

What the Disciples in the States are Saying and Doing.

CULLINGS AND CLIPPINGS FROM EXCHANGERS.

BAPTIST VS NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE.

The Western Recorder says: "Baptism has no connection whatever with regeneration, or remission of sins, or salvation. It is an act of obedience to be performed only upon those who have previously been entirely regenerated, forever saved and whose sins God has already remitted because their penalty has been borne by the great substitute." The New Testament says: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark xvi. 15, 16) "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins" (Mark i. 4). "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John iii. 5). "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost" (Acts ii. 38). "And now why tarriest thou? arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord" (Act xxii. 16). I must say that if the writers of the New Testament were trying to teach the doctrine which the Western Recorder so vigorously asserts, they were peculiarly unfortunate in the selection of words and arrangement of sentences. Now the Recorder and other Baptist papers never make any such blunders in the use of language when they undertake to state what they say the writers of the New Testament taught on the subject of baptism. It is a little peculiar if not deeply significant that when such papers as the Recorder undertake to state what the New Testament teaches on this subject it invariably uses language not found anywhere in the New Testament, and never selects the sentences of the New Testament to state the doctrine of the New Testament. It might be well to raise the question as to whether the Recorder and others of its way of thinking can boast the inspired and spirit-guided men of God selecting words and arranging sentences to teach the truth touching the question of baptism.—Gospel Advocate.

A LAYMAN ON DANCING.

James Oliphant, in the Westminster Review, uses some plain words in speaking about one of the popular amusements of the day, and we would commend them to all lovers of the dance. He says: "The standard of personal delicacy is probably the truest indication of progress toward the social idea of purity and elevation in life and thought, and it behooves every earnest-minded citizen to be zealous about the consistency of the community to which he belongs in this all-important respect. It has been already pointed out that there is a reason in the nature of things why various degrees of proximity and bodily contact should mark out different stages of intimacy, and the more truly refined the society is the more punctiliously are these distinctions insisted on. Manners are the real guardians of morals. Any unauthorized breach of conventional decorum in this matter is visited with severe pains and penalties in the form of social ostracism. Any practice which systematically ignores the usual distinctions may be called sharply to account for its justification. What plea can be offered for dancing? It is clear that it runs entirely counter to the prevailing standard of good taste in other matters where the same ques-

tion arises. To what end do we make a reverent regard for the sanctity of a woman's person the touchstone of refined and chivalrous feeling when we allow all the signs of a respectful approach in intimacy to be swept away in a moment before the chartered libertinism of the dance? How is it that we can suffer a pure, delicate-souled girl to be clasped round the waist by a man of whose existence she knew nothing five minutes before? The wonderful convention which governs dancing seems able to transform an act which would otherwise be the grossest insult and familiarity into the merest commonplace. Can society make an indelicate act delicate by merely calling it so? It was a logical if somewhat cynical man whom Punch reports to have assured his hostess that he didn't dance, but would be happy to sit out the waltz with his arm around a girl's waist. Why not have a further convention that you should kiss your partner before taking her to a seat? There is a similar arrangement in the game of kiss-in-the-ring which has received the sanction of a certain class of society. It is difficult to see at what point of familiarity the license must necessarily stop.—C. S. Long, in Missionary Weekly.

UPDIKE AND HAWES AT WICHITA.

Great meetings excite interest throughout our brotherhood. In view of this I had thought of writing up the great meeting in Wichita at some length, but press of work and the second thought that volumes would add nothing to the renown of Updike and Hawes and Wichita, have led me to pen a few of the most interesting facts only.

This meeting exceeded in numbers any held by these noted workers in Kansas, and stands second to Des Moines only.

The meeting began June 11, and closed July 26. The interest was intense from the first. The large tabernacle was filled to overflowing—at times hundreds were unable to gain admittance. The last night, notwithstanding the tabernacle had been enlarged so as to seat 400 more, hundreds stood in the aisles, doors, and hundreds more turned away unable to get in sight. Six weeks more would have given us 1,000 additions.

Additions were about as follows by the week: 14, 50, 72, 52, 79, 114. Total, 887. The largest number any one day was 27; 9, 10, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20 and 21 were common figures for one day. Twenty-one the last day.

No word of praise can be penned too strong to express the masterly manner in which Updike and Hawes did their work. They have been written "up" so often that I have decided to just let them remain "up." May God keep them "up" for a thousand years to preach and sing the love of Jesus for the lost and perishing millions of earth.

