

The Christian Messenger.

A RELIGIOUS AND GENERAL FAMILY NEWSPAPER.

NEW SERIES.
Vol. XVI., No. 39.

Halifax, Nova Scotia, Wednesday, September 27th, 1871.

WHOLE SERIES.
Vol. XXV., No. 39

Poetry.

ROWING AGAINST THE TIDE.

It is easy to glide with the ripples
A down the stream of Time,
To flow with the course of the river,
Like music to some old rhyme;
But ah! it takes courage and patience,
Against its current to ride;
And we must have strength from heaven
When rowing against the tide.

We may float on the river's surface
While our oars scarce touch the stream,
And visions of earthly glory
On our dazzling sight may gleam;
We forget that on before us
The dashing torrents roar
And while they were day dreaming,
Its waters will carry us o'er.

But a few—ah, would there were many!—
Row up the "stream of Life;"
They struggle against the surges
And mind neither toil nor strife,
Though weary and faint with labor
Singing triumphant they ride;
For Christ is the hero's captain
When rowing against the tide.

Fast on through the hazy distance,
Like a mist on a distant shore,
They see the walls of a city,
With the banner flying o'er;
Seen through a glass so darkly,
They almost mistake their way
But faith shows light on and labor,
When darkness shuts out their day.

And shall we be one of that number,
Who mind no toil or pain?
Shall we mourn the loss of earthly joys
When we have a crown to gain?
Or shall we glide on with the river,
With death at the end of our ride,
While our brother with heaven before him,
Is rowing against the tide?

Religious.

THE REMEDY FOR THE WOES OF FRANCE.

(Translated from a popular French Protestant tract entitled "Le mal et son remède," now being widely circulated in France.)

We know now the true nature of the wounds of France, and the origin of her misfortunes. It should be easy to find the remedy. What remedy can we apply to the disease which is moral, unless one of the same nature? Let the army be re-organized—I agree to it with all my heart; let the artillery be increased newly modelled—I see no obstacle to it; let the administration be reformed—better and better still; let us strive to implant in our soil the laws, the forms, and the usages of liberty. But that will not be sufficient. If we are content with that our wounds, our three great wounds, will neither be bandaged nor healed; there they will remain gaping, offensive, threatening, and soon become fatal if we do not take care, yes, fatal in spite of all our caution, of all our political or administrative reforms.

A bandage, a remedy, for our three great wounds! Who will find, who will point out, the true remedy? This is what ought to be the cry of every enlightened patriot. I have heard the word virtue uttered by some. Virtue—yes, this is what we want; virtue a moral power, in the place of our demoralisation, and with this moral power, convictions which flow out of it, solid and deep convictions, instead of our miserable and fruitless infidelity, enlightened and generous convictions instead of these absurd and degrading superstitions.

Yes, we want virtue. But how can we get it? How can we acquire this moral power? How, out of our infidel or superstitious, and above all, alas! demoralised people form a people with healthy convictions? Truly here is the difficulty.

I will only deal with the question, where shall we find this moral power, where shall we seek it?

And first, shall we ask the nominal representatives of morality and religion? Shall we ask it of our priests? Let us respect them, let us respect their character, whatever our opinion of their doctrine and tenets may be; let us

respect their liberty as men and citizens, let us respect the virtues of those who possess any; but pray let us have no more fetishism, no more nonsense. In the name of our salvation let us give our confidence to men who are worthy of our esteem, and let us value them according to their worth. Having said that, I will return to my question. Shall we ask for this moral power from our priests? I do not deny the personal virtues of a large number, nor the enlightenment of some; I will leave unmentioned the failings of others in these respects; but as to giving us this moral power, our clergy have proved that it is an impossibility. See the time for which Roman Catholic priests have occupied the pulpits of our churches and during which the whole of the rising generation (with the exception of some thousands of Protestants) have been taught manners and religion by them. And note it well, never more than during the last twenty years, has the clergy been of more account in the persons of the cardinals, it had seats in the senate; of the bishops, it had a footing in our prefectures; of its parish priests in the whole country; not only had it perfect liberty, but it had great honour and a large share of power. In exchange for such favours what has it done for us in regard to moral power? It has given us the France we know.

Leaving the priests, shall we ask the philosophers and the freethinkers for this moral power? I shall reply as I have hitherto done with perfect candour. The freethinkers, it must be remembered, have talent and science, not all the talent and all the science of the world, as they would have us believe, but a large proportion of each. They have had that powerful auxiliary time. From Voltaire and Rousseau to our day they have not been deficient in it, and I hasten to add, they have not lost it. Now they have newspapers; they preside in schools of learning with just a few exceptions; they have influence. The majority of the youth, and the population of the great towns, a large part of the bourgeois class, and nearly all the working class, so lively, so ardent, so carried away with excitement, sometimes so generous—in short, they have Paris. It is easy to judge them by their works which are before our eyes. We see that they have been enemies of hypocrisy, of tyranny and of superstition. Everywhere these shameful idols of the past have disappeared before them, they have swept them away with a hissing vengeance. This is to their glory. But when they have been striven to re-construct, to re-place staid and fruitful convictions for superstitious theories, to reply to the eternal aspirations of the human soul, to its deep and legitimate longings, to its moral and religious desires, they have shown themselves powerless. I will take Paris for an example, where the freethinkers have certainly won their greatest success, and have gained most ground. This noble city has shown itself more and more rebellious against tyranny, implacable against hypocrisy; for this it cannot be too highly commended; but more and more has it lacked morals and faith without which a nation cannot live. These have been wanting to such an extent, that Paris, the freethinking city, has been, and now is, a city of blasphemy, of impiety, the city of pleasure, the theatre of orgies, and the school of corruption. From all this what follows, but that the freethinkers cannot cure our wounds any more than the priests? They have got rid of one superstition, but only to deepen and evenen the other two—infidelity and demoralisation.

