

the door, and ran up stairs to hand her the three-cornered little note.

"You stopped to read this!" cried Bell, looking suspiciously at the flushed face.

"I thought it was intended for me," stammered Bertha.

"I do not believe it," returned Bell. "You do not know the meaning of good manners," giving her cousin a shove into the little store-room just off the landing.

An hour later found her still in solitary confinement, gazing at the long string of dried apple festooned on the bare walls of a room full of the smell of soap drying in long bars before the dusky windows.

"Hepsy, Hepsy!" she called, raising the sash.

"Well, well! I am glad I have found you at last," was the response.

Bertha forebore to explain how she came to be fastened in the little room at the top of the house. Hepsy suspected the truth; she was chafing her cousins purple hands before the great fire, when Elsie burst into the room, as dejected a little being as possible.

"It isn't that I care a fig what the girls say," she sobbed out, when questioned as to the cause of her grief, "but it is hard, when all in our set are going this winter either to boarding-school or to visit their friends, to see a bit of the world, that we alone must stay by the chimney-corner at the old farm. I wish there were only fairies in these days," she added, vehemently.

"Fairies only bestow frogs and toads on those that treat them rudely. It was the kind young girl on whom was showered pearls and diamonds. Don't you remember the story?" asked a soft voice.

Elsie looked up at her Cousin Bertha. "Oh, I should be so good to a fairy in any guise that she would deluge me with rubies," she answered, laughing through her tears.

"No, you wouldn't for a fairy did come to you; not in the form of an old man or old woman, but a girl like yourself. I am the fairy," Bertha went on, half playfully, half sadly.

"You have chosen Hepsy!" cried Bell, looking up, flushed and excited, into her cousin's face.

"Yes," said Bertha, drawing her favorite's arm within her own, "I have chosen Hepsy, because she alone had the goodness of heart to welcome her ragtag of a relation,—the fairy."—*Watchman.*

The best known of the recent hymns of Sankey, Bliss and others are being translated into the vernacular by the Rev. Isaac Fieldbrave, native pastor of the Hindoostani Church at Lucknow, India.

The *Church Times*, an organ of the Ritualists, expresses the opinion that Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress" is not much read now, and that its past popularity "proves nothing but the appalling dreariness of juvenile literature before the days of Sir Walter Scott!"

An entire Baptist church, at Delta, La., with a colored membership of three hundred has joined the exodus to Kansas.

The Disciples of Christ, or Campbellites claim a membership in America of nearly 750,000.

The people of Baltimore are so earnestly opposed to Sunday excursions of all kinds that they stopped a train that was loaded with passengers going to a camp meeting.

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger Missions at Prince Edward Island Baptist Association.