June 23, Bro. Updike delivered a lecture to men only. The tabernacle was filled to hear one of the most pointed, practical, timely lectures ever delivered. This lecture, with the instructions accompanying it, ought to be placed in the hands of every boy and young man in the land. The power for good exerted by this lecture wherever delivered led Bro. Updike to secure a first-class stenographer to take it down just as delivered. The stenographer did his work well. The lecture makes a neat book about the size of Dr. Hammond's "The Greatest Thing in the World." It contains instructions that will prove worth hundreds of dollars to thousands of young men. It can be had by addressing Bro. Updike, or L. T. Van Cleave, Wichita, Kan. Price 25 cents.

The Central and South Lawrence churches united hands, heads and hearts in this meeting, and did everything in their power to carry out the plans of the Evangelists. Never did Christian people do more nobly. They did so well that Bro. Updike came near forgetting to scold.

The meeting closed with all bills promptly paid, and \$1,000, on thirty to sixty days, pledged to build an addition to our church building. This work is begun and will be pushed to completion. Our membership is between 600 and 700. The house when enlarged will seat 700 to 800. For the present we worship in the tabernacle. All departments of church work have taken on new life. The Sunday school has doubled. The prayer-meeting numbers 800 to 100. Persons are coming forward at all our preaching and prayer-meeting services.

Expenses: Evangelist's salary, traveling expenses and board, \$500.00. Tabernacle lights and watchman, \$240.00. Advertising, \$68.00. Total, \$805.85.—L. T. Van Cleave, in Standard.

THE BREAKING OF BREAD AND PRAYERS.

It is recorded of the disciples in the Church at Jerusalem that they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine, in the fellowship, in the breaking of bread, and in the prayers. There are manifest reasons why they should continue steadfast in the doctrine and fellowship. This may also be said of the "breaking of bread" and prayers.

An ordinance is an order or regulation established by authority. The breaking of bread, or the "Lord's Supper," is generally regarded as an ordinance within the church and for its members. Its importance cannot be overestimated. It is a commemorative service. Luke xxii. 19, 20: "And He took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is My body which is given for you: do this in remembrance of Me. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new testament in My blood, which is shed for you." It is in this institution that we remember our best and truest friend. It is a communion service. 1 Cor. x. 16, 17: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we, being many, are one bread and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread." It is a perpetual pledge of our fidelity to Christ as our Saviour. 1 Cor. ii. 26: "This do in remembrance of Me: for as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do show the Lord's death till He come." It is a solemn and yet a joyful service, for it is the symbol of the mighty sacrifice, the herald of glorious liberty, and a sacred pledge of union and communion with one another and the Lord. There is a pathos about it that time does not diminish or frequency destroy.

"Do this, and remember the blood that was shed, When Calvary's victim to slaughter was led; When sad and forsaken the garden alone Gave ear to His sorrow and echoed His moan.

"Remember the conflict with insult and scorn, The robe of derision, the chaplet of thorn, The sin-cleansing fountain that streamed from His side, When, 'Father, forgive them,' He uttered and died.

"Remember the victor o'er death and the grave! He liveth forever His people to save; O take with thanksgiving this pledge of His love, Tho' forsaken of rapture eternal above."

These early disciples were also steadfast "in the prayers." While they prayed in private, as all good Christians will do, they had fixed hours and

times for public devotion, and they were glad, and said: "Let us go into the house of the Lord. Our feet shall stand within thy gates, O Jerusalem. . . . The Lord hath done great things, whereof we are glad." They realized the danger in the neglect of any duty, and that it was dangerous to neglect these public expressions of their confidence and hope in God. A prayerless Christian cannot live long, for by prayer the dependent heart is filled from the everlasting fountain of supplies.

Prayer is the soul's sincere desire, Uttered or unexpressed; The motion of a hidden fire That's kindled in the breast.

It is impossible to inspire the prayerless heart with the sublime activities of the Christian life. The sublime characteristics of a living church are steadfastness in doctrine, in fellowship, in breaking bread, and in prayers. Such a church will always "look forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners." Such a church is always ready for every work or trial of whatever kind that comes upon it. Such a spiritual life as is manifested by these things will overwhelm the discords of the world's wild music with the conquering and thundering anthems of the children of God.—F. M. Green, in Missionary Weekly.

