

For the CHRISTIAN WOMAN.

I am at home just now on a visit. Home! Yes, I see so little of home, that I feel more like a visitor here than anything else. And what hallowed associations cluster around that blessed word, Home! A place of rest; of comfort; of solid enjoyment and of joy and hope. A place where we can do almost as we please, and enjoy almost unlimited happiness, and have almost what we wish; Or, it may be the very opposite of all this. How earnestly then should we labor that we may have the means to make our homes, what they ought to be—places of comfort, and real enjoyment. And how we should strive to make them pleasant and happy. It is not at all surprising that the author of "Home sweet home," should have written as he did; and thus have given expression to that continual longing for home and happiness, found in the human heart. But when we consider the unsatisfactory condition of all things earthly; and that earthly homes and earthly happiness are neither perfect nor enduring, we should feel the necessity of seeking that "Better Country" and that "Home beyond the River" where unalloyed happiness endures for ever. And if we, who often have to wander far away from home, can, through God's infinite love and mercy secure to ourselves such a home, how shortsighted we are, if we do not strive to secure a place in those mansions prepared for the blest. We should let everything else drop until the gem, the precious treasure, the inheritance of unbounded wealth, be secured. Our Father in heaven knows the value of that treasure, the joys of that home, and the glory of that inheritance; and has put the highest price within the power of infinite love to pay for it, by the sacrifice of his only-begotten Son, and without money, and without price. Oh! how blind we are, if we do not accept of the offer, when it is so freely and so lovingly given to all those who will accept of it, and enter into that rest which remains in the hope above.

W. M. C.

MANITOBA MISSION.

BRO. WHITELAW.—Received your communication, and should have answered earlier only that I deemed it best to confer with the sisters that I might have something definite to write. and now I am happy to say that we are all in perfect accord with the idea of sending an Evangelist to Manitoba, as soon as it can be arranged; though our number is small, we are trying to do what we can to get others enlisted in the work. We have sent letters to the churches in Niagara District, addressed to some individual sister in each, appealing for help in this noble work. We have not made any decided effort at soliciting, not having any definite object in view, for we know it was quite impossible to attempt to support any one in the field, unless others were willing to help, so we just worked on in faith; many and earnest were the prayers that were offered for the success of missionary work in general and our own feeble attempt in particular, and we are now impressed with the thought that this opening is most opportune if not a direct answer to prayer, and we will therefore make an earnest effort to raise as much as possible and after your most generous offer of placing the columns of the WORKER at our disposal, we feel inclined to ask you to still further extend your kindness and take

charge of the fund as soon as it can be found who will take hold of the work, we are willing and earnest but are poor financiers and would prefer that some one undertake the disbursements of the money, should there be enough forthcoming to make the work in all practicable. I recognize the wisdom of your remarks in regard to organizations, but I am inclined to think that like, my own, your objections are based upon the fact that some make a hobby of opposing everything in the shape of united efforts, and ride it so vehemently that they get away out of reach of their purses, and so we lose their contributions. This is lamentable, but in a country place like this where the membership is scattered over a radius of some seven miles, and every sister seems to have plenty to do in their own households, (being farmer's wives and daughters,) it seems such a saving of resources, that we deem it the wiser plan, and likely to secure the best results, inasmuch as it is no spasmodic effort, but we mean to lay ourselves out for quiet, continuous, and united work. And in our monthly meetings, conducted in a devotional spirit, we are learning sweet lessons of faith, humility, patience and the power of prayer; which tend to enliven our minds and strengthen our purpose, but the end is not yet. We would not presume to dictate to any one else or even advise, but would suggest that each congregation in faith and confidence proceed as it seemeth best, and God will surely open up the way.

Mrs. W. ANGEL, Forks Road, Wainfleet, June, 1885.

WAINFLEET.

As regards our missionary work we have heard nothing from the sisters of Gainsboro, Smithville, Fort St. and Beckettville, who have been written to, but I presume they are waiting to see what the WORKER will have to say on the subject.

