

and at last she noticed it. Also that my eyes were rather red.

"This little girl looks as if she had been crying. I hope you have not made her cry, Tommy my dear?"

"Tommy was silent. But I eagerly declared that Tommy had not made me cry. Tommy was never unkind to me.

"I am glad to hear it Evangeline' (she always gave me my full name); and I hope you too are a good child, who is never in mischief, and above all never tells lies. If I were not quite sure of that, I could not allow Tommy to play with you."

"She looked us full in the face as if she saw through and through us—which she did not, being very short-sighted—yet I felt myself tremble in every limb. As for Tommy he just glanced at me and glanced away again, turning crimson to the very roots of his hair, but he said nothing.

"What would have happened next, I cannot tell: we waited in terror, holding one another's hands under the table-cloth. But mercifully at that very instant the old lady was fetched to speak with some one, and we two children had to finish our tea alone.

"It almost choked us—me, at any rate. But as soon as ever it was over, and Tommy and I found ourselves safe out in the garden, flung my arms around his neck and told him all.

"And Tommy believed me. No matter whether the others did or not, Tommy believed me—at last! Tommy sympathized with me, comforted me, thought I was not so very wicked even though I had told a lie, but not the one I was accused of telling. Tommy wept with me over all I had suffered, and promised that, though perhaps it was better to let the matter rest now, if such a thing were to happen again, he would not be afraid of Will or anybody, but would stand up for me like a man."

"And did he do it?" asked Cherry, with slight incredulity in her tone.

"He never had the opportunity. A week after this he was suddenly sent for to join his parents abroad, and I never saw my friend Tommy any more."

"But did you never hear of him? Is he alive still? He must be a very old gentleman by this time."

"Very. No doubt a father—possibly even a grandfather," replied Cousin Eva, smiling.

Cherry blushed. "I didn't mean that, since he was barely as old as you and, you are certainly not a grandmother. But I want to hear more of Tommy. Is he married."

"I really cannot say. The last time I heard of him was ten years ago, when he was living somewhere abroad—I rather think at Shanghai. He was not married then."

"I wish," whispered Ruth solemnly, "I wish he would come back to England and marry you."

Cousin Eva laughed. "There might be two opinions on that question, you know. But oh! My children, when you are married and have children of your own, remember my story. If ever a poor little thing looks up in your face saying, 'I didn't do that,' believe it! If it sobs out, I'm not naughty, don't call it naughty! Give it the benefit of the doubt. Have patience, take time; and, whatever you do, don't make it afraid. Cowards are always liars. Of the two evils it is less harmful to believe a person who tells a lie than to doubt another who is speaking the truth."

"I think so too," said Cherry sagely. "Remember poor Jeanne d'Arc."

"And poor Cousin Eva," added Ruth, kissing the well beloved hand.

And so in the fading twilight, the three rose up together, and went down the hill from Notre-Dame de Bon Secours.

The following from American Baptist papers may convey a lesson to some brethren in England:—"We know a preacher who has never, we think, spoken a kind word concerning this paper, except when he wished us to aid him in securing a new field of labor, or to make some announcement concerning him."—*Religious Herald*. "That man was living in Alabama not long ago. When did he move to Virginia?"—*Alabama Baptist*. "There must be some mistake about this man, for he was certainly a resident of South Carolina quite recently."—*Baptist Courier*. "That man must be ubiquitous. We know him here in Kentucky. 'He has been with us, is still with us, and he promises to remain with us to the end.'"—*Western Recorder*.

Public Spirit.

Every man owes a duty to the town in which he resides, to advance its prosperity, to add to its advantages for residence to make it the abode of kindly sentiment, brotherly love and neighborly feeling. It is a shame for a man to use the community as a shepherd uses his sheep—merely to shear the wool. Money—material gain—is not all of life. Barren would be the spot where no man respected his neighbor's rights. That man is a disgrace to the civilization of the nineteenth century whose every day duties are regulated by the thought, "Can I better myself at the expense of the town or of the community to which I belong?"

