

fill them. Some festoon themselves over trees, and hang their beautiful cups from all sides; while others lie on the ground, and hold up their gay little pitchers in a circle around the stem.

"How odd they must look, papa!" broke in Maud; "are they green, like the leaves?"

"O no! they are of the gayest colors, like flowers. Some are pea-green and purple, some are green and red, and others are flesh colored. One kind is bright crimson, and another is deep purple. The smallest is about three inches high."

"O how cunning!" exclaimed Maud. "And the largest more than twenty inches," added papa, "and nearly every one has a pretty cover which closes, it is said when the pitcher is full."

"Do they hold good water?" asked Maud, "I should think it would be warm."

"It is warm, and insects get into it, but travellers say that the taste is not unpleasant. But now supposing we take a big ship and sail away from this island; we will turn our prow to the rising sun, and keep close to the equator all the time. Let me see—where do you suppose we'll come out?"

Maud jumped down and ran to the big atlas, which she opened at the map of the world. Looking at the map was always part of the "supposing" game.

"Here's Borneo," she cried, putting her plump forefinger on it, and nearly covering up the unfortunate island altogether. "I found it yesterday, you know. But we can't sail east, papa, we'll run against another island."

"Supposing we sail around that, and go dodging around among all these islands?"

"What a lot of them!" said Maud. "I shouldn't think we could help hitting some of them in our big ship."

"They're not so near together on the ocean as they are on the map," said papa, smiling. "But go on. Where do we strike land that it isn't so easy to sail around?"

"South America!" shouted Maud eagerly, "almost exactly at Quito."

"Well; supposing we leave our ship and go back into the country, where it is so rocky that hardly a green thing is seen, and not a stream or a spring to be found; what would you do there for a drink of water?"

"I s'pose I'd go without," said Maud, "I don't suppose any water-cups grow there."

"They do, though; in the shape of the only plant that can flourish in such a place—the Cactus."

"Like those in the green house?" asked Maud, with interest, "ugly prickly things!"

"The same family, but of different kinds," said papa. "Many of them are full of water. One especially—the Melo Cactus—is round in shape, and as big through as a dining plate. It is covered with sharp thorns, and an ugly thing to handle, but it is a treasure in that country; it is more than a cup, it is a big bowl of water. The natives prize it very highly, and even the animals are said to break it open carefully with their hoofs, and drink the contents. But perhaps by this time you're tired of water, and would prefer a glass of milk."

"O yes! I should!" answered Maud. "Well, then, we would have to hunt up a Cow-Tree."

"A what?" cried Maud.

"A Cow-Tree, which gives milk," went on papa, while Maud's eyes grew bigger and bigger.

"You only need to stick a knife into the trunk, to get a stream of beautiful white milk, almost exactly like that which you drink every day, only with a pleasant odor."

"I should be afraid to drink it," said Maud.

"You need have no fear," said papa. "The natives drink it all the time, and it is entirely harmless. There are several water plants in this country. One is a vine something like the Water Withe, only it is like a running brook inside the stem, and you have to hurry your drink, or it would all run out on the ground. Another supply of water is to be found in the roots of a certain forest tree which grows there. In fact, Maudie, there's hardly a place in the world where that precious fluid is not to be found by those who know how to look for it, though you'll never be able to go and see for yourself, till you learn to wait half an hour for your drink of water."—N. Y. Examiner.

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger.

Intercommunion.

No. 3.

BY J. C. BLAKNEY.

Let our discussions be intelligently conducted, and dignified in their bearings. Nothing is gained by resorting to any thing like subterfuge. We should present and substantiate our arguments, and leave both undignified manner and matter to those whose tastes and habits qualify them for such business.

I thought that Bro. Munro, having taken the affirmative of the question on intercommunion, would present affirmative arguments, and answer my objections. Instead of this, he has confirmed, at least, five out of my six arguments against intercommunion.

He has shown the futility of the effort to sustain intercommunion by scripture.

His argument does away with the heaven-ordained separate and independent constitution of our churches; encourages a disrespect for church discipline; puts it out of the power of the local churches to preserve the purity of the ordinance; and virtually yields the question of the analogy between the passover and the supper. And all that now remains, for Bro. M. to accept my negative argument, is to say that intercommunion is not essentially necessary.

