

The Christian Messenger.

A RELIGIOUS AND GENERAL FAMILY NEWSPAPER.

NEW SERIES.
Vol. XX., No. 45.

Halifax, Nova Scotia, Wednesday, November 10, 1875.

WHOLE SERIES.
Vol. XXXIX., No. 45.

Poetry.

For the Christian Messenger.

ALONE.

Father I know not where Thou leadest me,
A mist hangs o'er the way in which I tread,
I cannot see the path; the light is gone,
And shadows gather darkly o'er my head.

The path is rough my Father, and at each
Uncertain, wavering step I well-nigh fall;
I seem to lose the way—I cannot hear
An answer to my trembling anxious call.

The sighing of the wind among the trees,
The rustling of the leaves around my feet
Are all the sounds I hear. Could I but see
The light, or hear Thy voice so soft and sweet!

I call to Thee, my Father; dost Thou hear?
Or hast Thou left me in the wild alone?
I listen in the darkness but there comes
No sound but of the wailing forest moan.

And must I wander in this desert gloom
Without one ray of light to cheer my way,
O God, Thy child is weary; take my hand
And hold it fast until the break of day.

I cannot walk without Thee for the road
Is all so thorny, and the briars tear
And pierce my hands and feet; and now I fall
Amid the darkness—Father, O come near!

Alone! alone! My Saviour hear my cry,
O lead me onward thro' the darkness wild
And make me feel Thy tender loving care
And comfort me—Thy weary, wandering child.

And when these tired feet shall rove no more
This aching head lie down at last to rest
O take me to that sweet abiding home
Where I shall dwell with Thee forever blest.

MAY K. WARREN.

Religious.

WHO ARE THE BIGOTS?

It is often charged by their opposers that Baptists are captious in the matter of baptism. But a fair review of the matter finds the bigotry and schism to be on the other side.

The Presbyterian and Congregational standards admit that either immersion or sprinkling is baptism. But when a convert asks immersion in those denominations, he generally asks it in vain. The minister will argue with him for hours together, to get him to consent to be sprinkled. Fair argument failing, ridicule and vituperation will be used, and he will be told that the ceremony of immersion is immodest, indecent and disgusting. And if he still refuses to be sprinkled, he will be told to go and join the Baptists. Though admitting that immersion is really baptism, a Presbyterian minister will absolutely refuse to administer it. Immersion is sometimes administered by Presbyterian clergymen, but generally, if the convert will not receive sprinkling, he can have no baptism at all at Presbyterian hands. However much the convert may love the Presbyterian Church, if he will not be sprinkled he must be shut out from it.

Now if Presbyterians held that there was no baptism but sprinkling, it would be proper for them to refuse to administer any other ceremony. But when they hold that immersion also is baptism, to refuse to administer it shows a narrowness of mind not honorable to the Christian name. Baptists will administer anything for baptism which they believe to be such. Pedobaptists will refuse to administer that which they freely concede to be at least one act of baptism. If that be not bigotry, where will you find it?

There would be more reason for this refusal, if it were generally conceded by the Christian world that sprinkling is valid baptism. But as a matter of fact, Christendom is divided upon this question into two nearly equal parts. The Roman Church, together with the Reformed churches which have sprung from it, hold that sprinkling as well as immersion is baptism. The scores of millions of the Greek Church, together with three millions or more (Baptists and others) in Western Europe and America, deny that sprinkling is baptism. Now a conciliatory spirit would encourage the practice of immersion—not necessarily as

being the only act of baptism, but as being the only one admitted by all Christians to be such. But the bigotry of Presbyterians and others refuses to practice immersion—that which all Christians admit to be baptism—and insists on the use of sprinkling, which is repudiated by half the Christian world. Is not such a course schismatic? Immersion is a ceremony of "Christian union," the whole Christian world admitting it to be baptism. Sprinkling is a sectarian ceremony, it being recognized as baptism only by a portion of Christendom. Immersion is "catholic"—sprinkling is schismatic.

And this is the more apparent from the fact that even in the western Church sprinkling did not come into general use till a comparatively recent period. The baptismal ceremony of the Apostles' day was immersion—more scholarly Pedobaptists themselves being witness. When the doctrine arose that baptism was necessary to salvation sprinkling, or rather pouring, began to be used—in the Latin Church alone—in the case of persons who, being converted on a death-bed, could not be immersed. For thirteen hundred years and in England and in Scotland till after the Reformation, sprinkling and pouring were used only in the case of the sick—immersion being the usual ceremony. It is only within a few hundred years that sprinkling has come into general use.

Not only were Christ and the Apostles immersed, but also Ignatius and Polycarp, Basil and Chrysostom, Ambrose and Augustine, Clovis and Charlemagne, St. Patrick and King Alfred, Anselm and Kempis, Latimer and Ridley, Lady Jane Grey and Edward VI. Immersion has the sanction of the highest authority, and it has been received always and everywhere as valid baptism. Sprinkling has been sanctioned only within a short time. To insist therefore upon sprinkling, refusing to administer immersion, is inexcusably schismatic.