I have read "A word of Criticism" in the Messenger of the 15th, I do not know as I should make any reply to it, were it not that the writer has so misunderstood the spirit of the report as to leave a false impression on the mind of the reader concerning the feeling existing on the Island with respect to the cause of Missions. I will not say that I regard the criticism as wholly unjust. That the report was hurriedly prepared and might have been better worded, I allow. Indeed I think as much is admitted in the report itself. We have been accustomed heretofore to prepare our reports during intervals between the transaction of different items of business brought before the body, and this will account for any language in the unfortunate production that may have left an impression not at all intended by the committee. Indeed I think if any one will look in the Minutes and see who composed the committee on this report, he will not readily lay to our charge an attempt to disparage the great cause of Foreign Missions. In order that critical dispositions may be set at ease while looking forward to our reports next year, I might state that an improvement has been introduced by appointing our committees one year beforehand. I will not charge "Home Missionary man" (as he has charged me) with writing his criticism hastily, but whether he has in all cases dealt fairly with the letter of the report, or understood its spirit and evident intention, I shall be content to leave the intelligent reader to decide. It is not that I care particularly for the report itself, that I write this, but being passed by our Association, I feel that it is justice to my brethren on the Island that some explanation be given which shall free the public mind of any such impression as that we do not feel a lively interest in the Foreign Missionary enterprise. Our critic says, concerning the report, "but here nothing is said of Foreign Missions except in the way of disparagement, although the report professes not to wish to lessen the interest taken in Foreign Missions." Now it seems evident from this that our critic believes that the language of the report is just the opposite of what the writer, as well as the committee and the entire Association which passed it, believe in their hearts. Although the report professes not to wish to lessen the interest taken in Foreign Missions, yet we are charged directly with trying to disparage the great enterprise of the foreign field. I can assure "Home Missionary Man," that nothing of the kind was intended, and I do not see why a plain statement to the contrary might not have been used as a key to the intention of the whole report. Nothing was said of Foreign Missions in the report except to show that a great deal had been done for them the world over, and with good results, but not one word that would fairly imply that too much had been done, unless indeed the word undue may have been understood in some such way. I think however that the word is qualified sufficiently to give a fair understanding of what is meant. When the report says that "Foreign Missions," were supported at the expense of Home Missions it had exclusive reference to P. E. Island, not to Nova Scotia, and if it had not met the minds of the brethren it would not have passed without an amendment. The report was made to act on Home Missions exclusively for definite reasons—1st. Because in proportion to our numbers, we think we contribute our share to the Foreign Field. 2nd. Because we have not contributed so largely for Home Missions last year as formerly, in consequence of which some of our missionaries were suffering the lack of pay, if forsooth we can conceive of a Home Missionary suffering. 3rd. Because Home Missionary labor at the present time on the Island seems to be of great concern to the churches, and of interest to the denomination. So far as answering the question, "Does money account for converts?" is concerned, we need only to say that it is our firm belief that if God blesses any effort of the church in the salvation of souls, he does most positively bless those efforts that include the

giving of money. When we say that the salary of the Foreign Missionary is sometimes treble that of the Home Missionary, it is not implied that \$1,000 is too much for the Foreign Missionary, but that \$300 is positively too little for the Home Missionary. If I were so disposed I could relate some tough adventures and some keen privations endured by Home Missionaries as I have received an account of them from themselves. Just such adventures and privations as those which, if they came in a letter all the way from Burmah, would make us all pity the poor Foreign Missionary. Usually the churches of this Island (so far as I know) at least it is so with respect to the church in Charlottetown, have been used to taking collections for Missions without regard to either Home or Foreign, which was usually divided between those two departments of mission work equally. This does not appear to be the case, upon reference to this year's statistics, because at the Association Bro. Cohoon made a strong appeal in the interest of Home Missions which swelled the collections for that object, also an appeal which was made through the papers toward the end of the financial year helped to increase the donations, but still they fall far below the demands. Not wishing them to lessen the sum annually given to Foreign Missions, we desire our churches to make a sum equal to the Home demands. Now an equal division of funds between Home and Foreign Missions would be the support of one at the expense of the other so far as this Island is concerned. So long as this Island maintains its reputation for liberality by actual donations, we think we should be allowed to make our own distribution of the money raised. The case is different this year however, as the Convention has made the division for us. We shall contribute as liberally as we are able to the common fund, proposed to be raised by that body for denominational expenses during the coming year. I think with these explanations, if we read the report in the light of this plain statement, not wishing to lessen the interest taken in Foreign Missions, we desire in this report to bring our Home Missions into more prominent notice, the grave charge of wishing to disparage Foreign Missions will vanish away.

HERBERT FOSHEAT.

Charlottetown, P. E. I.

P. S.—What is wrong in the practice of receiving members into the fellowship of a Baptist Church on their statement of experience?

For the Christian Messenger.

