

ALABAMA BAPTIST.

ORGAN OF THE BAPTIST STATE CONVENTION.

VOL. 25.

"SPEAKING THE

MONTGOMERY, ALA.

TRUTH IN LOVE."

MARCH 10, 1898.

TERMS CASH: \$1.50 A YEAR

NUMBER 10

ALABAMA BAPTIST.

Published Every Thursday by the ALABAMA BAPTIST COMPANY

Office:—304 Dexter Avenue, up-stairs.

TERMS:—\$1.50 per Annum, in advance.

\$1.00 to Ministers in regular work.

THE LABEL:—The date on the label of your paper shows to what time you have paid. It serves as a receipt. If proper credit has not been given within two or three weeks from time of payment, notify us at once.

RULES.

THE ALABAMA BAPTIST is sent to subscribers until an explicit order is received by the publishers for its discontinuance, and payment for arrears is made.

CHANGES:—Over 100 words in length are charged for at the rate of 1 cent a word. Remember this when you send one for publication. Count the words and send the money with the notice.

ANONYMOUS COMMUNICATIONS:—Will always find their way to the wastebasket. The name of the author should be sent for the editor's eye.

TO CORRESPONDENTS:—Do not use abbreviations; be extra careful in writing proper names; write with ink on one side of the paper; do not write copy intended for the editor, and business items on the same sheet. Leave off personalities; condense.

CHANGES IN POST OFFICE:—When writing to have your paper changed, please send the post office at which you receive the paper, as well as the one to which you wish it changed.

STATEMENTS:—Will be sent to each subscriber when written in this way: "This is true, and reasonable people will not object to it."

REMITTANCES:—Should be made by Postal or Express Money Order, Registered Letter, Express or Bank Check, payable to The Alabama Baptist Company.

ADVERTISERS:—Will find it to their interest to write for terms. This paper has a wide circulation in Alabama among the 100,000 white Baptists.

Served at the Post Office at Montgomery, Ala., as second class matter.

From the Nashville American.

An Answer to Mr. Ingersoll.

Sermon by J. B. Hawthorne, D. D., Nashville.

Dr. Hawthorne's sermon at the First Baptist church yesterday morning, replying to Robt. Ingersoll's lecture, delivered at the Vendome theatre last Monday night, was heard by a very large audience.

Dr. Hawthorne took as his text, Psalms 137: 7-8: "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul. The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart." He spoke as follows:

On last Monday evening Robert Ingersoll delivered his lecture on "Why I Am an Agnostic," in one of the theatres of this city. Our community is too loyal to the constitutional right of free speech to refuse even such a character as Ingersoll an opportunity for the publication of his views.

It becomes all Christians to accord to him the same freedom of utterance that they claim for themselves. Absence from the city deprived me of the opportunity to hear his lecture, but I have read, in various publications, a full synopsis of it. It is substantially a reiteration of what he has been saying in other lectures for more than a quarter of a century.

Mr. Ingersoll is a very successful trimmer. He would not say in this latitude what he has said in other regions of our country. Down here in the South, where Christian sentiment prevails, he is simply an agnostic, and refrains from much of the ribaldry which has characterized his utterances in some sections of the North. Among the infidel Germans of the Northwest, he is more than an agnostic; he is an atheist, and is unparing in his denunciations of everything that is dear and sacred to the heart of the Christian.

The fact that this man is heard by multitudes of people, and that some have had the faith of their childhood disturbed and even uprooted by his assaults upon Christianity, is a sufficient warrant for a brief discussion of some of his views.

Mr. Ingersoll assumes that belief in God is incompatible with reason, and that men who cherish this belief are weak and foolish. The Bible declares that "the fool hath said in his heart there is no God," and it requires only a moderate exercise of our reasoning faculties to prove that this declaration is true, and that Mr. Ingersoll, and not the believer in God, is the fool.

Every rational man must and does admit the eternal existence of something. If Mr. Ingersoll denies that the universe came from something, he is the only infidel who does. Only a lunatic or an idiot would say that something came from nothing. It is incontrovertibly and overwhelmingly true that "from nothing nothing comes." This being true, we are compelled to believe that something has always existed, and that in that eternal something, which antedates all other things, the universe had its origin. If Mr. Ingersoll is not at variance with all other infidels he accepts this conclusion.