He assumes that I am quite alone in denying that the members of one Baptist church have the scriptural right to commune in other Baptist churches of the same faith and order.

You will, therefore, permit me to give a few from the many things which have been said by some of the ablest "Baptist Bible scholars" upon this subject.

Prof. Curtis, author of "Progress of Baptist Principles" says,— "Thus, then, it is clear (i. e., from 1 Cor. 11) that the Lord's Supper is given in charge to those visible churches of Christ, in the midst of which he has promised to walk and dwell (Rev. ii. 2.) To each of these it belongs to celebrate it as one family. (Then certainly not as parts of different families or bodies.) The members of that particular church are to be tarried for, and it is to be a symbol of their relations, as members, to each other."

Dr. A. P. Williams, a Baptist author, says— "If he (a member of one church) ever has a right anywhere else, it must be either by a transfer of membership or by courtesy, see Lord's Supper, p. 94. "But this courtesy can not be exercised in violation of church discipline or of divine authority. Tract on Communion, "He (a regular Baptist) has a right to Communion in the church of (to) which he has been added; but nowhere else. As he had no general right when running at large, so he has no general right now."—Lord's Supper, p. 93.

Dr. T. G. Jones says—"The first Supper, we have seen, was celebrated in the church and by its members alone—not even the mother of Jesus or the other holy women who so loved and served him, or the seventy evangelists whom he had sent forth to propagate his gospel being invited to it." See late work.

Richard Fuller says—"As the Passover was a meal for each family only, so the Supper is a family repast for the members of that particular church in which the table is spread."

Dr. Arnold says—"Such a principle is in our judgement incompatible, alike with the independence and the responsibility of churches—with their independence, because it takes from them the right to judge of the qualifications of those whom they receive to their highest privileges; and with their responsibility, because it deprives them of the power to guard the table of the Lord against the approach of the unworthy." Prerequisites to Com., p. 62.

Dr. Gardner says—"A member of one Baptist church has no more right to claim the privilege of voting in another Baptist church, than has a Campbellite, Methodist, or Presbyter. The same is equally true of Communion at the Lord's Table, which is a church act, and the appointed token, not of Christian or denominational, but of the church fellowship subsisting between communicants at the same table. Hence it follows that a member of one Baptist church has no more right, as a right, to claim communion in another Baptist church, than he has to claim the right of voting,

for both are equally church acts and church privileges. The Lord's Supper being a church ordinance, as all admit, and every church being required to exercise discipline over all its communicants, it necessarily follows that no church can scripturally, (and it is certain that it can not unscripturally) extend its communion beyond the limits of its discipline. And this, in fact, settles the question of Church Communion, and restricts the Lord's Supper to the members of each particular church as such." Com., p. 18, 19.

The following letter is from the same author, written to a friend.

"MY DEAR BROTHER:—In compliance with your request I would state that I have long regarded Intercommunion among Baptists at the Lord's Table as unscriptural and of evil tendency. It does no good, but much harm, and ought to be abandoned in all our churches. There is neither precept nor example for it in the New Testament; it is a modified form of loose Communion wholly at war with church discipline. The limits of church discipline are the scriptural limits of Communion at the Lord's Table.

I take this ground in my Book on "Church Communion, and in the new and revised edition it will be more clearly and fully presented.

"Yours, fraternally,
W. W. GARDNER."

Dr. Furguson, of the CENTRAL BAPTIST, St. Louis, Mo., says—"A local ceremonial institution must of necessity be in the hands of a definite class. Jesus committed the Supper either to local churches or to the ministry. If to the latter, the priest is right in carrying the bread and wine from house to house, and in giving to, or withholding from whom he pleases. If to the former, then Communion is by the nature of the law restricted to the local church, and cannot be carried beyond unless there is positive warrant. If any kind of Communion is to have a title to denote that it is exceptional or peculiar, that kind is 'loose' Communion. Church Communion, we repeat, is the indisputable law of the New Testament on the subject. Any invitation must be upon the wholly gratuitous supposition of an implied, not expressed, liberty; and it does not then follow that the minister has any more right to invite than the humblest member."