The Second Coming of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Mr. Editor,—

I have read several articles on the above subject in the Messenger during the past few months. One by our venerable brother Dr. Cramp, which like all his productions, was well worth reading. Mr. Brown's was more diffuse, and stated the arguments more fully for the post-Millennial doctrine. Both those writers lay down the principle that the Lord will not come till after the Millennium, and Mr. B's. statistics present certainly a very gloomy prospect respecting that anticipated season of blessedness. Our friend "Luke" gave the history of the doctrine of the premillennial advent, and Mr. McLean has criticised his article. I propose with your leave, to give in a few brief articles, the proofs from Scripture, that have convinced myself, and many others, (who were educated and trained in the contrary doctrine, and held it tenaciously, and preached it, for many years)—that the coming of the Lord back to this earth, will take place, not after, but before the Millennium.

No one can object to the spirit in which the discussion has hitherto been conducted, unless indeed Luke may think Mr. McLean has been a little too severe and personal. I do not see myself why "personalities," in the usual sense of that term should be introduced. It is not the naming of persons however that gives offence, but naming them disparagingly. I will, I hope, endeavor to avoid this.

I will confine myself in this communication principally to a simple statement of what I believe the Scriptures teach on the subject, and afterwards, if the Lord will, will proceed with the proofs drawn from Scripture, giving the quotations.

I premise that the Second Advent of the Lord Jesus is set forth, and set forth as a truth of the utmost importance, in every book, and every epistle in the New Testament, with the exception of the epistle to the Galatians and that to the Ephesians, (and perhaps one or two of the short private letters. First, it is in many places affirmed that the coming of the Lord will be personal and real. "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." Acts. i. 11. "Behold he cometh with clouds and every eye shall see him." Rev. i. 7. "And then shall they see the Son of Man coming in the clouds, with power and great glory." Mark xiii. 26. "As it is appointed unto men," (men, observe, not all men, as it is often quoted,) "once to die, and after this the judgement, so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." Heb. ix. 27, 28. The first coming was real and personal. So will be his second coming. And, mark, he comes but twice. So it will not do to say that he comes when a believer dies, that would make unnumbered comings. Nor to say it means a "revival," or a special judgement, such as the destruction of Jerusalem, of the old world, of Sodom, &c., &c., for this would involve the same absurdity. Besides a careful reading of John xxi. 20, 23, will convince any candid reader that, "If I will that he tarry till I come," cannot mean, "If I will that he live till he dies"!!!

I have carefully again and again examined all the passages in the New Testament that speak of the coming of Christ, and have repeatedly marked them for others—there are over seventy such passages—and I am confident not a single one of them refers to death.

I have no sympathy with any theory that fixes the time of his coming. I am confident that the whole system of fixing the time is a serious blunder, arising from confounding Israel and the church, and taking it for granted that the Antichrist has come, and that the pope is the Antichrist. But nothing is easier than to show that this is all a mistake. Many antichrists there have been, and are, and I doubt not that the pope is one of these; but the Antichrist is yet to come. But this is too soon to discuss that point.

But there is another point of importance. In a very friendly interview which I had with Rev. J. Brown, after reading his article on the subject, I told him that I considered that he and the venerable Doctor Cramp, had erred on this very point, and violated the principle laid down by our blessed Lord himself, in Mark xiii. 32-37, for, said I, you both assume to fix the time, not certainly when he will come, but during which he will not come! Let us quote the passage, for it gives the principle respecting the time when we are authorized to expect his return, viz., at any day, and at any hour. But of that day and that hour knoweth no man—"take ye heed, watch and pray, for you know not when the time is. For as a man taking a far journey, who left his house, and gave authority to his servants, and to every man his work, and commanded the porter to watch: watch ye therefore, for ye know not when the master of the house cometh, at even, or at midnight, or at cockcrow, or in the morning, lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping. And what I say unto you I say unto all watch."