What is that something that antedates all other things, and from which all things derive their existence? The Bible calls it God, but Mr. Spencer has named it the "unknown and unknowable." The name is not essential, but whether you call it protoplasm, or fire-mist, or force, or the unknown and unknowable, or God, you must admit that it is eternal, and that out of it all other things have come into existence.

If that original something is the parent of all other things it has intelligence. If that original something is protoplasm, it is thinking protoplasm. If it is fire-mist, it is intelligent fire-mist. If it is force, it is rational force.

Why do I say this? Because it is a self-evident truth that a thing can communicate only what it possesses. Was that first thing protoplasm? Then you and I came from it, and if you and I are intelligent beings there is intelligence in protoplasm—if it has intelligence it is supreme intelligence, for there is nothing anterior or superior to it. What was the origin of matter? Was it created? If it was, there must be a personal creator, because a creation without a creator is unthinkable. If you say that matter was not created but has always existed, I will ask you another question. What was the origin of motion? Was it created? If it was, there must be a personal creator, because there cannot be a creation without a creator.

If you say that motion is eternal—that it never had a beginning, I will ask you a third question. What is the origin of thought? Is it a creation? If it is, there is a personal creator. If it is not a creation, and has existed from all eternity, then we are compelled to admit the existence of an eternal thinking being.

I challenge this infidel teacher, who comes to enlighten the benighted minds of our people for a consideration of \$500 a night, to inject into his next performance an answer to this argument.

In common with other materialists, Mr. Ingersoll claims that human life is transmitted. I will not controvert that proposition. But let him tell us from what the first man's life was transmitted. Perhaps he would answer, "From the monkey." If that be true, from what was the monkey's life transmitted? Perhaps he would answer, "From the alligator." If that be true, from what was the alligator's life transmitted? From the lizard? Then from what was the lizard's life transmitted? Thus we may go back and back until we come to protoplasm.

What a relief to men like Ingersoll if the human mind would stop there. But it will not stop there. No sooner has the infidel declared that human life had its origin in protoplasm than I, and all other men who think, want to know where protoplasm got its life.

Who then is the fool? The man who believes in a personal creator, or the man who goes through the world selling his atheistic blasphemy?

It is a question of \$500 a night for a consideration of \$500 a night?

In one of his lectures Mr. Ingersoll declares that the miracles of the Bible are frauds—the mere tricks of men who made their living by imposing upon human ignorance and credulity. He claims that Jesus Christ was "only a slight-of-hand man," and that he gained his pre-eminence among his associates only by his superior skill in feats oflegerdemain.

No man who admits that the universe is a creation, and that it came from the hands of a personal creator, can with any show of reason deny the possibility of miracles. To declare that a miracle is an impossibility is equivalent to saying that God is incapable of performing a miracle. It is unmitigated folly to assume that God cannot do anything that he chooses to do.

If it is admitted that God has performed one miracle, it is perfectly compatible with sound reasoning to believe that he has performed other miracles. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." "The worlds were made by the word of God." The fact here recorded was a miracle. Creation, whether by evolution or otherwise, was a miracle. The creation of the germ or the germs out of which the whole physical universe has grown, was a miraculous work, because it brought into existence something at a period when nothing existed but the divine Creator.

Did Christ perform miracles? Nicodemus believed that he did, for he went to him in person and said, "No man can do these miracles which thou doest, except God be with him." Nicodemus was a member of the great ecclesiastical high court of the Jews—a man of intelligence and learning, and one not liable to become the victim of a base trickster.

The evangelists tell us that Jesus performed miracles, but Mr. Ingersoll says no one knows who wrote the four gospels. When he says this he convicts himself either of stupidity or dishonesty.

He does not doubt that John Milton wrote "Paradise Lost," or that Newton wrote "The Principia," or that Tom Paine wrote the "Age of Reason." Why does he not doubt it? Because he accepts the testimony of history and tradition.

Our belief that the gospels were written by Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, rests upon the same kind of evidence. The testimony which sustains the authenticity of these sacred books is not only of the same kind that Mr. Ingersoll accepts with reference to "Paradise Lost," "The Principia" and the "Age of Reason," but it is much more voluminous and conclusive, because the gospels have occupied a much larger space in the thought of the world,

and have been subjected to a more thorough investigation.

