

# Messenger and Visitor.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER,  
VOLUME LI.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE MARITIME BAPTIST PUBLISHING COMPANY.

THE CHRISTIAN VISITOR,  
VOLUME XXXIX.

VOL. III.

SAINT JOHN, N. B., WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1887.

NO. 50.

**ATTENTION**—If our brethren intend to help the circulation of the MESSENGER AND VISITOR on their field, now is the time. Hundreds are ready to take the paper if asked to do so. Who will give a day to this work this week?

**ALARMED**—The colony of New South Wales appointed a Commission to investigate the drink curse. The report has been published and may well cause alarm. The sum of \$25,170,000 is spent annually on intoxicants, or about \$24 per head, man, woman and child. This is a greater average expenditure by any other nation per inhabitant than in Great Britain. During last year 232 violent deaths through intemperance had occurred. The Commission recommend the expedient, always most harmless to the public and not liable to alienate liquor men from their party, of reducing the number of licenses.

**A CORNER PRINCIPLE**—An Open and Unconventional Letter to the Baptist pastors of the United States says: "Fifty-two gentle pulls on a man's pure strings are more promotive of healthy liberality than one convulsive jerk on any Sunday." Is not this true? This epidemic of "jerk" does not usually more than open the purse for a very little money to run out, while in many cases it does the work in all the harder part. It does not make the heart much more open and free; it does not help character building; a great deal, either does it give the by which regular contributions to the Lord's work assure. There is nothing like the scriptural rule, to weekly interest in the Lord's work, to deepen the desire for Christian service, and to fill the soul with the joy of the Lord. We are glad to find that more and more of our churches and people are adopting this scriptural rule and reaping the benefits. Why should not all follow their example and thus obey the inspired command, "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him."

**PROHIBITION IN THE UNITED STATES**—The Supreme Court of the United States has decided that the Iowa Prohibition law is constitutional. This settles the question of the legality of prohibition without compensation in the whole Union. In the meantime, prohibition has been defeated at Atlanta, where it has been in operation for one year. The whole liquor power of the United States was brought to bear upon the vote. The negro, led on by a patent medicine man, went solid against prohibition and turned the scale.

**STATISTICAL**—President Angell, of Michigan University, states: Out of 1,406 students, the parents of 502 were farmers; 171, merchants; ninety-three, lawyers; eighty-three, physicians; fifty-two, manufacturers; fifty-four, mechanics; and fifty-one, clergy. Angell estimates that as many as forty-five per cent, belonged to the class who gained their living by manual toil. The sons and daughters of the rich, he said, do not form a very large percentage of the whole number.

**HOW THE "CHRISTIAN UNION" FUTE IT**—The Christian Union having remarked: "Mr. Spurgeon is a curious admixture, a double personality—a seventeenth century man in action. In the aggressive spirit of the nineteenth century, in its missionary zeal, in its endeavor to apply religious truths to every-day experience, he is a man of the nineteenth century; but in theological thought he is a child of and belongs to the seventeenth century." The Christian Secretary suggests that if the Christian Union would push its historical investigation further back, it would find that both in thought and action Mr. Spurgeon is a child of the first century, when apostles lived, taught and labored, and that is profitable for all centuries.

**A LESSON**—The history of the Baptists of Maine in its relation to that of the Congregationalist body carries with it lessons and suggestions. In 1844, there were 295 Baptist churches and 23,860 members in that State. Prior to that time their increase had been steady. They had, however, given little attention to the work of establishing strong churches in the centres, the great strength being in the rural districts. From this time on the population has been soving more and more to the city centres. The result has been that the Baptists are not as strong by 4,000 as in 1844, while the Congregationalists, who paid more attention to the cities, have made rapid progress. They have not only gained in membership, but they have gained more than proportionally in wealth and influence. The obvious lesson is this, let us build up strong interests in the centres, for in this way only can we hope to have our share of wealth and influence hereafter.

