

COMMUNICATIONS.

Vindication of the Communion of Baptist Churches.

A Review of the Present Views of Rev. J. R. Graves, D. D., of Nashville, Tennessee, as Found in His Book Entitled "Intercommunion Inconsistent, Unscriptural and Productive of Evil."

The Lord's Supper, and the Passover.

BY J. J. D. RENFROE.

No. V.

"For I have received of the Lord that which I also delivered unto you."—Paul.

Here is the connecting link between Christ and his churches in visible institutions—the infallible Apostles received from the Lord unmistakable revelation, and delivered to the churches in the correctness of that revelation, and delivered to the churches, as relates to the supper, the institution of the supper in the Lord's ecclesia, the transferring of it from the College of Apostles to the written word, which word is the constitution of the churches.

In coming to the third part of Dr. Graves' book, we reach his views of the institution and nature of the supper stated more specifically. In the preceding two hundred pages, he seems to have intended to lay the foundation for what was to follow, but the remaining one hundred and sixty pages would be much more influential for the accomplishment of his design, if he had committed the first and second parts to the flames. In this third part we have eight chapters and an appendix. It is my purpose to dispose of this—two chapters each week. In the mean time I may reach back occasionally, as heretofore, and bring up something of the past.

INSTITUTION OF THE SUPPER.

I have but little reason to dissent from the first chapter in Dr. Graves' third part, "The inspired account of the institution of the Lord's supper." (p. 205.) He publishes the New Testament narratives of the Passover feast between Christ and his Apostles, and of the institution of the supper, and then states twelve "facts," in two divisions, of six each, as drawn from these narratives; and nearly all strict communion Baptists will heartily agree with him touching most of these "facts." And therefore we need not now discuss these facts except as we can make them useful in our general purpose. His "sixth fact," where he

was not present at the institution of the supper, (p. 215), springs a question which cannot affect the subject of intercommunion; because, if Judas "went out at the command of Christ before the paschal supper was finished," as Dr. Graves contends, this can only be used to prove that each church should *purify itself* as far as possible in order to communion; but it can prove nothing as to what should be its conduct towards the true and orderly members of a sister church. But if Judas remained and partook of the Lord's supper, the act would not have violated the letter of the law governing the supper, for, 1. Judas had been immersed; 2. He was in full fellowship with this family of Christ, this church of the apostles, as some call it, for he had committed no overt act of sin known to them." (p. 216.) And therefore it is unnecessary to controvert this question of the presence of Judas. And so of his "fact" on "feet washing," and the "fact" about the "one loaf;" we may let all that pass now. A line or two at the close of his first chapter is pure gold. "It (the supper) is not a feast of communion with each other, but a feast in commemoration of Christ." (p. 220.) And this is the only "specific symbolism of the elements used," as we shall see when we come to examine Dr. Graves' legislation on "symbolism."

THE PASSOVER.

Dr. Graves is fond of an argument on communion drawn from the Jewish Passover. This is legitimate, to the unprejudiced Bible reader must see that there is some sort of kinship existing in the Word of God between the two institutions. He made happy use of this argument in his triumphant discussion with Dr. Ditzler; and it is to be regretted that in his special pleading against intercommunion, he now changes the plea, and turns it against the inter-fellowship of Baptist churches. The Passover furnishes an unanswerable argument against communion with those who practice an untrue baptism, for they generally hold that baptism came in the room of circumcision, and the Lord's supper in place of the paschal supper; and as none could eat the Passover except the circumcised, on their own grounds none can partake of the Lord's supper but the baptized, and therefore unless their baptism is correct their communion cannot be. But we are not, in this discussion, concerned with the question of open communion as touching other sects. Dr. Graves has forced on us the question, Can the members of Baptist churches communing to the Passover, but returning to the Passover, observe that the supper was instituted at the Passover table, of the Passover bread and wine, and immediately at the conclusion of the Passover supper where Christ had eaten it with his Apostles, and that he enjoined the supper to be observed until his second coming, and commanded them, and through them all his churches in all time, to eat and drink it in remembrance of him. (See in the four Gospels and 1 Cor. 11.)