Of course a community is only an aggregation of individuals. The residents of a town, however, stamp the same character and reputation upon the place of their residence, that actuates their own conduct in life. A stream cannot rise higher than its fountain head, neither can the tone of society rise above the motives and sentiments of its individual members. A village is denominated a smart, active place simply because a few leading men are enterprising, sagacious and public-spirited. Brains, spirit and energy will triumph over natural obstacles. A fertile soil may be of little value to a lazy community while careful cultivation may render a sandy plain productive.

Many a once thrifty town can date its decay from the removal of some wide awake enterprising citizen. Few people appreciate the real money value of their public-spirited neighbors, and in far too many communities live business men meet discouragements from those who do not work themselves and seem to de-light in preventing others. It is unfair to expect a few men to bear the burden of making a reputation for a town, when a little cooperation among even its humblest citizens can accomplish the most beneficial results. New England towns of the greatest promise a year ago have gone to decay because its young men have found no welcome or encouragement in their enterprising designs, and have been forced to migrate to the city or to the Western prairie to find scope for their powers and ambitions.

A little reflection upon this important subject will in many cases develop the cause of the business stagnation and depression in real estate in many of our rural towns. A little determination on the part of its citizens to perform their duty towards the community in which they live, will transform a sleepy section into a most active locality, attracting new residents, infusing new life into old residents, advancing values of property, increasing incomes, making good local markets for produce, and adding to the sum total of human happiness and content. Is not this result worth striving for?

The Duties of a Mother.

She should be firm, gentle, kind; always ready to attend to her child.

She should never laugh at him, at what he does that is cunning; never allow him to think of his looks, except to be neat and clean in all his habits.

She should teach him to obey a look; to respect those older than himself. She should never make a command without seeing that it is performed in a proper manner.

Never speak of a child's faults or foibles or remarks before him; it is a sure way to spoil a child.

Never reprove a child when excited, nor let your voice be raised when correcting him. Strive to inspire love, not dread—respect, not fear. Remember you are training and educating a soul for eternity.

Teach your child to wait on himself; to put away a thing when done with it. But do not forget that you were once a child. The griefs of little ones are often neglected; they are too great for them. Bear patiently with them, and never in any way raise their anger if it can be avoided.

Teach a child to be useful whenever opportunity may offer.

Some 80,000 acres of land between Joppa and Jerusalem, having been secured from the Turkish Government, a colony is being formed for the persecuted Jews of the Continent. Already a goodly number of families have established themselves upon the land.

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger. Intercommunion and the New Testament.

BY T. M. MUNRO.

I continue to affirm that the Lord's Supper should not be denied any lawfully qualified subject of the kingdom of Christ on earth. Positively there is nothing in the New Testament to prohibit it, but a great deal to encourage it. Nothing as yet has been produced by Bro. Bleakney to prove that the practice of the Baptist churches regarding the Lord's Supper is inconsistent with the teaching of inspiration. All that he has said himself, and all that he has quoted, to my mind does not amount to the slightest puff of air on the subject, because he has failed to substantiate what he has advanced by the word of God. One word from the inspired record is worth more than all the opinions of men. But as Bro. B. has not the Scriptures on his side he must get Dr. Jones and Dr. Gardener and Arnold to help him. A drowning man will catch at straws. He must do something.

In his last article he has given us a long catalogue of quotations from certain Doctors of Divinity, but every one of them fails to show that the practice of intercommunion is unscriptural. Before I sift these quotations, I will ask Bro. B. if he and Dr. Hovey, and others whom he has quoted, practice what they preach, referring to the communion, of course. Please answer in the next.

Now for the quotations. The first is from Prof. Curtis referring to the 11th chapter of 1st Corinthians, which shows 1. That Paul received a renewal of the institution of the Lord's Supper by special revelation, which greatly enhanced its solemnity. Luke and Paul agree in their accounts of the institution, which is a strong proof of its genuineness, verse 23.

