writes thus; "but I hope to send Timothy unto you shortly, that I also may be of good comfort, when I know your state. For I have no man like-minded, who will caretruly for your state for they all seek their own, not the things of Jesus Christ." He quotes Timothy as an exception to the rule, and commends him accordingly. Rulers or elders were mostly seniors, only in exceptional cases like this were youths or novices elected to rule, and such necessarily commends itself to reason as well as being enjoined by revelation.

But in what does the ruling consist? Evidently not in being authorized to direct the church in matters of law. What then? Simply as exponents and enforcers—so to speak—of Apostolic rule. The church of God is ruled by God, through Christ as the Head of His church, through His apostles as the foundation of the same, and through qualified elders expounding and administering the laws of the same as recorded in the infallible word. It is Divine rule from first to last, but human agency intervenes and is, we may say, indispensable. The subject is not, however, narrowed down sufficiently yet, for we have not given a clear and explicit idea of what ruling is. We have seen that it is a work; a work of responsibility; and we now add it is a work done on behalf of the church by a few qualified seniors. The judges of Israel in old times did such work. They did much of the work of the nation. Qualified men were chosen for the work, and they were responsible for its execution, which consisted in dealing with all difficult or serious matters, which the common people could not be expected to understand. Is this anything like the work that elders in the church are expected to do now? Many experienced brethren affirm that it is. That many matters which some interpret the whole church should do is not to be attempted by the whole church, but by its capable and responsible rulers. The bishop must be one who is capable of ruling his own house, or he cannot take care of the church of God. The infer-

ence is that a similar rule obtains in both; and if so, discipline is part of the work of rulers, elders, bishops, and not of the whole church. Something written by Paul to the church at Corinth looks in this direction (1 Cor. 6:4). "If then ye have to judge things pertaining to this life, do ye set them to judge who are of no account in the Church?" The inference is that men were chosen to judge in such cases, and if to their best men. Then this is a stem in the ruling. The nearest approach to the work of a New Testament eldership that we can find in these days is the committee of management, or council of capable men, or directors which every society elects from its own members, to do the daily-occurring work of such society. The work done is charged to the society, and is said to be done by the society, although done by its officers and committee; so in like manner is much of the work in Church matters to be done by the eldership, who being qualified or appointed to rule, and what is done by them is done by the Church. Business meetings of the elders. Some qualification is necessary to render Christians capable of doing church business; and the history of churches everywhere goes to show that trouble is ever arising out of so-called business meetings at which every brother, whether a novice or otherwise, is equal. Nothing tends more to poison young minds, of intimate them in their early career than this calling them together to do work which belongs to the eldership and for which they are not qualified. In most churches at the present time the elders' duties involve no ruling. Elders may preside at meetings and have their say like any other brother, but ruling they do not. Is not this the cause of much of the trouble experienced by our churches at the present time? Can we improve upon the Apostles' teachings? Confessably we cannot; then let us elect qualified seniors to rule and order our affairs in the fear of God in the light of His truth, and let the churches everywhere submit themselves accordingly. Rebellion rather than submission is often shown now, and nothing comes of evil but evil.—Christian Pioneer.

OBITUARY.

DEAR WORKER.—I have been sent for to go back to Dorset to the funeral of a little boy, a son of Sister White, whose husband is at present at French River.

"BEAR YE ONE ANOTHER'S BURDENS."

Who shall say how much lighter, if we thus fulfilled the law of Christ, our own might become, for most of the burdens we have to bear are laid upon us because of disobedience to some point in that law, "the law of Christ." Truly Christ fulfilled that law, for who was so emphatically the burden bearer for others as the man of sorrows who, for the sins of others, bore heavier burdens than any of us are called upon to bear. I think there are none of us so insignificant but that we may be of comfort to others if we only try to be. It must be a terrible thing to have to stay at the close of life, "I never tried to comfort any one else; I felt that it was no use. I had trouble myself and I am afraid that any comfort I might have offered would have been of a very doubtful sort." But if you never tried, how do you know? I heard a conversation once that I never forgot. I was intimately acquainted with both the speakers. One of them I considered as possessing a much larger share of the spirit of self-sacrifice than the other. The one said frequently, "Well, what good is my life to either myself

or anyone else? No one cares whether I speak kindly or harshly. I have missed my aim in life. All that I valued most in this life I have lost. What I desired most of this world's gifts have been withheld. I know it is best that it should be so, that if what I desired so much was good for me I would get it; but how can I help feeling downcast when the prospect before me for all my future life is so dark, even though I know it has a bright side." The answer came with only a very slight shade of reproach in it. "Try and make others happy, try to do all the good you can and you will be happier yourself; besides, if you try to do good you may be sure your life will be useful though. If our griefs are carried to the throne of grace and trustfully left there. We may then possess 'a mind at leisure from itself to sooth and sympathize,' and thus, though our talents may be small, we may be helpful to those around us, and may do more good in our own sphere than those whose talents are greater, but who do not consecrate them to the service of the Giver. If we really desire to be of use in the world some way is found by which we obtain our desire, for in this we may obtain the assistance of One who has said, 'without me ye can do nothing,' and who will hereafter bestow approval in proportion, not to opportunity or ability, but to earnestness of endeavor and obedience to His revealed will. Do all you can to soothe the sorrows of others now. And for comfort of your own, be content, if necessary to wait till God Himself shall wipe away your tears by the side of the river of life with- in the city where sorrow cannot enter. Try to rejoice with those who are happy, even though you yourself may be pining through the deep waters of trial and to sympathize with those afflicted, even when you feel around yourself the sunlight of gladness.

E. J. B.

DEAR WORKER.—I have been sent for to go back to Dorset to the funeral of a little boy, a son of Sister White, whose husband is at present at French River.

DIED.—In Ephraim, on March 14th, 1885, Ethel May Kelly, aged 3 years. And on May 11th, her sister, Ellen Maria Kelly, in her 14th year. A severe attack of diphtheria was the apparent cause. Ellen was one of those bright girls who usually stood at the head of her classes at school. Brother and Sister Kelly have the warmest sympathy of the brethren in these hours of trial and sorrow. We pray that others of the family may soon be restored to health again.

When Paul proscribes that an elder must not be a novice, he means that he shall not be a new convert from a sinful life—a novice in the service of God. Such a man as Cornelius, long accustomed to the worship of God and to habits of benevolence, was not a novice when he was baptized. So of many venerable and pious men from the Jewish synagogues, some of whom had been elders of these congregations, and needed only faith in Christ in order to be qualified for the eldership in the Christian church. This circumstance enabled Paul to appoint elders in many churches newly planted, without violating his rule that an elder shall be an elder, —Apostolic Guide.