**Buddhism in Upper Burma**—Buddhism is very firmly entrenched in Upper Burma and will not be dislodged without a long and desperate struggle. In that part of this country south of the Shan States, the Buddhist pope gives the following statistics of Buddhist officials:

There are 13 archbishops, 133 bishops, 323 archdeacons, and 16,323 abbots, or rulers of monasteries, besides the young members of the fraternity, who remain only a short time in the monasteries. In the city and suburbs of Mandalay there are 3,447 monks of over ten years' standing, and 2,444 under ten years' standing.

**Idolatry in the United States**—The following which we clip from an exchange, sounds rather strange for a Christian land:

The Chinese residents of San Francisco had a remarkable parade in honor of the great idol known as "Tan Wong" recently brought from China. The parade was of Oriental magnificence, but was confined to streets and alleys in Chinatown. The costumes, banners and Oriental weapons incident to the parade were brought from China especially for the occasion.

There were one thousand Chinamen in line, and numerous Chinese women on richly caparisoned horses. The entire column presented a blaze of color. The women wore long silken gowns, and at their side walked attendants, holding high over their heads banners of gold. The men carried antique war implements, long gilt maces and elaborately carved swords or spears, around whose points were coiled gilt lizards, snakes and flaming dragons. A number of tall banners that sprang twenty feet in the air preceded another heavily armed battalion attired in the brightest yellow, and carrying weapons, no two of which were alike.

Immediately preceding the mighty Joss (Tan Wong) was a band of musicians sounding huge gongs and kettle drums while a body of cannoniers kept up a constant fusillade of fire-crackers. Twelve worshippers clad in light yellow carried Tan Wong, who sat in a huge chair. About him and behind him trod attendant priests in long black satin robes that swept the ground. They were accompanied by bearers whose osseous were hung from the ends of long red poles.

Following Tan Wong was dragon, one hundred and seventy feet long, and described as the most gorgeous ever seen in America. It was supported by sixty worshippers. This monster opened its mouth, writhed its body, and by appliances only known to the Chinese kept up a general outward appearance of being possessed of life, and as though desiring to devour the spectators viewing its contortions. The idol will be placed in Joss house to be worshipped.—*Christian Intelligencer*.

**WEAR HARM?**—How many professing Christians there are who, on being expostulated with about certain questionable practices, will say, "Why, what harm is it?" This question always reveals a very low spiritual state. It shows that those who ask it are willing to keep on the very border of the devil's ground, if not with one foot across it. Imagine a father satisfied merely with doing nothing to harm his family. And yet it is much more strange for Christians to satisfy themselves with merely doing nothing to harm the cause of Christ and Christ himself. If he had been satisfied merely with doing no harm to men who would have been saved by his blood and death! Every Christian should be at the time asking, "What good can I do?" "What can I do for Jesus?" Living and serving in the spirit of these enquiries, he will never get on the border land of questionable things, which is strewn with wrecks of Christian character, influence and usefulness, which act as stumbling blocks to those who would come over on the Lord's side. How is it with you, reader? Are you merely wanting to keep from what will harm? Then be assured your life in its want of spirit, its coldness and death is doing harm untold. Begin to ask what good is there in a practice, and if none—avoid it.

**No Hypocrite**—How often do we hear a wicked man say, when spoken to about his evil course, "Well, whatever people may say about me, I'm no hypocrite." He seems to think this the crowning virtue which raises him high above the people who are living good lives, and whom he implies to be all cheats. In this way wicked men delude themselves into the belief that a man who is outbreking in his sin, who is so far gone that public opinion has no more power to restrain him, who does evil openly if not defiantly, is much better than the man who has some inconsistencies mixed in with an otherwise good life. All this talk about being no hypocrite means usually that the man has lost that shame of his sin which is the last protest of the good within him against the evil of his life,—that the disposition to resist has gone and the man is completely hardened. Some use this expression who have not gone this length, but it usually shows them far along on the road.