Last Sunday, June 28th, was our June meeting, and Brother Hertzog, the speaker, was accompanied by Sister Graybiel of Buffalo, a lady upwards of 70 years old, whose daughter formed one of the party of missionaries who went out to India with Bro. Wharton some three years ago. She is devoted heart, soul, and estate to the cause of missions, and gave us a stirring address at the close of the afternoon services after which Bro. Hertzog at our request had a collection taken to help our fund, and \$4.20 was the result. The following Wednesday being the day for our regular monthly meeting, Sister Graybiel kindly consented to remain, and it was indeed a rare treat for our little band to enjoy the counsel, admonition, and encouragement, which this aged pioneer in the work was both able and willing to give. And here again our faith has been strengthened for we had long been wondering how we would manage to have a meeting where all would feel free to come out and hear something about missionary work which has been so little understood among us; when presto! it all came about without any managing at all. Truly the Lord is mindful of His own.

CAROL.

WOMAN'S WORK IN THE CHURCH.

(An essay read at Brn June meeting.) The subject on which I am to address you to day is one that has its own peculiar difficulties, and I rather regret it has fallen to my lot. I do not apprehend

that the difficulties surrounding it are insurmountable by any means, but they are of that peculiar character that are not easily overcome; for instance:

If we should find that the Scriptures nowhere prohibit women, from the fullest participation in all acts of worship but place her on an equal footing with men, two difficulties would still remain:

1st. The unwillingness every where felt to permit a woman to do one thing more than we have allowed her to do in the past

2nd. The unwillingness of women themselves, to do more than they are doing, in this particular matter.

I know of very few women who are desirous to lead in any of the services of the Lord's house and I know that the opposition they would meet, not only from the men, but from their own sex would be overcome by very few, indeed those who by their humility and diffidence would be most likely to benefit the church are the very ones who would be deterred by that opposition from taking so revolutionary a step. Still I hope that if in the past through a misconception of the teaching of the Scriptures we have robbed our sisters of any privilege they ought to possess, we shall be the more ready to encourage them to take it up in the future.

Woman's work then in the great field of christian activity will be equal to that of man's, unless there be some special restriction laid down in God's word. Her place in the home, in the sick chamber, can be filled by no other; where sorrow and sin abound amongst those of her own sex, no one can do the work as well as she can; in the hospital, the house of refuge, the battle field, amongst the wounded, in the prisons and amongst the degraded, she has left the impress of her presence in a way, they would never forget. The names of Florence Nightingale, Elizabeth Fry, Mrs. Judson, and an army of others stand out on the pages of history and are engrained in the hearts of thousands. But her position in the church, (that is in its public service), is one that must be settled by the New Testament and by it alone.

The Old Testament recognizes her in the service of public praise, as in the case of Miriam and the maidens who met Saul and David on their return from the slaughter of the Philistines, and also was also at times made the bearer of Divine messages, as Anna and Huldah and others, but these were all special occasions and did not help us in this inquiry. Before, however, turning to the word and testimony, let us give a glance at our own practice. Let me ask a question at this point.

In the congregations represented here to-day, how many women are there who ever pray publicly, in the assembly of the saints, or speak in the prayer meetings, or even address the Sunday School?

Our practice then, rightly or wrongly has shut out our sisters from leading any part of the public services except singing praises. Now to the Scriptures. There are but few Scriptures bearing directly on the point. 1st Cor. xiv 34, Paul lays down a rule, positive, explicit, and universal, there is no ambiguity in its expressions. The sense is evidently, that in all those things which he has specified, "Women are to keep silence. They are neither to teach nor to interrupt those who are teaching, but to be silent. It is often said, and rightly enough, that the occasion of this command of Paul's was a necessity of

