

out to the prophet so far away in the sky, "My father! My father! the chariots of Israel and the horsemen thereof!" Elijah remembered his promise, and he took his mantle and threw it down. Elisha put it on, took a last look in the sky where the flaming chariot had disappeared, and started back home. If he had been a Chicago man he would have said, "I don't feel that I have got the power. I thought I would feel a thrill go through me, but I feel just the same as I did, and look just the same." Elisha did nothing of the kind. He said, "He promised it to me, and I have got it." When he got back where the fifty prophets were, they saw him coming, alone, and they ran out to greet him. "Elisha's coming alone," they cried. "His master's gone! Elijah must have been caught up. We never will see the like of that man on earth again." Don't you believe it. There are some better men coming on after us. Don't you worry yourself, my friend, about all the good men going to die when you die. Well, when Elisha got to Jordan and stood there on the bank wondering how he should get over, the fifty prophets said, "How'll he get across? He can't make the waters stop running as Elijah used to do. He'll get drowned." But he didn't. He just took Elijah's mantle and struck the water, and old Jordan knew him, and opened, and let him pass over dry shod. And everybody looked on and said, "The spirit of Elijah is upon Elisha." Of course it was; God promised it; a double portion, too. You will find that Elisha performed just twice the miracles that Elijah did.

I have got sick and tired of hearing people say they are satisfied if they can get a few crumbs from God's table. They may be, I'm not. Crumbs are good for cats and dogs, not for men. I have three children, and I don't want them to live on crumbs. Let's go for the whole loaf! Let us pray that we may have the baptism of fire here this morning. Let us all join in prayer with Mr. Brown, of London,

The Rev. J. S. Sutherland, B. D., on Baptism.

The Rev. J. S. Sutherland, B. D., has read a paper before the students of the Presbyterian College in Halifax on baptism. In the spirit manifest, in the fairness with which the Baptist position is stated, and in the frank admissions made, the paper is Christian in a high degree and should be imitated by all who write on the controverted parts of revelation. There is not a sentence or a word in which does not breathe the spirit of kindly sympathetic feeling. This is encouraging. Baptists do not always stop to consider that their views involve the declaration that all pedobaptist churches are unbaptized, and consequently the ministry unordained. It must take not a little grace to keep human nature wholly in subjection with this inference ever in the front. But, on the other hand, Baptists in their right minds can have no pleasure in persistently deferring with other bodies of Christianity. Their peculiar beliefs are a matter of judgment and conscience. "The external washing with water is the sign of an inward cleansing and renewal," says Mr. Sutherland. "It should be ministered then only to those in whom the inward cleansing may be expected to be a reality. 'Expected' I italicize. Here Mr. Sutherland parts company with Baptists. Not expected, but is a reality, or a professed 'reality' that would harmonize with Baptist doctrine.

This is what Mr. Sutherland says of the Baptist position: "Baptists assert that none are to be baptized but those who have accepted Christ as their personal Saviour and are capable of making a credible profession of their faith in Him." This is satisfactory. It is fair. But on the other hand, "The standards of our church," says Mr. Sutherland, "declare that, beside such as are thus admitted into the visible church, the children of believing parents are fit and proper subjects for baptism."

He then turns to the Bible, "our great church directory and statute book." With their judgment and their conscience, all Baptists will go with Mr. Sutherland in this appeal to Scriptures. Let it be settled by the divine word. Then Mr. Sutherland says, "The New Testament records a number of instances of baptism; but in none of these is the administration of the rite to infants or young children mentioned." This is precisely what Baptists say, except perhaps Mr. Sutherland makes the New Testament too exclusive by the expression "young children." If this does not include any who "are capable of making a credible profession of faith in Christ," it will not be objected to by Baptists. Further Mr. Sutherland says, "No special command is given to baptize the children of believing parents." This, too, is the Baptist belief. At this point Mr. Sutherland parts company with Baptists. He says:

"If they (the Baptists) could produce a command of our Lord or his apostles prohibiting the practice (infant baptism) and declaring that in this respect Jewish custom should not be followed by Christian believers, though baptism was only the adaption of a Jewish rite; then the matter would be decided once and forever in their favor."