Where, then, in fine, shall we find this moral power? I will tell you in one word—in the gospel. Therein is our hope—our salvation. France has tried everything else, nothing has succeeded. There still remains the gospel. If she tries this I am sure she will not be deceived. . . . Alas! the gospel is known only by name in France, much in the same way as in the case of a young franc-tireur, who recently heard the gospel at Angers, and said, "This is the first time that I have

heard the gospel;" and, he added, "It has done me good, it is good, very good." I mean then, in a few words, to explain what the gospel is. It is good news, the news that God loves us notwithstanding our miseries and sins, and that to deliver us, and to render us fit to live with Him, and to share His glory, He has sent into the world His only Son Jesus Christ, who was born in a stable, who grew up in Galilee, and on the shores of the Lake of Genesareth, who taught in the towns and country of His birth, who was crucified at Jerusalem, but who was raised the third day by the power of God, and who ascended into heaven, where He is preparing a place for us, and from whence He will come one day to establish His kingdom. This good news God has proclaimed to all alike in a book called the New Testament, where the words of Jesus and his apostles are recorded. God says that it is enough for a man to believe this good news with all his heart, to be able to appropriate all these blessings, and to regard himself as a child of God on the earth, and an heir of eternal glory. "God" Jesus tells us, "so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." This is the gospel. Is it not true that it does good, it is good, very good, as the young franc-tireur said. The gospel, and only the gospel, is the remedy for which we seek.

It is only the gospel that will cure our infidelity, by showing us not a belief in absurdities, but a doctrine that will satisfy and control our intellects, and at the same time take possession of our hearts and wills—the grand doctrine of a God who loves us. It is only the gospel that will cure our superstition. Just as light expels darkness, and as the daybreak drives away owls and all kinds of night-birds, so the preaching of the gospel will bring to nothing all the silly stories, the monkish harangues, and the outrageous pretensions of superstition. The gospel alone will cure our demoralisation, for it will awaken a feeling of the dignity of the human race, it will conquer our evil passions, by the noble passion of love to God. It will conquer wicked selfishness by sacred contact with the devotion and spirit of sacrifice incarnate in Jesus.

Let us open the gospel and read it conscientiously, and we shall soon be convinced that there is no learning place comparable to it for faith, justice, charity, good morals, and true liberty. France cannot do without the gospel. She will either rise by its help, or she will sink even lower than she is now. But let no such a thought enter our minds! We will believe that she will rise. To do this she needs the gospel, and she will come to the gospel. God who loves France will work this miracle to save her, and France will give herself to the work.

Three centuries ago French voices offered the gospel to our country, and numbers of Frenchmen of all ranks and conditions accepted it. That Italian Medicis and her accomplices succeeded in drowning in blood the greater part of its adherents. Louis XIV., by the advice of his counsellors, finished the fatal work. By a stroke of his pen—signing the revocation of the Edict of Nantes—he drove abroad 300,000 of his subjects, the élite of the friends of the gospel, and the élite of the French nation, and cowed the others by dragons, the booted missionaries of his cruel persecutions. Now, in this bright day of liberty, the gospel is again offered to our country. To refuse it now would be suicidal; nor is this word too strong. Formerly, to its own great hurt, no doubt, but yet without actually destroying itself, France could do without the gospel; but now, with liberty since 1789, with universal suffrage, with the democracy increasing every day, when the people is supreme, and every citizen has his share in the government, the gospel alone can keep this power in order, and by the moral bonds of the love of God and man, respect for God and man in his likeness can confine it to its proper limits. The

tree of liberty can only grow and prosper on the soil of the gospel. How many times in half a century we have planted trees of liberty, and how many times have we, with saddened eyes, seen them droop and fall. It is because their roots have not taken hold of the gospel. Look at countries where liberty flourishes ever young, ever new,—England, Switzerland, and the United States of America. They are the very countries where the gospel is known most, most appreciated, and has most followers.—*Freeman.*

THE TWO CHURCH PARTIES IN GERMANY.

New phases in the development of the antagonism between the "Old" and "New" Catholics in Bavaria and Russia are continually arising. A council of German Bishops is to meet at Fulda (Hesse Cassel), to consult on the policy they shall adopt in view of the opposition of the Civil government to the execution of their plans. They will naturally be led to consider the question, how far the Infallibility dogma, which some of their own number swallowed with very wry faces, shall be thrust upon the acceptance of their subordinates. On this question it is understood that they are by no means agreed, some advising extreme measures against the "heretics," and others, like the more moderate Bishop Hefele, counselling conciliation, and the avoidance of all conflict with the State.

