

they shall have entered upon the duties of their life-work they may be enabled the more effectually to advocate the claims of the missionary enterprise. In view of this fact, it was deemed expedient to organize a society wherein mutual assistance might be afforded in gaining a complete acquaintance with this important subject, and in aiding, to some extent at least, in raising funds for missionary purposes. Accordingly, at the close of the last collegiate year, the society was duly formed, and designated as above indicated. It is now in successful operation; and the encouraging characteristics of its present working seem to predict increasing usefulness in the future.

The first and leading object of the society is to gain information in reference to the history, character, and extent of Baptist missionary operations. To this end periodicals, devoted to these subjects, are taken; and a beautiful Map of the mission fields has been obtained from the Boston Mission Rooms. The meetings of the society are held monthly. At these meetings essays are read which have been carefully prepared by different members on subjects connected with the origin, progress and present condition of missionary work, home and foreign. Thus, by division of labor, important facts, useful statistics, interesting historical sketches, and valuable information in reference to the various departments of missionary effort, are each month placed before the members of the society. The Secretary, Bro. W. F. Armstrong, is at present engaged in preparing a concise history of Baptist Missions in India. The results of his researches are, from time to time, submitted; and, when completed, they will form a valuable contribution to our literature.

The second object, namely, to aid, in some degree, in raising missionary funds, is not, however, entirely overlooked. An annual fee of one dollar, or a life-membership fee of ten dollars, is paid by the members of the society. Besides this, upwards of twenty dollars have been raised by voluntary subscriptions for the support of a Karen native teacher.

These statements, published at the request of the society, are not put forth in the way of ostentation, but simply as an incentive to lead to the formation of other similar societies throughout these Provinces. There are many young men eminently qualified to carry out a scheme of this kind; and thus, whilst they may benefit themselves and others, they may also assist, in some measure, in promoting the grandest of all enterprises—the spread of the gospel among fallen humanity.

WM. H. WARREN, President.

Two or three weeks since—we had a letter from Rev. Mr. Cote, now laboring in Rome, to the *National Baptist*, written in November last. We find another in one of our New York exchanges of a later date.

LETTER FROM ROME.

The temporal power of the Pope is gone. This will remain the great event of the year 1870, and indeed, of the nineteenth century. Who can foretell the consequences and results that must follow!

The gospel is now preached in Rome. What a privilege to continue and carry on the work of the Apostle Paul, so long interrupted by the crafty devices of the Antichrist—that "Wicked whom the Lord shall consume with the Spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." This promise is already being fulfilled. We have distributed twenty thousand copies of the sacred Scriptures among the people, who received them with the greatest pleasure. The other day I went to St. Peter's in company with a friend, and there, on the magnificent piazza in front of the church, and under the very shadow of the Vatican, we distributed the Word of God. A man, coming out of the Vatican, attempted to stop us in our work, but was ultimately forced to retire before the strongly-expressed disapprobation of the crowd around us, who called him a Jesuit, and took up our defence. The police not only tolerate our colporteurs, but even encourage them to proceed with their work. A city guard, to whom a colporteur offered a copy of the sacred Scriptures, thankfully accepted it, and said to him, "Go on with your work. Rome has great need of such books as yours. You are doing noble work. We will protect you." But I am glad to say that

their protection has not been required in a single instance. We find the people willing, and even anxious to read our books. Some it is true, refuse them, but always politely. Strange to say, the motive of refusing is, in most cases, because they imagine our colporteurs are emissaries of the Pope, and they will have nothing from him, not even his blessing! We have opened three meetings, which are well attended. They are held in Via della Croce, between the Piazza di Spagna and the Corso; Via del Campidoglio, near the Capitol; and opposite the Mamertine Prisons and the magnificent ruins of the ancient Forum; and Via Paulo, near the Porte San Angelo and the Leonine City. I have, as fellow-laborers, a converted priest and two colporteurs, who work faithfully and zealously for the extension of our Master's kingdom. I ask for them and myself the prayers of the brethren and sisters of America. Like the Apostle Paul, writing from this city to the Ephesians, we would request you all to pray for us, "that utterance may be given unto us, that we may open our mouths boldly, to make known the mystery of the gospel" to the degenerate descendants of the primitive Roman Christians.

W. N. COTE.

Rome, Dec. 15, 1870.

The Christian Messenger.

Halifax, N. S., February 1st, 1871.

FAITH, BAPTISM, COMMUNION.