And as to the charge that Baptists make a division in Christendom—separating themselves from their brethren on a mere matter of form, there are more ways than one for showing that Pedobaptists are the ones who are responsible for such a division.

If a Presbyterian or a Methodist minister comes to doubt whether sprinkling is baptism, and so refuses to sprinkle converts, he is deposed from his position. The Church authorities say to him, "If you refuse to sprinkle infants, we will not have you longer in our ministry." If now the preacher unable longer to preach in their ranks goes and preaches outside their ranks—gathers converts and builds up churches outside—is it not the absurdest arrogance for them to charge him and his converts with separating themselves from their brethren? A Presbyterian or Methodist preacher can declare that immersion is not baptism, and may refuse to administer immersion. But if he says that sprinkling is not baptism, and refuses to administer sprinkling, he is deposed. Does not the guilt of the division of Christendom rest with those who thus exalt sprinkling?

Nor can a private member who has ceased to believe in sprinkling remain in a Pedobaptist church, except on such terms as no conscientious and honorable man can accept. He may, perhaps, be allowed to believe in private that infant sprinkling is without warrant but he must not say so openly. He must conceal his convictions as a guilty secret. Though sprinkling be a "mere form," it is something too sacred to be spoken against. One who openly denies its divine authority must leave the church. Is it not foolish, therefore to talk as if Baptists wilfully separated themselves from other Christians? One who does not believe in sprinkling and who speaks and acts accordingly, will not be permitted to remain in the ministry or private membership of a Pedobaptist church.

If Pedobaptists allowed freedom of opinion regarding the claims of sprinkling—if they declared that a minister

who does not believe in sprinkling should not be compelled to administer it—if members were as free to speak against sprinkling as they are to speak against immersion—they would have more show of reason for declaring that their platform was so broad that all Christians could stand upon it—that no one was justified in leaving them because of his opinions regarding the ceremony of baptism. But when they seek to force upon all an acknowledgment of the divine authority of sprinkling, theirs is the bigotry—their the guilt of schism.—N. Y. Ex. & Chron.

THE PRINCE OF WALES AND OUR MISSIONS IN INDIA.

The departure of the Prince of Wales for India is an event of national moment. Not without special interest is it to those who, like ourselves, have so long had their attention directed to India as a field of missionary enterprise and endeavour; but the interest we now speak of is general, for the Prince enters on his great journey, not in any merely private capacity, as in his former travels, but as the representative, and almost the delegate, of the Crown and People of England. Surely such a journey, under such circumstances, has never been undertaken by royal prince before. The journeyings of the Prince of Wales in America and Canada were nothing to it. It will extend over twenty-five thousand miles at the least. It will occupy more than six months. It will bring the illustrious traveller in contact with modes of life and varieties of civilisation that he has never hitherto known. Including the two great cities of Bombay and Calcutta, it will include also Mysore, Madras, the island of Ceylon, those great North-Western Provinces so full of interest, some of it tragic, to England and Englishmen, and will extend as far north as Janu, on the very borders of Thibet. That every care will be taken for the Prince's personal safety we are well assured, but it were idle to conceal from ourselves that such a journey as we have described must involve dangers to which few men, except at the call of duty, would care to expose themselves. Already, we have commended the Prince to the care of Providence. None more loyally than ourselves will watch his progress, and none more sincerely hope and pray for his safe return.

That this visit to India will, if it be judiciously conducted be productive of good, there are already many indications. The interest that it has aroused amongst the population, who are anticipating a visit from the son of the Queen of England, shows that it is regarded by them as an event of no small importance. It will be at least an expression of the interest that is taken in them and their welfare by those whom they still regard as their conquerors. Nothing short of a visit by the Queen herself, which is, of course, impossible, could more strongly convey to them the idea that they are cared for by the Power that has taken upon itself the responsibility of their rule. We are obliged to add the wish that that care were really as great as they will be led to suppose. The way in which Indian legislation is conducted in the House of Commons has often been commented upon. Only a few hours can be spared at the far-end of the Parliamentary Session to consider the affairs of what is yet one of the grandest Empires the world has ever seen. Of course, a great deal of this arises from ignorance. The ignorance of Englishmen generally in regard to India is perfectly astounding. We should like to know how many members of Parliament even, could tell us, unless they had lately looked them up, the exact position of half the places that are put down in the Prince of Wales's programme. We remember many years since meeting a missionary from Muttra, and his saying, somewhat playfully and somewhat plaintively, "Here we have been working all these

years in Muttra, thinking that the Christians of England were praying for the progress of God's cause in Muttra, and now, when we come home, we find that most of them do not know where Muttra is."