**The Proposed Union.**

I am sorry that your reply to my letter had not been a more extended and exhaustive defence of your position.

You must not forget that your position, as editor, makes you the most representative man in the Baptist body of the Provinces. Your stand, in reference to this union movement, has seemed to many of your brethren a little inconsistent, and has been publicly challenged, and you cannot afford to treat the matter as if it were of little consequence, and so dismiss it by mildly censuring your critic.

A few words in reply to your criticism of my former seem called for at this point.

1. You say that the action of the F. C. Baptists of Nova Scotia, in voting, twenty-five to two against union, and their refusal to vote on the question at all in New Brunswick, is not a flag in the face of our Convention. I did not say that I believed it was intentionally so, but that it is so in fact, will be the feeling of Baptists generally. But we need not contend about that, one way or the other. Personally, I rejoice that the F. C. Baptists have taken the stand they have.

2. You think that I make too much ado about the article on "Perseverance." Well, I say simply this,—and I do not think that any one will attempt to deny the statement,—that article does not represent the views of the Baptist body; it does not represent the views of the F. C. Baptists. It is an attempt to frame an article to suit both bodies. Hence, it is a compromise of principle, and a compromise of principle is unworthy of Christian men.

3. You say I have insinuated that you are untrue to the belief of our body. I have only to say that I insinuated nothing, I stated, plainly and frankly, that,—taking for granted that you were a restricted communionist,—your advocacy of aid and support for organic union with an open communion body, is in my judgment inconsistent. There is no insinuation about it. I submit that you owe it to the 43,000 Baptists who were not present at the meeting in St. John, a year ago, and who were not present at the Convention, either to deny that you advocated and voted for union with the F. C. Baptists, or otherwise make the consistency of doing so more obvious.

Your explanation does not help me in the least, and I am quite sure it will not help others to see the consistency of voting for union with an open communion body.

You say that the "F. C. Baptists do not feel bound in conscience to commune with the unbaptized," and you support that statement by adding that "not one in ten of them ever do it." Why do they not do it? One speaker at the recent Convention, when this question was being discussed, answers the question when he said, that the Pedobaptists would not commune with them.

Of course they do not feel bound in conscience to commune with the unbaptized by force and bring them to the Lord's table. But do they not feel bound in conscience to commune with as many of the unbaptized as feel disposed to commune with them? It is marvellous indeed if they do not, feel bound in conscience to adhere to a doctrine that is fundamental to the body, and one to which the body has always given at least as much prominence as to any other which it holds. We have all heard the leading men in that body declare publicly that they are bound in conscience to commune with as many of the unbaptized as wish to commune with them.

You say that "practically their open communion amounts to next to nothing." What has that to do with the question? In inviting the unbaptized to communion, do they not surrender the principle for which they are contending? It is not the few or the many who may feel disposed to avail themselves of the privilege offered that we are contending about; that amounts to nothing, one way or the other. I need not argue a thing so self evident. Why you should have mentioned this as justifying your action in voting for union is a mystery to me.

You ask again, "Could they not consistently abide by our practice, while they held open communion sentiments?" No, certainly not, if, as they declare is the case, they are conscientious in extending the invitation to the unbaptized. But I want to say that the F. C. Baptists made no promise to abide by our practice, for in your hearing, and in mine, leading men in that body and members of the joint committee declared most emphatically that they had no intention of abiding by our practice; but, on the contrary, that they fully intended to continue their intercommunion with the unbaptized.

That fact was known to you and to others in voting for the union, and I say again, that the leaders in the Baptist body who voted for union in the face of that fact, owe it to the body to justify their action.

4. The reason given for the F. C. Baptists declining to vote on the "basis of union," is that they were "doctrinally divided among themselves." Did they not

know that during the three or four years that they were working towards the union? Did not the members of the Joint Committee, who gave this as a reason for not voting on the "basis," know when the basis was being framed that this doctrinal disagreement existed in the body?