The latter would undoubtedly be the wiser course. But Episcopal passion is as blind to reason as vulgar passion. The violent tone of Ultramontane organs indicates a spirit of defiance that will not be content with half-measures. The clerical party, in scarcely a guarded manner threaten revolution.

Meanwhile the government, instead of manifesting any disposition to recede, maintains its position boldly. The Prussian Minister of Religious Affairs and Public Instruction, in accordance with instructions from Prince Bismarck and the Emperor William, allows hardly a day to pass by without striking a fresh blow at Ultramontanism. It is but a few days since he authorised the excommunicated priest of Kattowitz, Kaminski, who had formed a large "Old Catholic," that is to say, anti-infallibilist congregation in that place, to hold divine service in the Catholic *Nothkirche*, and the protest of the Bishop of the Diocese against this measure elicited the answer that the same policy would be followed in similar cases. The "Old Catholics" for whom ultramontane priests refused to perform the marriage service, have been assured on the part of the government that at the next session of the German parliament the imperial chancellor would submit a bill rendering the institution of civil marriage obligatory throughout the empire. Another bill of equal importance, taking the supervision of the schools from the hands of the clergy, and placing it in those of eminent educators, is also said to be preparing. And, finally, it is asserted by well-informed German journals that the imperial government will refuse to recognize the successor of Pius the Ninth, in case the Ultramontane cardinals, after the death of the present Pope, by hurriedly convoking a conclave, should elect a prelate imbued with their aggressive and intolerant principles.

Meanwhile the "Old Catholics," as Dr. Dollinger's friends and sympathizers are called, are proceeding resolutely to organize a German Church. They are assured of the protection of the government, and they are of course prepared to condemn ecclesiastical penalties. Their convention at Heidelberg was one to command respect, and the congress which they have appointed at Munich for Sept. 23rd, 24th, and 25th, promises to be one of the most memorable assemblies that Germany has known for

centuries. Each party is marshalling its forces, shaping its policy, and preparing for the inevitable conflict.—*N. Y. Evangelist.*

THE BEST ARGUMENT.

Rev. E. A. Taffr. of Cleveland, O., writes something very much to the purpose to the *Journal and Messenger*. The argument he suggests is none the worse for the fact that it is a powerful aid to any religious sentiments, it being certain that no religious opinions will benefit any one without it.

I find the best argument for Baptist principles, or indeed for any other, is love. I may preach baptism till I'm gray, with a cold, fussy, fashionable church, and it will accomplish nothing. But with a church full of good-loyal brethren and sisters, of big, warm hearts, I don't need to preach on baptism at all. Their very spirit and presence give the ordinance a tremendous power. The beauty and significance of baptism, I find, are intensified amazingly by the spirit of holiness and love in a church. When a boy my pastor was always harping on baptism and communion. But the church was so cold and stupid that the truth repelled rather than otherwise. Nothing was gained, though the field was ripe. Scarcely a Pedobaptist ever united with that church, although multitudes attended, it being the only church in that place. I believe it is the brotherly love of the Methodists that has given them zeal, and built them up so fast. Love, in religion, will always do more than any form of truth without love. Couple love and zeal with the truth, which we as Baptists build upon, and our principles will prove irresistible.

Tell the pastors of Ohio to preach more love to their people. We must not let strangers come and go in our churches unnoticed. Give them a warm grip of the hand and they'll come again, and it will not be long before you will hear them asking, "See here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized?"

"And now abideth faith, hope, charity these three—but the greatest of these is charity (love)."

A PRIVATE BAPTISM.

The venerable Rev. James E. Welch, of Wright City, Mo., wrote the following to the Rev. J. M. Carpenter, Caldwell, N. J., by whom it is furnished for publication. Mr. Welch's letter is dated July 17th:

"You ask me, 'When, where, and under what circumstances you (I) baptized Rev. John Ford, at that time pastor of the Presbyterian church at Parsippany, N. J.?'

"I answer, In November, 1839, I was presenting the cause of Sabbath schools, as agent of the American Sunday School Union, and preached at Boonton and Parsippany, and spent the evening with brother Ford. At family worship, he took his Greek Testament and read it off in English, with so much facility, that after prayer I said to him, 'Why, brother Ford, you seem to understand the Greek language thoroughly.' He replied, 'Yes, I think I understand it as well as I do my own language.'

"Well, brother F., I believe you are a candid man, and will you allow me to ask you, what you regard as the primary meaning of baptism?"

"It means to dip—to immerse, and nothing else."

"How do you reconcile your convictions with your practice of sprinkling children?"

"O! I have not baptized any children for years. When I learned any were expected for baptism, I made it a rule to exchange pulpits with some neighboring pastor, and get him to do the baptizing; and, brother W., I have longed for an opportunity to get some Baptist brother to baptize me privately."

"Why, my brother, I could not consent to do that 'as in a corner.'"

"Then, had you been in Philip's