2. In this chapter Paul labours to show the Corinthian church the difference between the Passover Supper and the Lord's Supper. A love feast was substituted by the Corinthian church in the place of the Passover Supper, and which preceded the Lord's Supper. This church did not separate them; hence there was confusion and disorder. The rich provided for the poor members, but it occurred that the rich partook first, and the poor were despised. As Paul says in verse 21: "For in eating every one taketh before other his own supper; and one is hungry and another is drunken." This was the result. And when the Lord's Supper came on a due discernment of its solemnity was out of the question. There was an unworthy participation. "But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup." It is very evident that Paul is dealing with an evil in the church, not intercommunion. Hence this quotation affords no strength to the argument against our general practice.

The second quotation is from Dr. Williams: "He a regular Baptist, has a right to commune in the church to which he belongs, but no where else. As he had no general right when running at large, so he has no general right now." Paul was a Roman citizen, and, therefore, had a right to all the freedom and privileges of Roman citizenship in any city or place in the empire. So has the subject of Christ's kingdom who has submitted to all the requirements of the gospel a right to the Supper of his Lord whenever he finds it administered in a New Testament church. The command is, "take eat." "Do it in remembrance of me," that is all. Will Bro. B. show anything more?

The third quotation, and the only one that I shall consider any further, is from Dr. Jones. "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." Its members alone. Dr. Jones is made to say that the twelve constituted the church entire at this time. Where is the Scripture for this? Where is the Scripture for a regularly organized church at this time. The word *ekklesia* does not convey the idea of organization, but merely an assembly convoked, a congregation.

Now the seventy evangelists and those "holy women" were not called together. But were they not qualified? Were the seventy sent out by Christ to preach, and baptize all that believed, not having themselves first submitted to the requirements of John the Baptist? We believe they had been baptized by John just as much as the twelve, and hence just as much qualified for the ordinance of the Lord's Supper as the twelve. Then why not here? Because Christ did not choose them to be with Him as He did the twelve? "And He ordained twelve that they should be with Him," Mark iii. 14. "After these things the Lord appointed other seventy also, and sent them two and two before His face into every city and place where He Himself would come," Luke x. 1. The twelve were to be with Him. The seventy He sent abroad to preach. Luke does not say that the seventy were unfit for the Supper because they had not been invited. The same with the holy women. Christ's will and choice respecting the twelve who were appointed to prepare the Passover and to be with Him at the institution of the Supper is not our rule. If it were so we must commune with twelve men, and forever exclude the women from the Supper. So the argument here to support an inter-restricted communion falls to the ground. Bro. B., you must give us stronger meat than that. This milk and water argument will not do. But it is again argued "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." I deny it positively. The Lord's Supper is no more a church ordinance than that of baptism. It is an institution of Christ, to be celebrated by all those who believe in the "one Lord," embrace the "one Faith," and practice the "one Baptism." If I have submitted to Christ in all things necessary to qualify me for the Supper, I have a right to this ordinance; and you would not be treating me as a follower of Christ should be if you were to deny me that right, knowing that I was Scripturally qualified. It is the Lord's Table, and as a true follower of Christ I have a right to it. Voting is business. I have no right to interfere with this business unless invited to do so. The Lord's Supper is an institution, a spiritual privilege to be celebrated by all who believe in Christ to the saving of the soul, and submit to New Testament baptism, and who perfect holiness in the fear of the Lord. But Bro. B. limits the Supper at the bounds of church discipline, and quotes Dr. Gardener in his defence. I understand by this he makes them co-extensive in that particular church. Bro. B. differs from the New Testament considerably. I would like to ask Bro. Bleakney what has he to do with another's servant? What right has he to judge? "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat that bread and drink that cup."