Dr. D. Spencer, after showing that no invitations were given by the first churches, nor yet in the days of Justin Martyr, in the second century, says—"How, then, did invitations originate? The answer is plain. They originated with the perversion of the ordinance. When the ordinance came to take the place of Christ, the churches began to invite to it, as they had formerly invited to Christ. Hence in Romish churches to day you hear plenty of invitations to ordinances, but none to Christ." "Invitations to the Supper."

Now, at the risk of losing sight altogether of our Bro. M., I will give an extract from Dr. J. R. Graves' work on this question. After having demonstrated the unscripturalness, inconsistency, and evil tendency of intercommunion, he says—"Now let the thoughtful, candid reader, in weighing all these specifications, especially consider the following before rendering his verdict:

1. If Christ originated his churches to be independent bodies, as all admit would it not be reasonable to conclude that he appointed a symbolism, in some permanent and oft repeated ordinance, that would set this fact forth; that, so long as the churches rightly observed the ordinance, the centralization, interdependence unification, or consolidation of his churches could never be effected? Have we not seen that the divine symbolism of the Supper does teach the absolute independency of the local churches, i. e., that each church is complete in itself—has sole control of its ordinance—is alone responsible for its right observance, and since it symbolizes church relations, that none but its own members can unite in its joint participation? I can but think that to preserve his churches from centralizing tendencies and inevitable hierarchism, was one of the reasons why he guarded this ordinance with such fearful sanctions.

2. Is it not evident that the practice of Intercommunion involves the implied right, on the part of the churches, to change Christ's appointments, thus assuming legislative powers, and even assuming the right to abrogate and abolish Christ's own appointments? For

if Christ did appoint the Supper to be observed by each church alone, and, as such, the eating of one loaf to symbolize that all the participants are fellow-members of the one and self same church, then to extend this privilege to others than its members, is to contravene Christ's appointments and to make void one of his ordinances by its traditions.

3. Let the thoughtful reader mark this fact, that Intercommunion must be abandoned if church discipline is to be sustained, or the independency of the churches given up and an interdependency adopted, practically at least, by which the acts of one church, however unrighteous, bind every other—thus precluding the possibility of an excluded person joining another church—and councils, associations, and conventions practically made courts of appeal, and the churches inevitably controlled by their decisions. But ministers control these bodies, ever have and ever will, and hence Intercommunion is the legislative parent of the hierarchy. If any one of these inconsistencies or evils is admitted, then INTERCOMMUNION IS UNSCRIPTURAL."

What church does Brother Munro refer to, when he says, "If the practice of the Baptist Church has been unscriptural and untenable with reference to the Communion, it is time that she changed her practice, and got on scriptural ground?" It is certain that he can not mean the Baptist denomination, because churches of the denomination are not "constitutionally" one church, neither did they ever commune denominationally. He says—"The church at Corinth could not celebrate the Lord's Supper, because there were divisions among them, respecting their ministers and teachers. Now, in this distracted state they could not come together to celebrate the Supper, because they would thereby teach that Christ was divided, 1 Cor. i. Were the Baptists ever perfectly agreed respecting their ministers and teachers?" If so, when and where? And, if not why violate the divine injunction?

This one church idea, whether the Catholic or Universal church theory, or National or Provincial theory, is unscriptural, and only used for a purpose. The scriptures represent a church as being a local organization, a single congregation, complete in itself, independent of all other bodies, civil or religious, and the highest and only source of ecclesiastical authority on earth, and amenable only to Christ! This is the Baptist theory!

Now if Bro. M. will take this scriptural view of a church and apply his language, as given in paragraphs 4 and 5 of his last article, he will both fall in line with his Baptist brethren, (see above authorities) and get "on scriptural ground." Otherwise he never has nor can scripturally celebrate the Lord's Supper, because he can not get all the members of his ideal church to agree, and if he could get them to agree, he can never get them to "come together to eat," and Paul says, "Tarry one for another." It is, therefore, very evident that our dear Bro. M. is in a dilemma, and that to accept the scriptural church theory is his only possible way of escape. Now, my Bro. M., be sure that that "whereunto" you "have already attained" is the rule of the Master of assemblies, and, then, have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness. Read carefully 1 Cor. v., and be careful not to misapply it.