We have not space to refer in detail to the places that will be visited by the Prince, but we may mention some things. No sooner will the Prince land on the shores of India that he will find himself in a Presidency nearly twice as big as England and Scotland together, and containing a population of more than fifteen millions—he will find himself in a city the population of which approaches, if it does not exceed, seven hundred thousand, twice as large as that of Birmingham, and as large as that of Manchester and Leeds united. Passing on, by way of Beypoor, to Madras, he will be received, in the city alone, by a population of four hundred thousand; and in the island of Ceylon, of which Colombo is the capital, he will find a population of two and a half millions. We may not speak at length of Calcutta, the chief city in the presidency of Bengal, which, including its suburbs, has a population of over a million; nor of the North-West Provinces, in which, as at Delhi, Cawnpore, and Lucknow, the Prince will be reminded of the Indian Mutiny, which occurred when he was little more than a boy. We will but mention one or two other facts, only apologising to those to whom they are familiar, for the sake of those to whom they may be unknown. India has altogether a population, chiefly of Hindus and Mohammedans, of more than two hundred millions. The Hindus are more numerous than all the Protestants in the world put together. India is about twenty-five times the size of England, and all Europe, with the exception of Russia, covers but the some extent of surface. Its resources are enormous, and they are being developed with wonderful rapidity. Civilisation and education are making rapid strides. It seems as if the time were not very far distant when the title of Emperor of India would be a prouder title than even that of King of England.

We have written thus far in the hope of being able to give our readers some information respecting the country to which the Prince of Wales is now going as fast as steam will carry him. But our purpose would be only partially accomplished if we did not express the hope that the attention that is now being drawn to India will be utilised for those missionary purposes which we as a denomination have so much at heart. India is being rapidly civilised, but very slowly Christianised. The old idolatries are fast disappearing, but they are being displaced rather by an intellectual scepticism than by a belief in "the truth as it is in Jesus." For several months the attention of Englishmen will be directed to India as it has seldom been before. Cannot our missionary societies avail themselves of the opportunity? The Prince of Wales will, if he be spared, be, one day, Emperor of India, but we want to win it for a greater King than he. "India for Christ," was Carey's motto: shall it not be also and more than ever ours?—London Baptist.

"PAY FOR THE PITCHERS."

A Christian woman once asked for money for the cause of Christ; and the objection was raised, "Why! I thought you preached a free gospel; and you talk about the water of life being free, without money and without price."—"Yes," said she, "the water of life is free; but we need money to pay for the pitcher to carry it in." Yes, ours is a "free salvation;" but we must pay for the Bibles and tracts which tell about it; we must pay passage on the ships and railroads which carry our missionaries to the heathen we must supply them with food and clothing, and means to bring up their children, while they give their time to the work of telling "the story of the Cross" to the heathen, and translating

books and Bibles, or learning the language so that they may speak and write it. And the money for this purpose ought to come from every church of Christ, from every believer in the Saviour, however rich or poor, in its due proportion.

DESIGNATION OF MISSIONARIES AT THE TABERNACLE.

A deeply interesting service was held on the 10th ult., at the Metropolitan Tabernacle, at which several brethren and sisters who are on the eve of departing for the mission field were designated to that work. The congregation filled the entire area and must have numbered upwards of two thousand. The Rev. C. H. Spurgeon presided, and delivered an address in the course of which he made eloquent reference to the similar service the other day at Plymouth, and especially to the charge to departing missionaries given by Dr. Brock. This, Mr. Spurgeon characterized as one of the noblest utterances to which he had ever listened. The missionaries on the platform at the Tabernacle on whose account the service was held, were two young men from the Pastors' College, one of whom is proceeding to China, there to aid in the work carried on by Mr. Hudson Taylor; Miss Thorne, a member of the Church at the Tabernacle, and belonging to a family whose name is honorably associated with the church at Broadmead, Bristol, who is going to Delhi to assist in the Zenana work; Miss Burnett, who is going out to become the wife of a missionary; and along with these a veteran worker, Miss Packer, who has already laboured for twenty years in India, and who is now about to return for the purpose of continuing the work to which she is devoting her life. Miss Packer originally went out under the auspices of the Ladies' Association for the promotion of the Education of Women in India. She was subsequently baptized by Mr. Denham, of Serampore, and for eight years was associated with the Baptist mission in Calcutta. For twelve years she was connected with the Orissa mission, spending part of that time at Russell Condh, where she was associated with the late devoted John Orissa Goadby. At the commencement of the Orissa famine she became connected with the orphanage, and a considerable number of the boys and girls who were then converted under her ministrations are now located in the Christian villages. The Rev. Jas. A. Spurgeon gave an address in which he described the Zenana work, and the Rev. Mr. Bailey from Orissa described the past and future spheres of Miss Packer's labours. Other addresses were also given. The closing scene of the service was profoundly impressive. Asking the people to rise, Mr. Spurgeon took the hand of each one of the missionaries in succession, and uttered a fervent prayer on his or her behalf, to which, as at Plymouth, all the people responded with a devout "Amen."—Ib.

We regret to learn that the Rev. Dr. Landels has met with a somewhat serious accident while crossing a railway on the Continent. He did not think at the time that much was wrong, but since his arrival in England it has been ascertained that the injury to one of his limbs was of such a character that he will be obliged to rest for several weeks.

A Troy clergyman recently announced to his congregation, after a communion service, that he had long sought and at last found a substitute for wine in the administration of the sacrament. The new discovery is grape jelly, which dissolved in water, he said, would be free from the objections urged against wine. The minister's proposition to make the substitution was approved, and a committee of three ladies appointed to make the jelly, of which a single bowl will suffice for each sacramental occasion.