Here, when Mr. Sutherland turns out of the plain Baptist path, he is reduced into a false position by an unwarranted assumption and a fallacy. The assumption is that baptism is circumcision perpetuated. It is enough to say that circumcision was for males alone, and that the circumcised, as well as the uncircumcised, were baptized on the profession of their faith in Christ. The fallacy is that infant baptism is not prohibited by specific command. Were I a Roman Catholic, I would trust the

logic of Mr. Sutherland to establish the validity of every one of the many rites and ceremonies with which Romanism has adorned her authorized services. I would say of the confessional, it is not authorized by the Scriptures. Mr. Sutherland would say, the Scriptures do not prohibit it. Then it and infant baptism stand on identically the same ground, so far as this line of reasoning is concerned. Giving the bread alone to the laity and the cup to the priests is not taught in the Word of God, I say. Mr. Sutherland would say the Word of God does not prohibit it. It, too, on the non-prohibitory logic, stands beside infant baptism. This process can be continued till Mr. Sutherland's fallacy, which protects infant baptism, clasps in its embrace all the added sacraments and services of Romanism. Mr. Sutherland will find more congenial company with the Baptists. His non-prohibitory argument is good ground for Romanism. But Rome does not want it. The church authorizes it.

Again Mr. Sutherland says: "If those who believe in infant baptism could point to a command to observe it, or to an instance in which a child was certainly baptized with apostolic approval because of the faith of its parents, then again would the question at issue be decided by direct evidence." That is sound Baptist doctrine.

Further Mr. Sutherland says: "But when the matter is simply not referred to, the question is left open." Here again, Mr. Sutherland leaves the Baptist faith and goes another way. "When the matter is not referred to" in God's word, the question is not an "open" but a "closed" one. God does not leave to the caprice of human nature and to its skill in guessing the matter of filling up his revealed will to man. His revelation is complete. It is sufficient. This is the crux of the whole question—has God given us a full and an all-sufficient revelation? or can human device supplement it at will? Faith in the parent makes infant baptism believer's baptism, so says Mr. Sutherland. Suppose the two parents are very ungodly, and the four grandparents are very godly, and the children are under the roof trees of the grandparents, why should not the faith of the grandparents avail for the infants, especially in instances where the ungodly parents have died? Here is a difficulty for Mr. Sutherland to solve; and it is not the only one. This assumes what Mr. Sutherland grants, that faith is a prerequisite to baptism—the Baptist view.

Further on Mr. Sutherland says: "In the New Testament we find instances of baptism that seem to be based upon the principles that warrant infant baptism." "Seem to be based." Lydia and the jailor are two cases. But the jailor "rejoiced, believing in God with all his house." He believed in God, all his house believed. This takes away anything "seeming" to favor infant baptism.

Mr. Sutherland, as reported in the Presbyterian Witness, incorrectly quotes from the Scriptures; not for a moment, do I suppose intentionally. This is his quotation: "And having believed on God he rejoiced greatly with all his house." Not so! "He set meat before them and rejoiced, believing in God with all his house." He believed; all his house believed; all were baptized—true believer's baptism. Moreover, Paul spake the word to the jailor and to all that were in his house." The apostle never preached to infants. That is an impossibility.

Mr. Sutherland says infant baptism is being neglected among Presbyterians in Canada. Baptists, of course, are glad to hear that.

Mr. Sutherland intimates that infant baptism in public "is not a means of grace to minister, parents or people, whatever it may be to the child." He suggests that it be performed in the home. If it is to be continued, surely the home is the place for it.

In regard to the mode, Mr. Sutherland, with his characteristic fairness, says: "Here again the Baptists mark the advantage of a very definite and clearly marked position, which they badly declare their ability to defend against all who may presume to assail it. With them immersion of the person is essential to all valid baptism; and so conscientious are they in regard to this matter that they would rather not baptize at all than baptize in any other way than by plunging or dipping. In fact no other mode is in their view permissible."

"Of late," says Mr. Sutherland, "the tendency among scholars has been to grant almost everything to advocates of immersion, possibly on something the same principle that leads an indulgent father to give everything to a son which he demands with sufficient boldness and persistence." That will hardly do! The world's scholars have something more at stake than indulging Baptists.

To defend sprinkling the beaten path is followed. The fallacies have been swept away a thousand times, and still they are doing duty, but with evident signs of weakness.

"The genius of Christianity," argues the author of the paper in question; "is one of freedom and adaptability, and lays stress upon the inward and spiritual, rather than upon the outward and material."

"The symbols that teach great truths should not be thrown away for unnecessary human substitutes, unwarranted by God's word. Immersion symbolizes 1. Death to sin. 2. Resurrection to a new life. 3. The washing away of sin. 4. The voluntary pledge to a new commander—Christ. 'Baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea.'"