At the meeting in St. John, a year ago, I raised that very point as one reason why the Baptist body should not vote for union, and was told that that was one reason why the F. C. Baptists were so anxious for the union, as it would likely result in the going out of the hollow faction, but now it is given as the reason why they could not consistently vote for the union.

I hold that the Baptist body has been placed in a false position, by those who voted for union with an open communion body, knowing as they all certainly did at the time, that it was the avowed intention of that body, as expressed by its leaders, to continue their open communion practice. Since my articles appeared in the MESSENGER AND VISITOR, I have received letters from loyal Baptist brethren, who felt grieved and humiliated, in view of the action of Convention in this matter. One of these letters—received a day or two ago from a brother who has perhaps done more to build up the Baptist denomination in these Provinces than any other single man,—is open before me now, from which I quote the following sentences:

"When the articles or basis of agreement were published, I was surprised to see an attempt made to cover up rather than bring to light the differences that exist between the two bodies."

That sentence touches the point of which I complained in my last letter, and which you passed over without notice.

I have no doubt, but that there are thousands in our body who feel as strongly as I do, that the Convention was not justified in taking the action it did, in reference to this movement, and those who were so prominent in that action, and hold positions of trust in the denomination, owe it to the body at large, to go a little more fully into an explanation of the matter. It will not suffice to dismiss the matter simply with complaining of my insinuations. If anything I write seems like an insinuation, I am assured you it is unintentional, and I hope you will not again accuse me of such meanness.

You must not forget that in commencing this denominational paper to the advocacy of union as you have done, you are professedly speaking for 43,000 people, and so with the action of Convention, which of course consisted of delegates representing the Baptist body, but without delegated authority to act in reference to the matter of union. That was not a part of the Convention's work, as understood by the churches; and as many of the people whom that action professedly represented, felt aggrieved on account of it. It is surely not too much to ask our leaders, who were prominent in bringing it about, to at least attempt some explanation of the matter.

E. J. GRANT,  
Dartmouth, Nov. 23.

We have little relief for long drawn discussions. They usually become vain repetitions, and are better fitted to obscure than to help right conclusions. The better way is to state the case as forcefully as possible on both sides and then leave it to the good judgment of the reader. We had hoped brother Grant would have consented to do this; but he seems unwilling.

Brother Grant assumes the right to put us upon our defense, as if he were representing the denomination and we were committing the paper to a course which was opposed to their well recognized sentiments. We beg to remind him at the outset that all but two or three of the members of our Convention voted for the articles in the Basis referring to the Lord's Supper. These brethren are the most trusted and true in our denomination. In being in their company rather than in that of brother Grant and the one or two who voted with him the editor of the MESSENGER AND VISITOR hopes he has not strayed far away from the 43,000 Baptists who were not at the Convention.

2. We beg our brother's pardon, but the all but two or three of the Convention who disagreed with him did not vote to unite with an open communion body. We voted for the following articles, bearing on the communion question:

**A Gospel Church**—We believe that a Church of Christ is a congregational of baptized believers, &c.

**Baptism**—This is the immersion of believers in water, into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, &c.

**The Lord's Supper** is designed to commemorate the sufferings of Christ; and to represent in the use of bread and the communion which unite him with him and with each other. Every baptized believer in Christ, being a member of his body, and a part of his visible church, has not only a right to partake of the emblems of his body and his blood in the Communion, but is under obligation there to do so, to the end that he may not incur the guilt of his death.

From these it appears that immersion only is baptism and none that immersed believers have a right to church membership. When the article on the Supper declares that the Supper is for the baptized and for church members, it therefore means that it is for immersed believers who have united themselves with a church. All the members of the Convention but the one or two who sided with brother Grant thought this article satisfactory and voted for it. If our F. C. Baptist brethren vote for this article and act accordingly, we shall have no reason to complain. If they do not vote for it, we have nothing to fear. We can leave it to them, to vote and act consistently with their own belief.