FAMILY OF CHRIST.

Dr. Graves tells us that the Lord's supper at its institution, was "given to the family of Christ," that Christ considered the Apostles "as constituting in a Jewish sense, his family," and thus he speaks of "full fellowship with this family of Christ." (pp. 216, 221, 222.) This may be true, but our Lord did not institute his supper in "the Jewish sense" whether in the family or out of it. He instituted the supper and committed it to his apostles just as he committed every thing else to them, "not as ordinary ministers of the Word," (p. 222), nor as an ordinary church, nor as an ordinary family, but to that body of Apostles whose word should be his own word, and whose order in the churches should be his order, and whose infallible authority should command the churches to observe all things whatsoever he had given unto them. Bro. Graves in other places attempts to make an argument against intercommunion by the fact that there were no others present at the institution of the supper except the Apostles. But here he tells us that "it would have been in open violation of the divine law to have observed the Passover except as a family." For this reason he could not have eaten the Passover with his church, but only with his family—the eleven Apostles—which we may consider here as actually representing his local church." (p. 223.) If this be true how is it possible for any to be present at the institution of the supper except this apostolic family? How was it possible for any other part of his church to be present except as "represented" by these Apostles? And so how is it possible to construct an argument against intercommunion out of the absence of others, when it would have been a violation of the Passover-law for them to be present, since only a family could be present?

A NATIONAL RITE.

Bro. Graves says that "The Passover was not a national," but strictly a family rite." (p. 223.) Surely there is some mistake about this. It was both a national and a family rite. "Speak ye unto all the congregation of Israel, saying, * * * they shall take to them a lamb, according to the house of their fathers, a lamb for a house." "All the congregation of Israel shall keep it." (Ex. 12: 3, 47.) "The congregation of Israel" was the nation of Israel; and national qualifications alone constituted qualifications to observe the Passover; "the foreigner and the hired servant, not being of their nation, were not to eat of the Passover." (Verse 45.) It can not be denied that the Passover as a memorial, was intended to commemorate not only the angels passing over the houses of the Israelites, but also the work of their redemption from their bondage and their escape from Egypt. "And ye shall observe the feast of unleavened bread; for in this selfsame day have I brought your armies out of the land of Egypt; therefore shall ye observe it this day in your generations by an ordinance forever." (Ex. 12: 17 and 13: 9, 10.) And this redemption was not fully realized until they passed over the Red Sea, where they "were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." (1 Cor. 10: 1-4.)

A FAMILY RITE.

But I will admit for the sake of argument, that the Passover was strictly a family rite. For the whole nation to observe the Passover at one table, or even for all of one tribe to do so, would have been a practical impossibility for they were six hundred thousand adults. And then the nation was saved by the destroying angel passing over them by families. Every family of the whole nation was passed over as a family and thus saved as a family, and thus the Passover ordinance of commemoration had its true significance in being observed by the family. But Jesus does not save by nations, nor by tribes, nor even by churches, but by *families*; he saves every man in his individuality, and the saint communes in his individuality; he eats and drinks in remembrance of his crucified Lord for himself; yet he can only commune in the church, for the reason that his Lord has placed his table there alone, and while that church of which he is a member is pre-eminently the place where he has the right to commune, as every man's own home is the place where he has the right to eat, still, whenever he finds "the unity of the spirit" among a church of the "one Lord, one faith, one baptism," (1 Cor. 10: 17), he commemorates the redemptive love and death of his Savior, it being agreeable to the "one body" with whom he is assembled.

Bro. Graves' object in using this Passover family argument is to show, that as the Lord's supper is not the family, the Lord's supper is not only to be confined to churches as all admit, but confined to churches in such sense as that none can approach the table except in the church of which they are members. (pp. 223, 268.) This argument breaks down in the fact that there was special provision made in the law of the Passover, for two families or parts of families to unite in eating the paschal supper. The divine law says, "And if the household be too little for the lamb, let him and his neighbor next unto his house take it according to the number of the souls." (Ex. 12: 4.) "This is the divine law, and it breaks the argument which has been attempted against intercommunion from the Passover in a Jewish family, because it opens the way for more than a family." Josephus says "there were never less than ten present" at the eating of the Passover. Dr. Gill says, "A lamb for every family, if there was not sufficient number in it to eat it up; not two, or more families were to join and keep the feast together." And Dr. Matthew Henry says, "God appointed that * * * each of their families kill a lamb, or that two or three

families, if small, should join for a lamb."