Much space has of late been given by some of our contemporaries to a discussion of the communion question. An attempt has been made by a few writers to open up the subject of restricted communion, by inquiring whether baptism is indeed a prerequisite to communion, or, if the Lord's Supper may not properly be administered to persons who have not received true scriptural baptism. This has called forth a host of writers affirming over again, for the hundredth time, the reasons for the Baptist practice in this respect. Of course the advocates of infant baptism have sought to fan the flame, and have seized hold of every point supposed to have been made in favour of relaxing the restriction in the observance of the Supper. When Pedo-baptist advocates of open communion seek to shew that Baptism is not a prerequisite to communion the less considerate of them, seem to forget that such a statement condemns their own practice and that of all Christendom besides. The fact is the argument thus used is as much against the principles and practices of the Pedobaptists themselves, as against Baptists. This however is put out of sight by them, for the purpose of influencing those Baptists who may lean towards the looser instead of the closer communion.

The question to our mind, is a very simple one, and may be easily settled beyond controversy. The plain order of a New Testament reception of Christianity is, 1. Faith, 2. Baptism, 3. Fellowship and Communion. Believing, as we do, that the baptismal question is settled beyond controversy, resting on our Lord's word:—"Whoever believeth and is baptized shall be saved;" it is evident that no Baptism is scriptural except the subject is first a believer. Taking this for granted, we say that the apostolic practice is the best guide in leading to a correct understanding of our Lord's instruction in this matter. We find this so beautifully described in Acts ii. 41, that no further argument is required. Read the passage:—

Then they that gladly (1) received his word (2) were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. And they continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine, and (3) fellowship and in breaking of bread and in prayers.

Here is not only a very strong presumption, but we think absolute proof that no other order was thought of in apostolic times. It is as improper to put baptism before faith as to put communion before baptism; and vice versa.

An article in a late No. of the *N. Y. Examiner* by Rev. Dr. A. C. Kendrick is so much to the purpose that, believing it will be read with pleasure, we copy it entire:

BAPTISM BEFORE COMMUNION.

A late number of the *Richmond Religious Herald* contains a brief letter from Rev. Dr. Caswell, President of Brown University, on the relation of baptism to the communion, and the duties of Baptists growing out of it. In the course of the letter he says:

The very strong presumption, on my own mind, is that baptism preceded the communion, in the practice of the primitive Church. And that, I think, of course, should be the rule. But can that practice be shown to rest upon any positive command of Christ or the Apostles? If it can, then the question is settled. If it cannot be shown, then are we called upon to make assent to this doctrine of close communion a test question in admitting members to our Churches?

Now, is it really a question whether, by the command of the Master, and in the practice of the Apostles, baptism precedes, and is a prerequisite to the communion? Is there really nothing more than a very strong presumption that such was the fact? Is not the fact as certain as the most explicit language and the most unvarying usage could make it? If it is, it must be capable of being shown, and ought to be shown, that all reasonable doubt shall be laid to rest. If it is not, Baptist Churches, and all Churches, ought to understand it, and adjust their usage to the state of the evidence. For myself, I do not see how a candid and careful survey of the language and usage of the New Testament can allow us to doubt that the injunction of our Lord did most distinctly and unequivocally place baptism in advance of the communion. Three things concur in forcing me to this conclusion: The nature of the two rites, the command of the Lord, and the practice of his Apostles.

What is the baptism of the New Testament? It is the act by which the new-born believer outwardly and symbolically puts off his body of sin and puts on Christ; by which he professedly dies to the world, and rises to and with Christ in a spiritual resurrection. It is the assumption, by the new-born child of God, of the badge of sonship and discipleship,—the act by which he formally, publicly, solemnly enrolls himself among the followers of the Redeemer. Where, then, does it properly come? I answer, it follows immediately upon that act of faith by which he has allied himself to the Redeemer. It is the birth from water, following upon and symbolizing the birth from the Spirit: it is the "bath (washing) of regeneration," accompanying and sealing the "renewing of the Holy Ghost." It has its fixed and definite place in the believer's life. It stands at the threshold; it belongs to the starting-point of the life, and nowhere else. It is to be performed once, and once for all. It is not a duty of the professed believer; it is specific outward mode in which its subject becomes a professed believer.

And what is the communion? It is the professed disciples recognition, from time to time, of that death which brings him life, and of Him who suffered it. It is the Church's standing mode of declaring to an unbelieving world her faith in her unseen Lord,—of re-kindling, through affecting visible symbols, her memory of his self-sacrificing love, and her hope of his glorious re-appearing. It is in its nature designed for repetition,—to be done over and over again,—the frequently-repeated spiritual banquet of the Lord's house: "This do, so often as ye do it, in memory of me."