the times. That the church in Corinth, singularly blessed with gifts, especially that of tongues had abused this great power so that confusion had arisen, the woman questioning and disputing the assembly, and thereby defeating the object for which they came together, ("worship and spiritual edification,") and setting at naught the oft repeated injunction to be subject to their husbands. All this is no doubt true, but it is no reason why the command should be limited to the church in Corinth, as is sometimes held. What took place in Corinth would have been repeated the world over, but for Paul's prohibition. It cannot be set aside with safety. In the xi chapter of the same epistle, Paul speaks of women praying and prophesying in an improper manner that is to say uncovered. This he condemns as unbecoming but there is no indication that either the prayers or the prophecy fell under his censure. In harmony with the promise in Joel's prophecy there were women on whom the spirit of prophecy had been poured out, as the daughter of Philip and others. These I have no doubt were exempt from Paul's prohibition, so far as was necessary to deliver the message and at a proper time and in a proper manner did make known what God had recalled, but with this of course we have nothing to do. It is the fact that some evidently prayed, which is of importance to us in this matter. They prayed and there is no word of condemnation.

In 1st Timothy ii 11-13. We have a distinct prohibition against either teaching or usurping authority over the man. There is little in this chapter which seems at first sight to connect it with public worship. But the fact that Aquilla and Priscilla taught Apollolis the "way most perfectly" makes it almost certain that public worship was the thought in the Apostolic mind when he wrote this, for if it is a prohibition against teaching at any time, then the kindly offices of Priscilla and Aquilla were a violation of Paul's rule, a thing most unlikely. There is however the probabilities that the ministrations of Priscilla and Aquilla took place before this prohibition of Paul's was given.

I have referred now to the principal Scriptures touching this matter, there are however others remotely connected with it, but we need not pause to consider them, bearing these utterances of the Apostle in mind:

Let us ask a question or two: What does the Apostle mean by the words "In the church"?

You will reply, the assembly of the saints correct.

When do the saints assemble in that congregated capacity?

Again you reply, on the first day of the week, to break bread and worship together, correct; or we may perhaps safely add, when the church meets as a church for teaching, worship at any time, how does the prohibition refer to any other time. For instance the church meets on the Lord's Day as a church, here women may neither speak nor teach, but when in the evening we preach the Gospel and the audience is almost entirely made up of those who were not in the church, only a few being present. Is that preaching "In the church" and if a woman capable of preaching the Gospel to sinners had stood up and told the story of the cross, would she have violated Paul's command, would it have been in "the church," once more if there were no christians at all in that gathering, would it still be "in the church." If we can settle just

what Paul meant by "in the church," then we shall have the exact measure of his prohibition. Is it speaking "in the church" when our women miss masses go out to heaven lands and preach the Gospel to women in heathen darkness, who can be reached in no other way? Was the work of Emily Judson a violation of Paul's Command? Is the work of our own sisters in India and Japan, a violation of this command?

Did the Apostle enjoin silence on a woman when at any time two or three are met together who are all christians? Does the presence of a few Christians anywhere and at any time constitute "the church" if not met for worship and breaking the loaf.

You will at once see that on the correct answer to this question will depend our clear understanding and correct practice in this matter.

The conclusion to which I have arrived is some thing like this:

1. That Paul has by the Holy Spirit, expressly enjoined silence on the woman, so far as speaking and teaching in the assembly of the saints is concerned.

"Let your women keep silence in the churches for it is not permitted unto them to speak."

2 That by the words "in the churches" he means in the assembly of the saints on the first day of the week, or whenever they met as a church for worship such as that described by Paul in the chapter where the prohibition occurs.

3 That praying from the statement of the 11th chapter of the same epistle. The command to be silent does not extend to the matter of praise I concluded that a woman may pray publicly in the assembly of the saints as well as sing without violating Paul's command.

4 That there is no prohibition against women preaching the Gospel to sinners publicly.

If these conclusions are correct then I can see that while it meets the object the apostle had in view. Namely, to prevent confusion in the assembly, and to prevent women from taking an improper position and usurping authority over the man. It also opens up the way for our sisters to take an active part in the services of prayer and praise, gives her liberty to preach the Gospel, and answer the difficult question, how shall the Gospel be carried to the millions of heathen women to whom the men cannot gain access.