HIS FORMER POSITION.

And so Dr. Graves regarded it in his debate with Ditzler. He said, "A Jew, merely because he was a Jew, had no right to go into any house to celebrate the Passover with any other family than his own, except by special invitation and upon certain divinely fixed conditions, viz: Each Jew, each family, must possess the self-same qualifications that the family possessed which invited." (Carrollton debate, pp. 860-1.) Here we see that a little over six years ago Bro. Graves held that there were circumstances when "the Master of a Jewish house" could "invite" other Jews to unite with his family in celebrating the Passover, and that this was according to the divine law. And as it was according to the order of the law, that the Master of each house should design to have his lamb all eaten, and as it is true in all nations with them, there must have been many families who were "too little" to eat a whole lamb at a single supper, and therefore this inter-family Passover must have been very frequent.

"Now," says Dr. Graves, "apply this to the (Lord's) Supper. Each local church is a family, independent of all others, and the Supper is placed under its guardianship and it is responsible for its purity. The Supper does not belong to the church. It has no right to make rules governing it. It has no right to invite whom it pleases." "It is the Lord's Supper, and the church must observe the Lord's rules. It must not invite another family, though bearing the name of Baptists or any name, unless possessing the same qualifications with itself. The family invited must bring in a *leaven*." (Carrollton Debate pp. 861-2.) And although he says in this same speech that a church should limit her communion as she does her voting, yet he also states circumstances when a member or minister properly vouches for, being present at the communion season of any church, "the church would be justified in inviting him, for she always has more (bread and wine) than her own family can eat." (Debate p. 863.)

THE LESSON.

Although all this is stated with a caution, which indicates that Brother Graves was then marching in the direction of the so-called "impregnable line," upon which he now places himself, yet it also shows beyond question that the lesson which he then gathered from the Passover was that there are circumstances when a church can invite a family to commune with it. And this is what we contend for. And so, if the Passover teaches any lesson at all in regard to the terms of communion, it is an inter-communion lesson to all intents and purposes. And yet it most powerfully vindicates the practice of restricting our communion to our own faith and order, for none could eat the Passover but the circumcised Jew and proselyte to the Jew's religion; and therefore the lessons of the Passover are all in favor of the "old current" practice among Baptists.

And again, as all other members of the church of Christ were Jews who still observed Jewish rites, was it not absolutely necessary that they should all eat the paschal lamb with their respective families; and as all observed the rite at the same hour in their own families, or united families, how was it possible for them to be present with the Lord and his apostles when he instituted the Supper?

I conclude this article with firm endorsement of Dr. Graves' concluding propositions in the second chapter, "Part Third:"

1. That in every case those who partook of the Supper, had been baptized.
2. That all who partook of the supper were church members; and that the Supper was under the special and sole control of the local churches. (p. 237-8.) And so complete was this "sole control" that they could extend the privilege to all brethren of like faith, the same baptism, similar churches, who, like themselves, were maintaining Gospel order. And anything short of this is a wanton segregation of the kingdom of Christ.

Let us next take some notice of Dr. Graves' views of the "symbolism of the Supper."

Bible Promises.

Golden lamps hung up in the spiritual skies to light prodigals back to their father's house. The sweet singer of Israel says, "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet and a light unto my path." Pillars of cloud by day and pillars of fire by night leading the true Israel of God to the land of promise, like oases and cool springs of water in a dry desert, refreshing the thirsty and weary traveler.

Precious jewels found imbedded in every book in the Bible. As soon as Adam fell war was declared between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent, but victory was promised to the seed of the woman. "It shall bruise thy head." A blessed promise. The promise of a Savior. Here is the dawn of the gospel day. Before the Lord drove Adam out of Eden, he put into his hand the lamp of Promise, not to light him back, however, to Eden, the old homestead (for he had placed there an angel with a flaming sword to prevent his return) but to illumine the way of life up to the Paradise of God.