When Mr. Ingersoll says that no one knows who wrote the four gospels, he charges all the earliest writers of the Christian era who quoted from these books, believing them to be the works of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, with disgraceful ignorance and stupid credulity.

Celsus, Porphyry and Julian hated Christianity as bitterly as he, but their writings abound in quotations from the New Testament, and they never questioned its authenticity. They never insinuated in the remotest degree that Christians of their day were mistaken as to the authorship of the four gospels, or any other part of the New Testament.

I defy this infidel teacher to furnish one jot or tittle of evidence to show that any opponent of Christianity, during the first four centuries after Christ, ever questioned the genuineness of the New Testament, or expressed even a doubt as to the honesty of the men who claimed to be eye witnesses of the miracles which they recorded.

Mr. Ingersoll says, that if Jesus had wrought the miracles which it is said he performed, the Jews would not have crucified him. This is a specimen either of his ignorance of history or of his moral inability to speak the truth. Every student of the Bible knows that the Jews did not deny the reality of the miracles of Jesus, but claimed that he worked these miracles through satanic power.

Mr. Ingersoll does not deny that Christ claimed to perform miracles, but declares that he was a deceiver—a slight-of-hand—a peripatetic trickster, who bamboozled the ignorant and unsuspecting rabble that followed him.

What respect can any rational man have for such an indictment? Can you believe that the man who taught the purest morality ever given to the world, and who lived the most benevolent life that men ever witnessed, and who died to bear testimony to what he taught, was a mere wandering vendor of tricks which he had learned from Egyptian magicians? No, you can not believe it. Neither does Mr. Ingersoll believe it. Why then does he say it? Ask the ticket man when you go to purchase your next admission to his lecture.

When Ingersoll says that "the Bible is the most infamous book in the universe," he means, evidently, that of all the books in the universe, this is the most infamous.

It is standard of ethics is the lowest. Is there any basis of reason or fact for this accusation? What is the morality of the Bible? We may learn what it is, not by listening to a man who gets \$500 a night for misrepresenting the Bible, but by going directly to the book itself.

Here are some samples of Bible ethics: "Honor thy father and thy mother." "Children, obey your parents." "Thou shalt not commit adultery." "Thou shalt not steal." "Thou shalt not murder." "Thou shalt not bear false witness." "Love thy neighbor as thyself." "As ye have opportunity, do good unto all men." "As ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them." "Love your enemies." "Above all things have fervent charity." "See that none render evil for evil unto any man." "If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men." "Keep thyself pure." "Shun the very appearance of evil."

In these passages we have an epitome of Biblical morality. Is there anything here that will warrant this man in calling the Bible "the most infamous book in the universe"? What manner of man would Mr. Ingersoll become if he should obey all of these righteous precepts? A good man? Or the bad man that he is?

Jesus Christ, in his incarnate life, was the perfect embodiment and illustration of the ethics of the gospel which he preached. What was there in his life that deserved condemnation from any man? Set over against Mr. Ingersoll's representation of the morals of the New Testament the words of Mr. Lecky, one of the most intellectual and learned men of modern times. In his history of "European Morals" he says: "It was reserved for Christianity to present to the world an ideal character, which through all the changes of eighteen centuries has inspired the hearts of men with impassioned love; which has shown itself capable of acting on all nations, ages, temperaments and conditions; which has not only been the highest pattern of virtue, but the strongest incentive to its practice, and has exercised so deep an influence that it may be truly said that the simple record of his three short years of active life has done more to regenerate and soften mankind than all the disquisitions of philosophers and all the exhortations of moralists." This is the testimony of a great scholar and critic—a man whose learning is as much deeper than Mr. Ingersoll's as mid-ocean is deeper than the artificial lake on the grounds of our late Tennessee Centennial Exposition.

An infallible and universal standard of right and wrong is an absolute necessity to mankind. There must be such a standard somewhere. But where is it? It is not in our

selves. It is not what we feel or think. That would make as many standards as there are individuals in the world, because no two human beings feel and think exactly alike.