The difference in the nature of the two ordinances thus fixes their relation to each other. The one stands at the gateway of the believer's course; is done once for all, and never repeated. It is his act of enlistment,—of consecration,—and its proper significance would be destroyed either by postponement or by repetition. The other is the prerogative of the professed and living Christian; it is part of the rich provision made by the Lord of the way to refresh his spirit, and cheer the toil and burden of his pilgrimage. In accordance, now, with this, is our Saviour's command. Where has he placed baptism? On whom has he enjoined it? "Go, disciple all the nations, baptizing them into the name," etc. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Nothing can be more explicit than this language. It couples in indissoluble union faith and baptism; the faith preceding, as the essential act,—the baptism following, as the commanded and obligatory symbol.

And how did the Apostles interpret their Lord's command? Were there a single case recorded of apparent departure from its obvious requirement, we might hesitate in our judgment. But there is not one. "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, for the remission of sin." "Who can forbid water, that these should be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" "Lo, here is water," said the just-converted eunuch, "what doth hinder me to be baptized? And . . . he baptized him." "He washed them from their stripes, and was baptized and all his house straightway;" and such is the unbroken tenor of the New Testament testimony. Baptism appears everywhere as the new-born believer's mode of testifying his faith in Christ; of declaring his discipleship; of turning his back on his former life of sin; and of dedicating himself henceforth to a life of devotion to Christ.

When, then, we are asked whether Christ has distinctly commanded that baptism should precede admission to the Lord's table, we answer unhesitatingly that he has. If we are asked, Where? we reply, in every instance in which he has given the command, either directly or indirectly, that we be baptized at all. He has made it the first act consequent upon and declaratory of the repenting sinner's acceptance of him as a Saviour. He has placed it at the head of those acts which mark him as an acknowledged follower of the Redeemer. He has placed it there, and nowhere else. To have formally and in terms stated that baptism must precede communion, would have been utterly gratuitous. It precedes it by its distinctive nature, and the place which the Lord has assigned to it in the Christian life. Baptism

precedes communion as necessarily as the Roman soldier's sacramentum,—his military oath,—preceded his discharging a soldier's duties and receiving a soldier's pay; as necessarily as the Hebrew priest's anointing preceded his discharge of priestly functions. If we are commanded to be baptized in the place and for the purpose in and for which the rite is enjoined. To refuse to submit to it at this point,—to remove it from this place,—is an act of disobedience. If a man is required, first of all, to testify his faith by baptism, then for him to thrust himself, unbaptized, into the assembly of believers, and assume their prerogatives,—is a flagrant impertinence. He is subverting a divine command. He is not merely changing the place of an ordinance,—he is setting aside and nullifying it. For, if he may interpose one communion season between his faith and his baptism, he may a thousand; if he may refuse at the outset to make his declaration of faith in the way described by the Lord, he may, and he logically will, refuse it all his life.

We would by no means hurry a penitent believer in submitting to baptism, before he is well assured in his own mind. We do not say that he necessarily sins who, deprived of the opportunity of a baptism for which he inwardly pants, should, under some peculiar circumstance, avail himself of an occasion for uniting himself with those with whom he feels himself spiritually allied, in commemorating their common Saviour's passion. We simply say that the order of baptism and communion would seem to be as fixed as a positive enactment can make it. It lies imbedded in the nature of the ordinances, the command of Christ, and the practice of his Apostles. These, together, form a three-fold cord of argument which cannot be broken. To attempt breaking it, is to rend asunder the divinely instituted union between faith and baptism. Our Lord's command links it with the first act of faith, and places it at the starting-point of the Christian life, as the expression of the allegiance which he has inwardly vowed, and the symbol of the regeneration which he has experienced. To remove it from that place is virtually to abrogate it altogether; for it is removing it from the place which the Lawgiver assigned to it, which Apostolic usage assigned to it, and in which alone it has significance and propriety. He who does so, does it at his peril.

PARIS FALLEN: THE WAR ENDED.

PARIS has at last wisely resolved to surrender to its powerful foe. The terms are of course most humiliating but no choice was left but absolute starvation and the utter extinction of the city, or the acceptance of the proposals of the Prussian leaders. Paris has no common history, for the past two thousand years; but of all the sieges it has endured perhaps there has been none equal to that now just closed. It may be interesting to notice some of the principal occasions on which it has had a besieging army around it. Here is a list:—

- 53 B. C.—The Romans fought a successful battle outside the city, and then entered it.
- 463 A. D.—Childeric I. drove out the Romans.
- 845.—The Normans pillaged and burned the city.
- 887.—Charles the Fat surrendered the city to Normans after standing a twelve months' siege.
- 1358.—The Dauphin, afterward Charles V., laid siege to Paris without success, and the attempt of Edward III. in the following year was attended with a similar result.
- 1420.—The English troops captured the city and held it for sixteen years, notwithstanding the attempt of Charles VII. to reduce it in 1427.
- 1464.—The Count of Charolais attempted its capture, and failed.
- 1536.—The Emperor Charles V., of Germany, likewise failed to capture it.
- 1593.—Paris sustained a memorable siege during the civil war, and opened its gates to Henry IV. in the following year.
- 1814.—The Allied troops occupied Paris, and reestablished the monarchy under Louis XVIII.
- 1815.—After the battle of Waterloo the Allied troops again captured the city, and occupied it for three years.