The unwearied hand of Providence has always been engaged in preparing for some future development of the glory of the church. From Adam to Christ the lines of Providence were all converging to the incarnation. Every change—every revolution was so shaped as to be preparatory to the

Advent of Messiah. That first, grand and mysterious event being accomplished, the next grand point of concentration is the Millennium—the complete development of grace and its victory over sin.

Ever since the crucifixion of Christ the whole energy of Providence has been engaged in maturing the great plan and gathering in its fruits. And to the Christian mind it is very interesting to notice how much of human agency he employs to accomplish his gracious purposes, and much more interesting to notice how he encourages the hearts of his people with his promises. "Exceeding great and precious."

When the Lord called his apostles and commissioned them to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, knowing the great difficulties they would meet, he encouraged them with the cheering promise of his presence always, "even unto the end of the world."

Some of the promises are universal; others peculiar and temporary. The promises made to Noah, to Moses, to David and to Peter, can not apply to us. The gospel is the universal promise, and is the ground and measure of our faith. Some of the promises are absolute and sure, others are conditional. The promises of the coming of the Messiah and the call of the Gentiles were absolute.

The promise of pardon and salvation is suspended upon our faith. To the poor sinner who inquired the way of life, Paul said, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." The promises, says Peter, are exceeding great and precious—great as to their number, great as to the blessings which they secure to the believer. There is everything promised to the believer that he shall ever meet, either in life or death, time or eternity.

In all the states of trouble and distress the word of promise sympathizes with us and brings its aid. Are you troubled on account of sin? Believe its promise of forgiveness. Are you pressed with outward sorrows? Hear the invitation and promise: "Call upon me in the day of trouble and I will deliver thee. Have friends forsaken you and are you troubled? Then listen to the promise of your best friend, saying: 'I will never leave thee nor forsake thee.'" In every scene of trouble and sorrow there is a promise of cheering and inspiring comfort.

The promises are made in Christ to certain characters. To the one burdened with a sense of sin and the danger of being lost, let him hearken to the words of Jesus, for he says:

"Believe in me, hear and rest your souls on me—Come unto me—ye seek in vain in legal rites or ceremonies or reformation or repentance, they will give you no rest unless you come to me. These precious promises are obtained through faith. As Paul told the Galatians, 'Given to those who believe.' And as St. James says, 'Made to those who love him.' But let us notice more closely the blessings promised, and while we think of them, let us admire, love, adore and praise the bountiful giver.

1. CHRIST—John's "Advocate," Luke's "Consolation of Israel," Hagai's "Desire of all Nations," John's "Eternal Life," Paul's "Head of the Church." He is Matthew's "Jesus" and "King," John's "Lamb of God," "That taketh away the sin of the world," Paul's "Mediator" and "Prince of Life," John's "Resurrection and Life," Job's "Redeemer," Peter's "Savior," Solomon's "Wisdom," Isaiah's "Wonderful Counselor," Paul's "Unspeaking Gift," God's "Beloved Son in whom he is well pleased." His name is above every name. In him is seen the clear manifestations of the Divine perfections: Almighty power, infinite knowledge, exuberant goodness, unswerving purity and boundless mercy. In him all fullness dwells. The depository of all spiritual blessings, in him there is rest for the weary, peace for the sorrowing, purity for the defiled, salvation for the lost and life for the dead. O, what a Christ have we! What a glorious promise—what an unspeakable gift.