If every man were a law unto himself, there would be nothing but chaos on the earth. The infallible and universal standard is the morality of the Bible, the as the Golden Rule—"As ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them." Neither man nor angel can conceive of anything higher and better than that.

As Mr. Ingersoll does not admit the existence of God, he does not believe in any universal law of human rectitude. If there be no God, every man must decide for himself what is right and what is wrong. This is Mr. Ingersoll's doctrine. He claims to be the ultimate judge for himself as to what is good and evil. What he commends is right, and what he condemns is wrong.

This infidel is perfectly consistent with himself when he says, "I do not believe in the New Testament doctrine of non-resistance." He believes that a man ought to resist anything that infringes on his natural liberty—the liberty to do whatever he desires to do.

Society, in its organized capacity, is ever infringing upon man's natural liberties. It demands, as a consideration for the protection which it gives an individual, that he surrender his right to do anything that he wishes to do. Theoretically, at least, Ingersoll is an anarchist. He is against all external government, human or divine.

He is consistent with this doctrine when he defends suicide. He believes that any man who is tired of life has the right to blow his brains out, and leave his dependent wife and children to endure the woes of poverty. Some years ago one of his disciples poisoned himself, and beside his dead body he found one of Ingersoll's books containing his damnable defense of suicide.

But Mr. Ingersoll was strangely inconsistent with himself when he said, "Slavery is a crime that includes all other crimes; it is the joint product of the kidnapper, pirate, thief, murderer and hypocrite."

I suppose there is not a man among us who does not rejoice at the downfall of slavery in this country, though he may reprobate the methods by which its overthrow was accomplished.

Committee of the Board of Trustees of the Alabama Baptist Association. We are not prepared to believe that every man in this republic who owned a slave was a pirate, or a thief, or a murderer, or a hypocrite. We do not believe that Patrick Henry, James Madison, Thomas Jefferson and George Washington were pirates, thieves, murderers and hypocrites. We do not believe that even Mr. Ingersoll's New England ancestors, the first slaveholders on American soil, were a combination of pirates, thieves, murderers and hypocrites.

"There is no God; or, if there be one, we cannot know it. The Bible is a lie; Jesus Christ was a sleight of hand man; whatever a man believes to be right is right; death is an eternal sleep; or, if there be another life, we cannot know it."

This is Mr. Ingersoll's creed. Does any man in his right mind believe that such a creed is better than Christianity? Mr. Ingersoll said in his Nashville lecture: "I hate your religion; I hate your God; while I live I am going to try to civilize Christians; I always hated Jehovah, and used to wish that somebody would kill him."

Does any man who is not bereft of reason, believe that the universal adoption of such blasphemous sentiments would advance the world in virtue, happiness and prosperity? Would it reform the drunkard? Would it make virtuous and useful men of thieves, bandits and murderers? Would it elevate our characters, dignify the objects of our pursuit and render us patient and cheerful in adversity?

Would it improve our social condition? Would it subvert wrong and establish justice? Would it enlarge our sympathies, harmonize discordant elements, and bring us into the bonds of a great, virtuous, loving and happy brotherhood?

No man who has mind enough to understand the influence of principles upon conduct believes that the prevalence of Ingersollism would accomplish these results.

Mr. Ingersoll himself sees in this proposed substitute for Christianity no real benefit blessing to any one which comes within the range of his agnostic vision when he discusses these questions is the \$500 which he is to receive for his blasphemous work.

I make no hasty and reckless assertion when I say that the desire on the part of thousands and hundreds of thousands of men and women to reorganize society on the basis of Ingersoll's infidelity is at the bottom of the evils which now threaten the existence of this government.

All this unjust legislation in the interest of monopoly had its origin in the hearts of men who repudiate moral government and the doctrine of retribution after death. All

these wild anarchistic methods which certain elements of the oppressed classes are adopting for the redress of their grievances are inspired by a belief in the utterances of Robert Ingersoll.

Ingersoll may harbor in his breast no revolutionary purpose. I am inclined to believe that he has nothing in view beyond the accumulation of money and the gratification of his mad passion for vulgar notoriety. But the doctrine which he teaches, falling as it does, upon the heads of millions of ignorant and almost dissatisfied people, if not counteracted, is destined to bring upon an unprecedented harvest of anarchy, lawlessness and crime. Christianity is not an experiment. It has been tried, and it has not failed. It has been the best thing that the original simplicity and purity, it has made men better and advanced every interest of society.