3. Our brother says the fact was known to the editor of the MESSENGER AND VISITOR and others that voted for the "basis," that the leaders of the F. C. Baptist denomination declared, at the meeting in St. John, that they intended to continue intercommunion with the unbaptized, in the event of the union taking place. We remember no such thing. We have consulted several who were present, and they agree with us that no such statement was made. Had any one of our brethren voted for union with the F. C. Baptists, understanding that the mixed practice was to prevail after the union, we were free to say that our brother's strictures would be none too strong.

4. The fact that open communion "practically amounts next to nothing," has a great deal to do with the question, if open communion is not a matter of principle but of expediency. It was in this connection that we need in our few words of reply. We were not insinuated as Bro. Grant would have the reader suppose.

5. We do not care to refer again to the article on Perseverance. It is in almost the exact words of Heb. 6:6, and can bear the same meaning. The worst that can be said of it is that it can be explained in two different ways. Surely our F. C. Baptist brethren, did they feel bound in conscience to commune with the unbaptized, could do so without "taking them by force, &c." Why could they not partake of the Supper in Pedobaptist churches?

6. In conclusion, we may state that we are none the less, but more convinced than we were years ago that strict communion is scriptural, that it is the logical sequence of our whole Baptist position and necessary to our highest success. If our F. C. Baptist brethren feel in conscience bound to have intercommunion with the unbaptized, then the editor of the MESSENGER AND VISITOR, for one, would rather ask them to change their practice or think union with them possible. If, however, they do not feel bound in conscience to have this intercommunion, then we hope they may see that union with us, with the wider intercommunion and other obvious advantages thus afforded, would be of very much greater moment than to hold to the open communion practice for the sake of a very few of their people perhaps once or twice in a lifetime, communing with the unbaptized.

**The Lord's Supper.**

FROM A SERMON BY REV. T. A. HIGGINS, D. D.

In the communion service we are reminded of the past. It is a commemorative, a memorial service. It is designed to keep alive in our thoughts and hearts the great transaction upon which the world's salvation depends. Better for us to forget all that we have ever learned than to forget that Christ Jesus died for our sins according to the Scriptures. This is the central truth of the Bible. All other truths hang around it, spring from it, or lead to it. It is the central truth of human history. All other history is stale, flat and meaningless, only so far as it leads up to or springs out from the redemption of the world through the death of Christ.

So long as the emblems of the broken body and shed blood of Christ are exhibited and circulated and partaken of, the fact cannot be quite forgotten that Christ is the central truth of history, and that the central truth of Christ is his death on the cross to atone for the sins of the world.

But there is an anticipation here as well as commemoration; prophecy as well as remembrance; a future as well as a past;—"I will drink it new with you in my Father's Kingdom." Christ says: "I go to prepare a place for you," where the kindly feelings awakened here shall be continued. There the eating and the drinking will not be of the broken bread and the fruit of the vine, but of that which these things only faintly resemble. The wine and the milk, the bread and the honey, terms so often employed to denote soul food, life nourishment, are only types and shadows after all. And when these types and shadows are needed no more they will fall away; and then the things signified shall be enjoyed. Until that day, said Christ, I drink it no more. But then I will drink it new and with you in my Father's Kingdom. The next time I join you in this feast it will be with new and better wine, and under greatly changed

circumstances. O, how changed, how enlarged, how glorious will that celebration be as compared with anything of the kind that has ever preceded it.

Shall we speak of the place? How can we, when we know so little of it? But it will be in "our Father's house" on high; and it will be a family gathering in our Father's house. Judas with his traitorous kiss will not be there. The chief priests in the pomp of their short-lived authority, and with their thirty pieces of silver will not be there. The soldiers with their lanterns and torches will not be there. And many other things which have so marked the memorial service from time to time, will not be there. Disorders and misunderstandings will not be there. Rivalry and jealousy and distrust will not be there; for nothing that is mean, or selfish, or unholily will be permitted to enter in.