2. THE HOLY GHOST—The other comforter promised and sent by the Lord Jesus Christ, and is now on earth prosecuting his gracious work. Quickening and convicting souls, inspiring hope, communicating joy, imparting the love of God, edifying the church, teaching ministers where to preach and what to preach, dwelling with the saints, leading into all truth and producing all the fruits of righteousness. He is equal to and one with God; distinguished by the same titles, and to him belong the same attributes. He may be tempted, grieved and resisted, until he will withdraw his convicting, converting and saving influences. The "Spirit will not always strive with man," and the one with whom the Spirit has ceased to strive is ripe for ruin. What a fearful thing to sin against the spirit of grace. Another promise exceeding great and precious is the

(3.) GOSPEL—What shall we say of the "Glorious Gospel of the Son of God?" "Glad tidings of great joy for all people." It is the power of God unto salvation, unto every one that believeth. Through it Jesus brought to light life and immortality. It is the "ministration of mercy." It is the "covenant of grace," ordered in all things and sure. A message from God to men in which he reveals the scheme of recovering mercy. When it is preached in its purity and is accompanied with the power of the Holy Ghost, stubborn wills are subdued, hard hearts are melted and sinners are forced to cry, "What must we do?" and the question, "To whom shall we be saved?" There are thousands and

millions who do testify to its saving power when received as the word of life. Matthew at the seat of custom, thief upon the cross, the persecutor of Jesus on the road to Damascus, three thousand souls on the day of Pentecost, and millions of others; such is its power.

Reader, do you believe its doctrines? Do you obey its precepts? Do you enjoy its blessings? Do you delight in its promises?—believe and you are saved, reject and you are lost. O, believe and receive a good title to a great inheritance, to a kingdom, to a crown, a throne, a home in heaven, to life eternal.

The promises of the gospel, says Mr. Spurgeon, is the believer's storehouse of food, his casket of jewels. He who believes in Christ, counts over the diamonds that flash in his hand like stars. Compute the worth of that single jewel "Ask and you shall receive," or that other ruby, "All things work together for good to those who love God," and then remember who it is that gave them, and to what an unworthy sinner, and tell me if they are not exceeding great and precious.

When Caesar once gave a man a great reward, he exclaimed, "this is too great a gift for me to receive," "But," said Caesar, "it is not too great for me to give." So the smallest promise within thy casket is too much for thee to desire, yet the most magnificent one is not too great for the King of kings to bestow. Now, since the Christian has promised him every thing that will make him happy in this life and the one to come, why does he not delight more in them? Is it not for the want of faith or the knowledge of all that is included in them?

Sometimes there is much more in a promise than seems to be. The following incident may serve to illustrate the idea: A silver egg was once prepared as a present to a Saxon Queen. Open the silver by a secret spring and there was found a yolk of gold; pressing the spring of gold, it flew open and disclosed a beautiful bird; press the wings of the bird, and in its breast was found a bright crown of jewels; when the spring of the crown was pressed, it flew open and there was found a ring of diamonds, which fitted the finger of the Queen herself. O, how many promises there is within a promise—the silver around the gold and the gold around the jewel. Yet, how few of God's children ever find their way far enough among the springs to discover the crown of his rejoicing or the ring of his "covenant of peace!"

Who that has never yet eaten of the promise:

"To him that overcometh I will give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God." Theologians tell us that to eat of the tree of life is to enjoy eternal life in Heaven. Heaven is the home of God and his people. A man at home has a right to do as he will. If he wishes to rest, labor or study, he can do so; it is his right; he is at home. The one that has "overcome" has a right to the "Tree of Life." If he is weary, let him rest; it is his right; if he would promenade the golden streets, let him do it; he is at home; if he would gather the flowers blooming upon the banks of the "river of life," wreath a crown and place it upon the brow of his companion, let him do it. Would he praise God? Yes; his heart has been attuned to that Heaven's work and the business of eternity. Let him tune his harp to the highest note and swell the praises of the great multitude, whose voices are as that of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, "Alleluia!" for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth." "To him that overcometh." Blessed promise. By the grace of God we shall.

And here let us notice briefly the dignity of the promises. Peter says "let us might be partakers of the divine nature." The Apostle John says: "Now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but know that when he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is." To see Jesus and be like him will be enough—to be as he, holy, pure, rich and happy. The prophet Isaiah says he "shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied." Satisfied with the purchase of his blood, with the number saved—"A great multitude that no man can number," with their purity. "His blood cleanse from all unrighteousness." Satisfied with his people shall be satisfied with his kingdom, with their thrones, with their crowns, with their society, with heaven as their home. When Jesus shall appear, may we all see him as he is and be like him. W. A. BISHOP.