If a man do not walk according to the rules and regulations of the New Testament he should not belong to the church. He has no right there. He is not a Christian. With such we should not eat the bread and drink the cup. But it does happen, and that in the same church, members who do not speak to each other, who discountenance each other, who say bad things about each other, sit down together at the Lord's Table. Where is church discipline in this case? What would you do in this case? Exclude them from the Supper? No. But, according to Bro. B.'s theory touching church discipline limiting the communion to it, these persons cannot sit down at the table of the Lord; but it is done, and will be done again. If so, why not commune with a brother of another Baptist church who walks in all the commands of his Lord, even if the discipline of that church does not extend to him? We be brethren of the great Baptist family, believing in one Lord, and practicing one faith, and therefore have the right to all the ordinances and privilege of the gospel. No, Bro. B., I am not "in a dilemma," I am in the light of Scripture, and on a ground that you cannot undermine or destroy with all your divinity pickaxes. My arguments still remain, because based on the word of truth. That is for the 5th of 1st Corinthians I have read it, and believe it. No Baptist church should

commune with such characters as Paul mentions in that chapter; if there be such in Bro. B.'s church, "deliver such unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." This is the Apostle's advice, and I hope that the Berwick Bishop will follow it.

"To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to these it is because there is no light in them." With this advice to my respected Bro. B., I dismiss the subject.

For the Christian Messenger. The Outlook for the Year.

TRURO, July 29, 1881.

Dear Bro. Selden,—

I think you were with us at our last morning prayer meeting in connection with our Eastern Association. If so, you will remember that special Divine influences were felt. During the meeting a brother asked that united prayer be then and there offered that the Spirit's power might be experienced in a marked and unusual manner in the churches of our Association during the incoming Associational year. A season of silent prayer, followed by audible supplication and appropriate remarks, showed that all present were in sympathy with the request, and heartily responded to it. But many of the churches were not represented at North Sydney, who would be interested in the united prayer referred to, and join their petitions with those of their brethren who were present if they knew of it, and I hereby avail myself of your widely circulated paper to call the attention of our churches to this important matter.

On my return to my people, I brought to their notice in the social meeting the request referred to, and asked them to unite in the petition, which they did with hearty good will.

All the brethren who were at the Association will, I am quite sure, do the same, and I would humbly but earnestly call upon the entire membership of our churches to join in the prayer.

Let the low state of many of the churches and the unsaved condition of a large proportion of our congregations and Sunday Schools be remembered at the family altars, in the sanctuaries, and in the closet. We have the unfailing promise of Jesus to plead at the mercy seat. See Matt. xviii. 19, and Luke xi. 13, and hundreds more.

When we pray let us exercise implicit faith in the Divine Promiser, and let us see to it, brethren beloved, that we so live and labor as to illustrate the earnestness and sincerity of our prayers, and, I doubt not, before the year closes a healthier condition will be manifest in the churches, and those who live to assemble with the church in Pughwash next year, will rejoice in large and blessed answers to prayer.

Yours in Christ Jesus, J. E. GOUCHER.

For the Christian Messenger. The Theological Department.

Mr. Editor,—

As different persons are making inquiries by letter concerning the Theological Department and its prospective work for the coming year, you will oblige by permitting me through your columns to give the following information to those desiring it.

A plan of Theological study for both partial course students and graduates was submitted to the Governors of the College at their late meeting in June, and received their approval.

In this plan it is proposed that partial course students be admitted to instruction in Theology on having passed the usual matriculation examination. It is not thought that, as a rule, partial course students should enter upon Theological study before reaching this point. Deviations from this rule may be made, but only for reasons satisfactory to the President of the College and the Principal of the Theological Department.

It is proposed again that the course of study for partial students course occupy three years, and that, in addition to Theological studies proper, it embrace such studies from the regular College course as will prove helpful to them in their life-work. Thus:—In the first year of their course they will take Hebrew Grammar under the Professor of Hebrew, and Greek Language, Rhetoric, and