Where is the authority for casting this aside for sprinkling which teaches none of these truths, except perhaps that of cleansing, and that only by the argument of its purpose in the Old Testament. To Gentiles it means nothing.

As to the impossibility of immersing in all countries and at all times, it is sufficient to say, God does not require his servants to do impossible things. He prescribed the mode of baptism, and he is able to bear the responsibility of its impossible observance. The Lord's supper is a church ordinance. God does not hold his people who are sailing on the sea away from the church, responsible for not partaking of the supper. Follow the plain commands and examples of the Bible, and God will take care of all fancied difficulties.

Women and Their Sphere.

I observe "J. D." of Wolfville is quite exercised in his mind on "Women and their Sphere." His disquisition on the subject recall to mind my observations of last summer while rusticating in a rural district. The wife of our nearest neighbor, one, by the way, of the handsomest women I have seen, presiding over her thrifty looking residence with the grace of a queen, I frequently saw her in the field aiding in the harvesting of grain, gathering potatoes after the diggers, picking stones, etc., and learned she often did the work of the barn, sometimes helping her husband into the house on his return from "town," and making the horse comfortable for the night. I was also informed that another woman in the neighborhood shingled her husband's barn. And heard these women praised as just the women for farmer's wives.

During the recent agitation on the subject of Women and the ballot box, I have had some warm discussions with some of these men—I maintaining that where women own a property she should have the privilege of representing it. That her "sphere," and man's too, was wherever they could do good, and that in every sphere in life "it is not good that man should be alone." They on their part maintaining that granting women the freedom of the ballot box was giving her that which would take her out of her "sphere." "No true woman should wish to be out of her sphere," and "great care should be taken that she don't get out." Question: Why this difference of opinion between woman's sphere on the barn question and the ballot box?

I wonder if "J. D." and those holding such like opinions ever had friends or acquaintances, or did they ever see any one who stepped into man's sphere after the fashion of the above incidents, and if so did they fly to the press to aid them in their fierce exposures and denunciations of the same? I have never seen such deliverances, careful inquiries fail to find any one who ever did, although I am assured the incidents are not unusual. Why, I wonder? But, perhaps, she is considered in her sphere when she lays "her gentle hand" on the horn of a four-footed animal and ties him up that he may not harm her boys and girls, and is only out of her sphere when she lays her hand on the ballot box for the same purpose.

It is a great world to live in, and the first thing somebody knows some woman will get out of her environments and there will not be the looking up with that reverence and awe that there should be. And so it is perhaps well to be on guard.

Truro, May 5th.

 Last Saturday night the young men's Bible class of the Fifth avenue church, with a number of invited guests, gathered for a social evening in the chapel, and listened to addresses by Dr. Faunce, Mr. Charles E. Hughes, teacher of the class, and Mr. John D. Rockefeller. The occasion was one of peculiar interest from the fact that Mr. Rockefeller, in the simple, unaffected manner characteristic of him, spoke with unwonted freedom of his early struggles to get a foothold in life, and drew helpful lessons from those hard experiences for the instructions of the young men whom he was addressing. The text of his remarks, which were entirely unpremeditated, was a little account book, marked "Ledger A," in which were kept the receipts and expenditures, with other memoranda, of this early period in his wonderful business career. Of this little book he said: "It does not look like a modern ledger, does it? But you could not get that ledger from me for all the modern ledgers in New York, nor for all that they would bring." We regret that we have not space for more of this excellent address this week; but there is so much good common sense and wise suggestion in it that we shall try to find a place for the larger part of it in our next issue. Meantime, for immediate use, we may quote one sentence whose bearings on the crisis in our missionary affairs will be apparent. Speaking of his small but regular contributions to benevolence in those days, he said: "Those contributions, small as they were, brought me into direct contact with philanthropic work, and with the beneficial work, and aims of religious institutions, and I have been helped thereby greatly all my life. It is a mistake for a man who wishes for happiness and to help others to think that he will wait until he has made a fortune before giving away money to deserving objects."—Examiner.

 The gilding in the throne room of the Sultan at Constantinople is unequalled by any other building in Europe, and from the ceiling hangs a superb Venetian chandelier the 200 lights of which make a gleam like that of a veritable sun. At each of the four corners of the room tall candelabra in baccarat glass are placed, and the throne is a huge seat covered with red velvet and having arms and back of pure gold.