An authority upon this subject, James Anthony Froude, once put above Robert Ingersoll. In a recent work he says: "All that we modern civilization, in a sense which deserves the name, is the noble expression of the transforming power of the gospel."

Gladsone, the most colossal man of modern England, is persistent in declaring that all that is best in the civilization of this century is traceable directly or indirectly to the gospel of the Man of Galilee.

Bismarck, the wisest and greatest living German, is a diligent and devout reader of the Bible, and says that he "cannot understand how any one can endure existence unaided by a belief in its teachings."

How foolish to turn away from the mature wisdom of the majestic men to listen to the rhetorical vapors and silly ribaldry of an infidel hireling.

"The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." It puts into us a new principle of life. It picks and unfastens all the high and finer faculties of the human soul, starts it on a career of noblest service here and fits it for an immortality of honor and blessedness as a life to come. A religion that does this is surely not "the most infamous thing in the universe." A God who has given us such a religion does not deserve to be "hated and killed."

Run a parallel between the life of Robert Ingersoll, a hired defamer of the Christian's God and Savior, and the life of Jesus Christ, who was hated and killed.

God loves the cheerful giver. Surely these heart experiences demonstrate this truth, for they are the heart experiences of two of his children personally known to me. God remembers.

When the Savior sat over against the treasury and saw the widow cast into it an offering richer by far than the uncounted millions that he received in all the years of his history, his loving heart was so touched by the unselfish offering that he embalmed it forever in his word of truth.

When that woman's hand poured the alabaster box of ointment on his head, he gave that offering of love an immortality, and he made those things of earth whose record is treasured in the skies. He who never forgets the cup of cold water, nor bread for the hungry, nor clothing for the naked, nor sympathy for the imprisoned, nor healing for the sick—how can he forget the offering his children make with loving hearts.

There is one view of these experiences that these sisters seem to have overlooked. They have confined their thoughts to God's acceptance of their sacrifice and the reward he has given them. They have forgotten to ask themselves what will he do with their loving gifts? How will he use them for his glory. When they went into that mission fund their work was not ended, it had begun.

As the dull element in the soil by contact with the mysterious principle of life dwelling in the plant, quits the mineral kingdom and advances to the higher realms of vegetation, where, possessed of new properties and powers, it may be loved from light or air until its beauty eclipses the glories of Solomon's. So the gifts of children are transmitted by their contact with his heart of love, take on new powers, new capacities, and by virtue of their relations to them, and to him are transmuted into the bread of life.

His hand who multiplied the loaves and fishes will reduplicate them until famished thousands feed upon them and bless his name forever. They will meet these offerings again. When the great harvest shall be gathered, divine love will let them see how great has been the increase. There the gathered sheaves will reveal to their astonished eyes that, while remembering them, he did not forget the seed they had scattered, but that the scanty sowing had become an ample harvest fitted for garner in the sky.

Your brother,
I. T. TICHENOR.

It is stated that under the new code of Alabama women are eligible to the office of register in chancery.

membered his child and had given to her more than she had wished, for it was not only a comfortable chair, but a gentle reminder of a loving friend far away who had entrusted to me something dear and sacred to her, and an ever present expression of my heavenly Father's thought of me. I do not feel that I could tell every one this incident. Some would say, "Oh, a chance; an accident." But I cannot feel so; and I know that he who loves as no other loves had but waited a few months to show his child that he had not forgotten."

There was a soft mist in Mrs. B's eyes as she said: "Like you, I have felt that one is not willing to disclose such heart experiences to everybody. Last spring I had a very impressive sermon which brought more clearly than ever before the thought of God's continued mercies to me. I felt impressed by this thought to make a thank offering, but where was it to come from? I had a five-dollar bill, the last money in my purse. I wished to give that, but my income was small and very uncertain. It was spring, and my little girl needed a new dress. I had given all I thought it best to give; clearly it did not seem my duty to give this too. And yet the next Sunday that five-dollar note with "A thank offering" written on the envelope, went into the mission fund.

