

plain inference is that he baptized them." "Amen," "amen," were heard in different parts of the house. "Next." The second brother arose and read: "And when she was baptized and her household, she besought us, saying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house and abide there." Acts 16:15. "That will do; any remarks?" Bro. Smith arose and said; Brethren, I see that it says that the household of Lydia

was baptized, but it does not say anything about infants being there or that any infants were baptized. Besides, we would have to prove first, that Lydia was a married woman. Second, that she had children. Third, that some of them were infants. Fourth, that she had brought them with her from Thyatira. And fifth, that they were included in the word "household." "That is true," said the preacher, "but the plain inference is that there were infants there and that they were baptized." "The next brother will read." The third brother read: "And was baptized, he and all his straightway." Acts 16:33. Bro. Smith remarked: "But it does not say there were any infants there." "No," says the preacher, "but the inference is that infants were in the household." Bro. Smith was then called on to read. He arose and read: And Balaam rose up in the morning, and saddled his ass." Num. 22:21. "Well," says the preacher "what has that to do with the question?" "It does not say anything about infants or baptism either." "That is true" said Bro. Smith, "it does not mention them in so many words, but the plain inference is that Balaam saddled his ass to carry the babies to have them baptized!" The meeting then closed.

Selections and Comments.

REFRESHING!—This refreshing paragraph is taken from the *New Northwest*:

"John Barleycorn," writing in the *Coquille City Herald*, reads a needed lesson to Brother Floyd, of the *Christian Herald*, for recent utterances which indicated that he considered drunkenness less reprehensible in men than in women. The article may help him to arrive at a better understanding of the woman movement. Women do not ask less stringent moral laws for themselves, but stronger ones for men.

Yes, some one sent us the paper referred to containing the much

"needed lesson" (!), but as the effusion was such a complete and willful misrepresentation of our note written in the interest of temperance, and so utterly devoid of common sense that, like a good deal of the literature of its grade, we passed it by unnoticed. This is good food, however, for the *New Northwest*. By the way, we did not know before that the "woman's rights" theory was intended to work both ways. If that class

of women, a representative of whom we saw drunk on the streets of Albany, are to be encouraged in the shameful and disgraceful habit of visiting the saloons and wallowing in the filth of the city, on the ground that their acts are no more contaminating and injurious to society, good morals and religion, and hence no more "reprehensible" in any respect than for men to engage in these acts, then our contemporary is welcome to the full benefit of its logic. As much as we deplore drunkenness on the part of any one, and as sinful and degrading as it is for a man to be seen drunk, we pity that woman who supposes her drunken appearance on the public streets is no more offensive to good taste and cultured society and hence no more "reprehensible" than that of her husband. But such is only the legitimate fruit of the "equal rights" theory.

NEW PHRASES.—The *Christian Intelligencer* is engaged in a laudable work in following up the "new theology" and exposing some of its infidel phrases. Here is the way it handles a new phrase:

Another phrase with which we have very little patience and which to us is one of the most unmeaning and absurd ever used by men of fair intelligence is, "The Church should believe in Christ and not in something about Christ; should believe in the Bible and not in something about the Bible; ministers should preach Christ and not about Christ, should preach the Bible and not about the Bible." What thorough, out-and-out bosh and trash that is! We would like to know how any one believes in anything or anybody without knowing about them and trusting on what he knows. We would like to know how any one is to believe in our gracious and adorable Lord and Savior without believing in what is written about Him, in what he learns about Him. Then when this utterly senseless trash takes the form of accusing the Christian ministry and Christian creeds of presenting not Christ but something

about Christ, not the Word of God but something about the Word of God, it is guilty of giving expression to an absolute falsehood. We have read many of the sermons, essays and books of these men and maintain confidently that in the ordinary sermons and treatises of the ministry who believe in the creeds there is not only ten times but a hundred times more Christ—pardon the form of expression, it is very distasteful to us, we use it because it is used against us—than in the dissertations of the "new theology;" and as to Christian experience, or in other words the experience of the grace of Christ, there is next to none of it in the utterances of the "new theology." We have never read any other professedly Christian works so barren of Christian experience.

The criticism is well made and we commend it to our readers. We can only believe in Christ as we do so through what he teaches, for this is all we know about him. There is no such thing as believing in him while we refuse to do what he commands; "For why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" says the Savior. It is easily to be seen that whenever we adopt the new phraseology, we are laying down the gap for every phrase of skepticism and infidelity to enter the Church of God.

PREACHING TO GOD.—A gentleman in New York City is visiting the different churches there for the purpose of writing a brief sketch of their noted ministers. He has visited Dr. Paxton's church, and here is what he says of his praying:

It is a hard thing to say, but I cannot help thinking that Dr. Paxton's services would be more edifying if he began with the sermon, and ended with it. His devotional services struck me as singularly unreverential and infelicitous. His prayer was uttered on the same pitch as the sermon, and in a tone of unintentional familiarity, if not dictation. In substance it was partly an *exordium remotum*, and partly a sermon to God. He began by a business-like statement of why we were there. He then gave the Lord a compendium of the life of Christ; reminded him how we also were in the world; gave a view of human life, with its temptations; and followed it up with a vivid sketch of the devil. It was a good thing to listen to, but it was not prayer; at least, it was Dr. Paxton's prayer, not the people. And it is this sort of thing which is driving cultured and sensitive people into the Episcopal church.

We might add that it is not necessary to go to New York City to hear these sermons preached to

God; we can get enough of them at home. It is this sort of thing that not only drives people into the Episcopal church, but, if possible, into what is worse—avowed infidelity itself. When we listen to these sermons we always think of the prophets of Baal who attempted to call down fire from heaven!

SECTARIANISM AMONG THE HEATHEN.—Dr. Phillips Brooks in a recent lecture in Boston on missionary work in India said:

That which makes people distrust foreign missions is the testimony that the Europeans in India will not trust the Christianized Indian. It is not strange that some poor creature should bring discredit on the religion he professes. He worships in strange houses and in a strange way. He kneels in American-style churches and is taught by men full of American ideas. Christianity will never be the religion of India until it comes there imbued with the spirit of the day. In time there must come forth an Indian Christianity, rich, full of power and goodness. The missionaries want this, and are perfectly aware it must come. The influence that now goes to India carries with it the curse as well as the blessing. Let the divisions of Church creeds be kept at home, and let the Indian religion be developed from within.

Yes, let the divisions of creeds not only be left at home, but let the creeds everywhere be completely abandoned, and thus let the children of God go before the world as a united people. Then and not till then, can Christendom make the world see the force and consistency of the Christian religion. Sectarianism is as sinful at home as in India, and the man who will not give it up here is not the missionary the heathen need.

IS INFIDELITY INCREASING?—Bro. B. B. Tyler, our preacher for the church in Brooklyn, thinks not, and in a letter to an exchange gives the following interesting paragraph as his reasons:

"It seems to me that there is an unnecessary alarm in the minds of not a few good men and women as to the unbelief of our time.

The infidelity of this hour is stronger, more widely extended, and more defiant, than at any previous time in the history of the Christian Religion, in their opinion. In this I verily believe them to be in error. There was a straw a few days since on this subject seen in this city.

With a great flourish it was announced in the public prints that a Miss Gardener, the equal of Col. Ingersoll in eloquence and in her