For the Christian Messenger.
Exhibition Notes.

Some time last fall after the Halifax Exhibition, the Messenger had a piece headed "Exhibition Notes." The writer promised more on the same subject—we may yet have it, but if any one wants to have a hand in modelling the Dominion Exhibition to be held next September in the city of Halifax (if so much of this '1881' remain to the credit of the world) it is high time to be at it. There be many who are vain enough to think that their wise heads have in them something or many things that would, if known and acted upon by those who have the getting up of Exhibitions, make them—the Exhibitions I mean, much better, much more useful affairs than they otherwise would be or at least ever have been; I have no doubt of this. I have no doubt but that I have

some good ideas about Exhibitions. I am pretty certain that if some of the other knowing ones, and Uncle Ned had the planning and arrangement of these affairs,—leaving the carrying out of our plans and ideas to the 'city' gentlemen, who really seem to be very good fellows at this kind of thing—the mere executive part of the thing you know—these yearly shews would be every thing that could be wished. A modest preface—Now for the "valuable ideas," If there are not as many of them, or any as good as might be expected lay it to the hurrying season of the year, to anything but actual deficiency.

All Exhibitions or "Expositions" should have three main objects. They should shew the condition of the industries of the country, and the progress made from year to year, and should give a healthy stimulus to their further improvement. About others than the agricultural industry, and I have little if anything to say except this, The public should not have to pay for advertising this or that business concern. It is not the main thing to know who makes the best pianos or wheelbarrows or caskets, or the best any thing else—though these are fairly secondary matters. It is the main thing to shew what the country can do, and to get it to do still better and more abundantly.

And this is especially the case about agriculture. "The people must be fed" and that "the hand that holds the bread;" and the power, should be thoroughly skilled and guided by the best wisdom and urged to the greatest industry, is more than in every thing else to the interest of all.

Said one of my neighbors to me the other day—"What is the use of their wasting our money the way they do at Exhibitions, giving prizes for big punskins and potatoes and beets and big things generally, or for the best table potatoes that are judged only by the looks of them. Them cattle judges think they know which cow ought to have first prize, which second, and which third by the looks of them, without seeing the milk or the cream or the butter, or knowing anything of their record. What's the use of giving prizes for fast trotting horses—we don't want trotting horses, we want walking horses that will cover their,—say from four to six miles an hour according to load and road. Them's the fellers to give prizes for and horses that shew good training for farm work. The horse or the pair that kin fetch the biggest load in the best style, true and steady. Them's the boys. Sporting men and city folk uncovourse like to see those trotters spinning round and round the ring, and the fellers that set in the little spider wagins holdin on for dear life—but we want to hitch onto the dandy plows and try which's best man and best team, and whether the plow is as good as they look: Wouldn't it look kinder useful you know to see the farmers sittin on their express wagins and their teams walking round the way afore the loaded wagins as though goin to market?"

Them big punskins and things—xcuse me, I don't like to hear a man use sich words'n common talk, sounds mean, but I say words kinder quick when Im ril'd times. About them big taters and things. No farmer wants to raise the like sept for shows and prizes. The big potatoes are apt to be holler harted and other large things woody. Those exhibition punskins want as much feeding and care as a prize pig or calf. Now there's Green got a first prize for wheat actooly sot his children to work and picked out a bushel kernel by kernel. Could a done it with a good riddle. Same kind a thing's done with peas and beans and the like. Fair average of the field, thats it eh—and the way it was raised too. Farmers ought to be made tell how they raise stuff they send to Exhibitions. Essays you know. Musn't judge em by potry and flourishes—high falutin you know, but by understandableness. Amber sugar cane raisin—raisin cattle for English market, and that silo and silage bisness all want to be shewed up and essayed. I wanted to try a little patch of amber cane this spring mi-elf but its out of the reglar way and its about's hard to get out of the reglar way as to get a loaded wagon out'n a deep rut. Then one dont want to wastetime and manure, which's scarce enough, for what must have em in the