"And now for the sequel. There came to me in less than two weeks twenty dollars in payment of an old debt that I had forgotten, and the gift of ten dollars from an unexpected source. Thirty dollars for five! Six times the amount I had put in the envelope! Surely he giveth good measure, pressed down, running over!"

Dear reader, these were two practical women who held this conviction. They are to-day living busy lives in a large and progressive city. One is a school teacher, daily instructing at least forty young girls; the other a busy house-keeper with only one servant to assist, with manifold duties outside of her own home.

There is no maudlin sentimentality here, but a healthy experience brought out with these two, with God's promise as their guide. This is written for the encouragement of those who believe that God keeps his book of remembrances.

This manuscript has fallen into my hands.

God loves the cheerful giver. Surely these heart experiences demonstrate this truth, for they are the heart experiences of two of his children personally known to me. God remembers.

When the Savior sat over against the treasury and saw the widow cast into it an offering richer by far than the uncounted millions that he received in all the years of his history, his loving heart was so touched by the unselfish offering that he embalmed it forever in his word of truth.

When that woman's hand poured the alabaster box of ointment on his head, he gave that offering of love an immortality, and he made those things of earth whose record is treasured in the skies. He who never forgets the cup of cold water, nor bread for the hungry, nor clothing for the naked, nor sympathy for the imprisoned, nor healing for the sick—how can he forget the offering his children make with loving hearts.

There is one view of these experiences that these sisters seem to have overlooked. They have confined their thoughts to God's acceptance of their sacrifice and the reward he has given them. They have forgotten to ask themselves what will he do with their loving gifts? How will he use them for his glory. When they went into that mission fund their work was not ended, it had begun.

As the dull element in the soil by contact with the mysterious principle of life dwelling in the plant, quits the mineral kingdom and advances to the higher realms of vegetation, where, possessed of new properties and powers, it may be loved from light or air until its beauty eclipses the glories of Solomon's. So the gifts of children are transmitted by their contact with his heart of love, take on new powers, new capacities, and by virtue of their relations to them, and to him are transmuted into the bread of life.

His hand who multiplied the loaves and fishes will reduplicate them until famished thousands feed upon them and bless his name forever. They will meet these offerings again. When the great harvest shall be gathered, divine love will let them see how great has been the increase. There the gathered sheaves will reveal to their astonished eyes that, while remembering them, he did not forget the seed they had scattered, but that the scanty sowing had become an ample harvest fitted for garner in the sky.

Your brother,
I. T. TICHENOR.

It is stated that under the new code of Alabama women are eligible to the office of register in chancery.

Central Committee.

MAN'S CENTRAL COMMITTEE.—Mrs. L. F. Stratton, President, Birmingham; Mrs. B. D. Gray, Vice President, Birmingham; Mrs. T. A. Hamilton, Treasurer, Young Peoples Mission Work, Mrs. D. M. Malone, Secretary, East Lake, Ala.; Mrs. G. M. Morrow, Treas., 1711 8th Ave., Birmingham; Mrs. H. L. Mellen, Vice-President, Ex. Com., Livingston.

PRAYER CARD.—MARCH.

Italy.—"There is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." S. B. C. Mission opened, 1870; missionaries, 3; native assistants, 28; churches, 21; out-stations, 56; membership, 490; baptisms, 23; Sunday-school scholars, 270. Contributions, \$300.

Study Topics.—The Epistle to the Romans. It was written for the hope. Growth of evangelical Christianity. Difficulties and encouragements.

THE EVANGELICAL CHURCH OF ITALY.

The great need of Italy is the gospel. Twenty or twenty-five millions of its thirty millions of inhabitants have long ceased to believe in the Papal church, and their connection with it is merely a matter of birth and name. Not only have they ceased to believe in it as a Christian church, but they have come to regard it as an institution hostile to Christ and to the gospel.