We have sent out women into our foreign fields, India, Japan, and other places, they will preach the Gospel there for years perhaps, before there will be any Church in existence. Are they violating the apostolic injunction. I think not, are we doing right in sending them there and supporting them, I think we are.

In the cities of the Old World the Bible women can be found day and night, no alley too dark, no neighborhood too low, she is gathering fallen women together. Her foot can go where the policeman would fear to tread. The burglar and the thief know her, the drunkard knows her, the abandoned know her, she gathers the vilest of vile to the house of refuge provided by Christian liberality, and while they are fed and warmed she takes her Bible and sometimes to ten sometimes to fifty sometimes to one, she preaches the old old story of Christ's love to her own sex whom no man could gather and instruct. Does she do right? I think so.

What say you? Let us honor the utterance of the Holy Spirit, but let us not carry them beyond the limits of

that spirit's intention. Let your women keep silent "in the churches," for it is not permitted unto them to speak.

P.S. The reader will see that this brief paper is far from exhaustive. It is written with the hope that others will to a their thought in this direction and that it will ultimately lead to a fuller participation in the public services by our sisters. If there should be found Divine liberty for these so doing.

J. LEDIARD, Ridgdown.

WHAT IS BAPTISM FOR?

Over the above question a fierce and acrimonious controversy has been raging for many centuries, and apparently the end is not yet. Some contend that baptism is merely an outward ceremony used simply to initiate or induct men, women, and children into Christ's visible church, (whatever that is), that there is nothing efficacious in baptism; that a person can be saved just as well without baptism as with it. Others contend that baptism is for or in order to the remission of past sins. With the former class there is considerable discrepancy between their pulpit and private declarations, and the writings of their standard authors, such as Wesley, Benson, Watson, and also with their Disciplinary and Prayer books. John Wesley taught that by baptism we enter into covenant with God; into that everlasting covenant, which he has commanded forever. That by baptism we who were "by nature children of wrath," are made the children of God. And the Methodist discipline and the English Church prayer book teach that "None can enter into the kingdom of God unless they be born of water and the spirit." Yet when John iii 5 is quoted to show the importance of baptism we are told that no reference is made to baptism in that passage; if such is the case, why do Methodist and Church of England Clergymen quote it when baptising a candidate? If the phrase "born of water" does not mean baptism when they are commenting upon it in the pulpit or in private conversation, is it not unfair to use it in the baptisms ceremony? Can it mean one thing at one time and something else at another time?

For the settlement of all questions there should be, and generally is, a court of appeal. Fortunately the human race has recourse to the words of the spirit of God by or through which all differences of opinion may be adjusted permanently and satisfactorily. On this question, what does our Saviour and his inspired Apostles say? Jesus told Nicodemus that "except a man be born of water and of the spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." John iii 5. Now if the phrase "born of water" signifies baptism (and all scholars, commentators and critics of any note say it does), is not baptism a condition of entrance into the kingdom of God, whatever the kingdom of God may be.

Again, he who came to save sinners said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Why should man who had nothing to do with making or instituting the conditions of pardon, object to receiving baptism as a condition with faith and repentance? Do we manifest faith in Christ when we refuse to take him at his word or depreciate his appointments?

Peter—to whom Christ gave the keys of the kingdom of God and who unlocked the door of that kingdom on the day of pentecost, said to the believing Jews on that occasion, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Acts ii 38. If the Jews were to repent for the remission of their sins they were to be baptized for the same purpose.

Saul of Tarsus was told to arise and be baptized, and wash away his sins, calling on the name of the Lord. Acts xxiii. If baptism be not a condition going before remission of sins, the above passage is unexplainable.

What God hath joined together let no man put asunder." H.T.L.