To this may now be added that of 1870-71. When Prussia under the Emperor William of Germany has after several weeks bombardment, compelled submission, and will shortly enter the city in triumph; and probably dictate the form of Government France shall adopt.

There will be but little difficulty we presume in putting down any rioting or disturbance that may be attempted by the populace. The great question will be what form of government shall now be recognized by the people, and approved by the dominant German Empire.

The terms of peace offered by Bismarck are the surrender of Paris, cession of Alsace and Lorraine; payment of one thousand million francs, and surrender of

forty war ships and one colony. The money indemnity must be guaranteed by the municipalities. If this is refused, the property of rich individuals will be held in possession, as a guarantee of payment.

The army of Paris, regiments of the line, Marines and Mobiles, are to be prisoners of war, with the exception of 12,000 men who are required to maintain order in Paris. All the corps of Franco-Tireurs are to be disbanded and the National Guard will remain armed. The French troops will deliver their arms, flags and field artillery within fourteen days, all of which will be collected at Suzan. French troops may retire into Paris unarmed. The cannons of forts are to be delivered up, but the ancient guns are to be dismounted. The carriages are to be delivered to the Prussians, but the guns, themselves, are to be left. Three railway lines will be repaired and permitted to carry sufficient supplies for the daily nourishment of the people of Paris.

Alarming rumors prevail of serious riots in Paris since the certainty of its capitulation has been made known.

The emperor William has sent the following despatch to the Empress Augusta:

VERSAILLES, Jan. 29.—"Last night an armistice of three weeks was signed. The Regulars and Mobiles are to be detained in Paris as prisoners of war. The National Guard will render maintenance of order. We occupy all the forts. Paris remains invested, but will be allowed to revictual as soon as the arms are surrendered. The National Assembly is summoned to meet at Bordeaux in a fortnight. All the armies in the field will be retained in their respective positions. The ground between the opposing lines is to be neutral. This is the reward of patriotism, heroism and great sacrifices. Thank God for this fresh mercy. May peace soon follow."

WILLIAM.

On the assembling of the National Assembly, the form of the future government will be discussed. It will doubtless be one of the following: Napoleon will be restored to power with institutions similar to those existing before the war; or a member of the Orleans family with more restricted popular privileges; or else, what is scarcely probable, a Republic dependent wholly on the popular vote.

OUR LOCAL LEGISLATURE will meet to-morrow, and enter upon the duties of the closing session of the present Parliament. It is supposed that the sitting will be a short one. It being the last of the present House of Assembly, the measures and speeches will probably have reference largely to the coming election. There will doubtless be attempts made by certain parties to obtain advantages for themselves in consideration of promising support on the next election day.

Will the House be asked to express sympathy with the Pope? Or to give moral and material support towards placing him again on the throne of the States of the Church? Perhaps not exactly in the bald shape of a petition like the one to the Queen. Nor is it likely that a demand for Separate Schools for Roman Catholics will be made again to the present House, seeing that there has been so decided a refusal given in former sessions, and as we believe, a large portion of the Roman Catholic people themselves deprecate any such movement.

It will be necessary however for the constituencies to be on the alert, even more so than they commonly are.—It needs great firmness in the representatives to resist the temptations frequently offered at the close of a Parliament.

Political bargains are sought for by those who have but a low estimate of morality and public virtue. The people should stand prepared to give support to their representatives in any measures that may be beneficial, and to remonstrate promptly against any that may be of an opposite tendency.

MORE ABOUT THE EXAMINATION OF TEACHERS.

The address delivered before the Teachers' Association at Picton a short time since by T. H. Rand, Esq., late Superintendent of Education, has been made the occasion of bringing forth during the past two weeks some curious matters in relation to Teachers' examinations.

The protest of Mr. Rand against the Minute of Council made on that occasion respecting the granting of licenses to Teachers without examination, called forth some remarks in an editorial of the *Chronicle* defending the said Minute, and at the same time charging Mr. Rand himself with not adhering to the law respecting Teachers' examinations. Mr. Rand denied the charge and challenged proof.

We did not care to interfere with the discussion while it was in progress, but now that it has closed we believe our readers are entitled to a resumé of the case, and we are better able to give a fair review, and one that will not be