"Egli porta troppo l'evangelo" (He carries too much of the gospel) was the judgment a theological canon in St. Mark's church, Venice, pronounced upon a friend of mine who was in training to become a priest, and according he was cast aside as an unfit instrument. And yet the Papal church stands sorely in need of Italian priests. Her native priesthood is dying out. Enough priests cannot be obtained to fill the churches, and so they have to import them in large numbers from other countries, and especially from Protestant England. But, say the Papal authorities, better an empty parish than a priest who knows the gospel. Such an one is utterly disqualified for the priestly office, and indeed, I have never known or read of a priest becoming a Christian who did not suffer persecution at the hands of his church.

The Evangelical church well deserves the sympathy and support of the Christian public. The young church is entering upon a new epoch of its life and history, and it is for those interested in a cause of Jesus Christ and his advance-

ment in Italy, so long cursed by the Papacy and now free and united, to befriend and help it that its record at the close of another twenty-five years may be even more splendid than that just concluded.—Missionary Review.

DID ITALIANS REJECT THE GOSPEL? More than one has refused aid for the evangelization of Italy on the ground that Italians have already had the gospel preached to them, have rejected it, while the heathen have never had an opportunity, and therefore deserve all our attention.

We affirm, and believe that the affirmation is unquestionably supported by history, that the Italians did not reject the gospel, but that they were led into error, step by step, by the Church of Rome, who buried the truth, as it is in Christ, deep down beneath a mass of superstitions and false doctrines, until the misguided masses can no longer distinguish the true from the false. The Jesus whom they know is only a helpless babe in the arms of a gentle virgin, or at most, is but a dead Christ on the cross.—Missionary Review.

Mrs. G. R. Farnham, Vice-President of Conecuh association, Evergreen.

"Our Missionary Society was organized in 1879 when the Central Committee was located at Montgomery, with Mrs. M. C. Davis as president. We have had a long, and at times a hard pull to keep up, but thank God for this long privilege of working for him. I think him also that he has let us see the fruition of our labor in many instances, and we are just as determined to work on 'as seeing him who is faithful as in all the long past. We report regularly each quarter to the Central Committee, and we try to keep in line with every suggestion of the Woman's Missionary Union. I have long since been convinced that this is the best method for all societies to adopt."

The society of Jasper was organized Dec. 6th, 1897, with a membership of 20. The ladies at once began work, sending off a Frontier Missionary box—value \$51.16, and sending in a Christmas offering. They have one of the most consecrated women in the state for their secretary—Mrs. J. H. Longcrier.

Miss Mary Evans, of Sheffield, sends \$5 for Miss Willie Kelly, and writes:

"Our society was re-organized in December, 1897, and has eleven members. We are sorry that we have never made quarterly reports to the Central Committee, but will do so this year.

"The ladies are paying off a mortgage on the parsonage, and hope to buy new carpets before spring."

Mrs. R. H. Hendon, Trussville.

"Our society is doing good work. We meet regularly and contribute liberally to the different objects fostered by our denomination. Our society is composed of farmers' wives, who earn their own money. Our quarterly reports have not been sent to the Central Committee promptly heretofore, but hope to do so hereafter."

Very many more than "five letters" have been received now! Still I am waiting impatiently for ten times as many as I have. I thank each one of these dear sisters for her good letter. I shall answer them all as soon as I can. How I do enjoy receiving a great batch of mail.

YOUNG PEOPLE'S DEPARTMENT.

EDITED BY W. A. HOBSON, East Lake, Ala.

SOUTHERN UNION TOPIC.

March 13.—The Mind of Christ. Phil. 2: 3-8.

Evidently the purpose of the apostle in writing the words of our lesson is to turn the eyes of the Philippian saints upon Christ, that they might profit by his example. He wished them to know the mind of Christ, and to become themselves like minded. He therefore gives

A DESCRIPTION of the mind of Christ in its general features. There are certain notable characteristics which belong to Christ as Redeemer, and these should never be lost sight of by the redeemed.

In order to appreciate the condescension of our Lord, we must know something of his pre-existent state. In writing to the Corinthians Paul says: "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich." Christ's earthly humility can best be seen in the light of his divine glory. These are set before us in striking contrast by reference to our Lord before and after his incarnation. He existed in the form of God before he took upon him the form of a servant. In such a state he thought it not robbery to be equal with God. Christ's equality with the Father was never changed in fact, only in form—in manifestation. The divine essence was not affected by the human form. Jesus was no less divine because human, and no less human because divine.