Verse 26th shows that the coming referred to was not the destruction of Jerusalem, nor the death of either saint or sinner. Then shall they see the Son of man coming in the clouds with power and great glory." Turning to Matthew xxiv. 29, we learn that the coming of the Son of Man, with the darkening of the sun, &c., is after the "tribulation." Therefore it could not be the tribulation itself. If the Lord was to come after the awful scenes of Jerusalem's destruction, it could not have been before, or in those terrible judgements.

Now the theory which affirms that the Lord will come in two years from to-day, and the theory that affirms that he will not come until after one thousand years, both alike affirm that he will not come to-day. But our Lord's statement clearly implies that for aught I can tell he may come this very day, and this very hour. Com-

pare also Acts i. 7. "It is not for you to know the times and the seasons which the Father has put in his own power." The Apostles never did fix the time. And this is the answer to all the difficulties raised about their expecting it in their day. They were told to expect and look for it till it came; and that I believe is the proper aspect for the believer, in their day, and in ours.

The fact is, writers and preachers are continually confounding things that differ, and speaking of four distinct events, as though they were one event. Scripture never confounds things that differ and never contradicts itself. To lay down the principle that passages of scripture can be quoted on both sides of a contradictory statement, is to deny their plenary inspiration. We may boldly affirm that such contradiction cannot be produced. The imaginary contradictions—yea, I am willing to admit, the apparent contradictions, are not the Bible's, but the offspring of inattention and ignorance, to say nothing of worse motives. The four things continually represented as occurring at one and the same, are, first, the coming of Christ as the Bridegroom, for his Church. Second, his coming as the Son of Man, to assume his dominion as man over the earth, to judge and to rule the living—the "quick." Thirdly, The judgement of the "Great White Throne;" and, fourthly, The day of the Lord. It is assumed that these all are one and the same, or at least, but different aspects of one great and solemn event, that will take place at one and the same time.

And here I believe lies the cause of all the differences of opinion that exist on this deeply momentous subject.

But to sum up what I am willing should be looked upon as the theory, (until it is proved) of the view herein advocated, I remark:

1. In the first case Christ will not come down to the earth at all, but his disciples will go up to meet Him in the cloud—where they last saw him,—to meet him as the Bridegroom. See 1 Thes. iv. 17.

2. When he comes down to, and stands upon this earth, it will be, not to raise and judge the dead, nor to raise anybody, but to execute judgement upon living men—nations—living in mortal bodies upon this habitable globe—and to introduce and establish the Millennium.

3. The Judgement of the great white throne, when the wicked dead will be raised and judged, will take place after the Millennium, and after the final apostacy; and that throne will not be set up upon this earth, for there will be no earth to set it on. "I saw a great white throne and him that sat on it, from whose face the heavens and the earth fled away, and there was no place found for them." Rev. xx. 11.

4. "The day of the Lord," is not a day of twenty-four hours but a long period, extending from the time that the church is taken away, on to the final winding up of all things, "the new heavens and the new earth."

This outline I believe is exactly given in Rev. xix. xx. as I propose to show in my next. May the Lord grant to us all, "to put off our shoes from our feet, in the discussion—for truly "the place where we stand is holy ground."

PAUL.

For the Christian Messenger.

A few words from "Luke."

At present I write merely to answer, as well as I can, the question asked by Mr. J. A. McLean at the close of his letter in the last Messenger. The remainder of his letter requires no comment just now.

Mr. McLean, "as a pledge of his sincerity," asks me to publish my testimony from Clement of Rome and Polycarp, and asserts "that there is not any trace" of the doctrine "in the writings of either."

Now I am of course unable to refer directly to the works of those Fathers, but Rev. Nathaniel West, D. D., in his History of the Pre-millennial Doctrine, mentions both of them among exponents of the Chiliastic faith of their times. He further quotes from Donaldson on the Apostolic Fathers, words of theirs which, though not explicitly declaring that the coming of Christ is to precede the Millennium, yet indicate that they held the orthodox belief in the speedy return of the Lord to set up His kingdom. If He was to come soon, and might come at any time, then evidently