The Baptist Creed.

"There is no Baptist church, though there are plenty of Baptist churches, and so there are no standard and authoritative articles of faith."

So said, last week, in answer to an inquiry, the N. Y. Examiner, which we may, probably, without offence to others, call the most widely circulated and influential exponent of Baptist opinion in the United States. This is, it will be seen, in exact harmony with the position we have all along taken in the Baptist and which we reiterated in our article in last number. But, says our esteemed critic, Dr. Goodspeed, in substance, after describing the general practice of the Regular Baptist churches of this continent: "If this practice is what is meant by having a creed, then American Baptists have a creed and there is no use quoting statements from any quarter to the effect that Baptists have no creed." Very true. But this is not what is meant by having a creed. Hence the whole superstructure built upon that little word "if" comes to the ground. Take that practice as we described it, we think correctly, last week, or as Dr. Goodspeed himself describes it in the following sentence: "While our churches do not restrict themselves to any one form of statement, but choose the verbal expression of their views they think best, their denominational unity and co-operation are based upon substantial agreement in doctrine." Why, that is essentially the very thing the Baptist has been contending for all along. If that were what is meant by having a creed, there would no longer be any difference of view worth mentioning and this discussion would be at an end. What we understand by a creed is, in the words of the Examiner, some "standard and authoritative articles of faith," extra-scriptural, of course. Our last article was devoted to showing that Baptists have not, never have had and cannot, as Baptists, have any such creed. We now turn our attention to the second question.

Ought Baptists to have such a creed? In his first article Dr. Goodspeed tells us that what he has been pleading for is "simply the continuance of the practice of the Regular Baptist churches of America up to the present." But no one, we venture to say, can carefully read his two recent arti-

cles in our columns, to say nothing of those of earlier date, without perceiving that he is really pleading for much more than this. Carried to its logical and legitimate conclusion, his argument means that the New Hampshire or some similar Confession of Faith, some formal, uninspired statement of belief, should not only be accepted for convenience' sake and for "substance of doctrine," but should be used as an authoritative standard. In this position he is certainly consistent, for there can be little practical use in formulating such a statement and asking assent to it, if we are not to be bound by it. At this point we join the issue and maintain, not only that by its very spirit and constitution the Baptist "body"—we use the term several times employed by Dr. Goodspeed, though we doubt its appropriateness—cannot have such a creed, but that it ought not to have it, and that the attempt to adopt and enforce it would be disastrous.

1. Dr. Goodspeed's argument is as follows. Is it not possible to have a statement of Scripture truth? Has not every Christian a right to frame as many such statements as he please, and make them his articles of faith? If fifty others agree with him have they not the "right to band themselves together, in a common fellowship to defend and advance the truth as they have, from their best judgment, concluded it to be." If so, have they not "the right to refuse to receive into their doctrinal and Church fellowship those who deny the doctrines they in common esteem precious."

Most assuredly any man and any number of men have such rights. But, and this is the gist of the whole matter, they have not a right to claim that, having done this, they and they alone are Baptists. They have not a right to force their conclusions upon the acceptance of their fellow-Baptists, who may not have reached the same conclusions in all respects, or who may object on principle to subscribe to any articles of faith. They have not a right to claim that these abstract doctrinal statements which they have formulated are a part of the constitution of the historic Baptist church, and that no one can be a Baptist, or have a right to membership in a Baptist church, without binding them upon his or her conscience.

2. In asking whether Christians have not the right to make such statements articles of faith, Dr. Goodspeed adds, "as well as the statement that immersion only is baptism, and that believers are the only proper subjects of the ordinance?" Can it be necessary once more to point out the distinction between statements of belief which have direct practical bearings, and are indispensable to church organization, and those which are merely abstract propositions, or at least have no relation to organization or practice? Every society or organization must have its terms of membership. Following the example of the primitive churches, Baptists simply make intelligent, personal faith in Christ and obedience to His commands the conditions of admission to His church. Surely no very profound discrimination is needed to perceive the difference between such a requirement and that of assent to articles of faith such as those under consideration. Further, faith and baptism are clearly prescribed by New Testament teaching and example as conditions of church membership; assent to a series of formal doctrinal propositions, is nowhere prescribed. Should not this be sufficient distinction for Baptists? Still further, the humblest Christian, though but a child in years or under-