Shall we speak of the company? How can we? For after the hundred and forty-four thousand the apostle beheld a great multitude which no man could number; a great family gathering brought together from all nations, tribes, kindreds and tongues, and made to harmonize in sentiment and feeling, because all were born of one blood through the first Adam, and then born of one spirit through the second, Christ, the one sacrifice for all; Christ, the first begotten from the dead for all; Christ, the one bond of eternal union; the central figure of life and of light, drawing all that is like himself towards himself, and making each like the other and to love the other, because each has become somewhat like himself.

Shall we speak of the nature of the repast, the food, the nourishment of that great company? How can we? The scenes are laid beyond the reach of our vision, our eyes are too dim. We cannot see far enough yet. The food will not be the manna which the Israelites gathered; not the milk and honey so delicious in the land of Canaan; not the delicacies so tempting which load the tables of noblemen and kings; not any of those things which please the carnal appetite and minister to sensual joy. But what shall it be? Something that will be congenial to those whose natures have been purified and refined till they can drink, relish and enjoy the same things that are pleasing to him who came from the Father and returned to the Father; for the expression is, "until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's Kingdom," a united enjoyment, a united feast.

But what shall the feast be? All that is holy and pure and good; all that is rich and blessed and glorious is a spiritual sense knowledge, direct from the source of all truth; delight, as pure as the nature of God is pure; intercourse with the redeemed of all ages; a renewal of tender friendships started here, but cut short because the loved one was wanted there; a long, unending draught from the inexhaustible fullness of God. And what is that fullness? It is love, for God is love, broad, deep, high; broader than the universe, deeper than the sea, higher than the heavens. That shall be the feast. We shall all share in the blessedness if we taste and see that the Lord is gracious, and are clothed in the fine linen clean and white, which is the righteousness of the saints. May none of us be found wanting in that great day of the Lord!

**Literary Notes.**

*Scribner's Magazine* for December, 1887, Christmas number, contains: "And Lo, The Face Was His Own," by William Hole, A. R. S. A.; *Frontispiece*; Ticonderoga, Robert Louis Stevenson; A Drift from Redwood Camp, Bert Harje; Tarpis, Louise Imogen Guiley; The Zadio Pine Labor Union, H. C. Bunner; The Water Witch, Elizabeth Akers; In Florence with Romolo, E. H. Blackfield and E. W. Blackfield; A Song to the Lute—From a Book of Airs, Austin Dobson; Law Lane, Sarah Orne Jewett; God's Comforter, S. Decatur Smith, Jr.; In Dickers-Land, Edwin Percy Whipple; King Solomon's Dream, Graham B. Tomson; The Tincture of Success, T. R. Sullivan; Alys, Edith M. Thomas. The full poems and initials in this number are from drawings by E. H. Blackfield, George Foster Rans, Helen Pettes, H. L. Bridwell, L. S. Ipsen, and others.

*Harper's Magazine*, for December, 1887, contains: Old Garden Flowers, F. W. Burdette, F. L. S.; The Vicar, a poem, Winthrop Moworth; Another Way, a poem, Andrew Lang; "Tais," a story, Amelia Bland; Pauline Pavlora, a dramatic poem, Thomas Bailey Aldrich; His "Day in Court," Charles Egbert Cresswell; The Convict's Christmas Eve, a poem, Will Charlton; Fire O'clock Tea, a farce, William Dean Howells; Precious Stones in the United States, George F. Kutz; Captain Ben's Class, a story, Captain Charles King, U. S. A.; Anthony of P., a poem, Harriet Lewis Bradley; Apple Laurie, a story, Elizabeth Stuart Phelps; The Convict's Brother, a story, Frances Conroy Bayler; From Elizabeth's Home, a poem, William Black; Edith's Story, a story, E. H. Black; Study, Edgar's Dream, a story, Lawrence Burton.