Letter from Dr. Dean.

Dr. A. Douglass, Cor. Sec. A. and F. Bible Society, No. 116 Nassau Street, N. Y.

My dear Sir—It seems now generally admitted that a Baptist Bible Society is a desideratum, and must soon come into common use, with the denomination; and under the management of such men as Ebenezer Morgan, James B. Colgate, William L. G. Norton, W. W. Everts, William Hagar, and others of like character the Baptist church may feel that her funds for Bible work will be wisely expended. If the work of all the objects of benevolence could be simplified and rendered more successful by being brought under the control of one society, then it might be wise to do it, but the prospect is to render the working of machinery more complicated and efficient than it would be wise to do it. Our missionary enterprise upon the heathen has now grown to enormous proportions, involving such large expenditures, and

reaching such vast results, that it seems presuming on human capability to impose the whole burden of the superintendence upon one mind. Our God is a merciful Master and requires no more of one man than he can do—and do it well.

We are informed that the Executive Committee of the Missionary Union has appointed a standing committee to the Bible work of our foreign missions. These men may be learned in Hebrew and Greek, profoundly in theology and finance, and eminently fitted to act as president of a college or the pastor of a church, to serve in the State Legislature or superintend a commercial firm, but it is no disparagement to these excellent and learned men to intimate that they are not qualified to decide as to the accuracy or expediency of a translation of the Bible into Burmese or Telegu, Chinese or Japanese, simply because they are ignorant of those languages. In these times when the mind of the Christian world on the subject of Bible revision is as agitated as the waters of a troubled sea, if the Apostles, Peter and Paul, were to be suddenly called from their graves, where they had left their divine inspiration and miraculous gift of tongues, they could not tell the Lords of Dublin and Winchester, Trent and Schaff, Conant and Kenrick by what words and idiom they should translate into English the truth they themselves had once written in Greek, simply because they did not understand the English language. Neither is the translation of the Scripture justly to be made by a committee not to be decided by a majority of votes. Wycliffe and Tyndale, Calvin and Conant each alone is responsible for the translation he has made, so far as its fidelity is concerned.

Committees at different times have been constituted for the revision of the sacred Scriptures. Forty-seven divines were engaged on King James' version, the committee for the late revision was composed of fifty-two English and twenty-seven American who have devoted ten years to the work. On the 22nd of August, 1843, all the Protestant missionaries then in China assembled at Hongkong and organized themselves into a committee of the whole for the revision of the Scriptures in Chinese. There were present on that occasion Dyer, Hobson, Legge, Medhurst, Milne, A. Stronach, and I. Stronach, of the London Missionary Society, Bridgman and Ball of the American Board, Brown of the American Presbyterian Board, Roberts, Nichols, and W. W. Phelps of the American Baptist Missionary Society.

For his Chinese translation still residing in Siam. These fourteen men, then commenced in earnest the revision of the Scriptures in Chinese, but stumbled on the very threshold of their work. Some contending that the *Textus Receptus* should form the basis of the proposed revision. There appeared at the first a want of harmony in regard to the terms for rendering *Theos* and *baptizo* and the divergence of opinion on those points was confirmed and continued to the end, so that one version was brought out by the London Society, one by the American Board and one by the American Baptist missionaries, besides various other versions before existing in Chinese, and since multiplied. The comparative merits of these several versions cannot be decided by a committee at home nor by a majority vote abroad. Chinese posterity alone must be the arbiters of their destiny. The translations of Carey and Marshman, Judson and Jones, Morrison and Medhurst, Goddard and Brown will not be prepared during the present generation for a stereotyped edition, but must wait for native scholars to be raised up in these various countries to translate the Bible for their own people. All that can be done by the present generation of Christian workers is to plant the seed corn of the Gospel in these heathen lands, and break the ice that covers the fountain so that their future scholars may draw the living water for their own people.

In doing this they must furnish their own buckets, make their own tacking, and do the work in their own way, and we all may in heaven rejoice together over the glorious results.

WILLIAM DEAN.

Bangkok, Sept. 10, 1881.

Fair Play.

Some time since there appeared, in the ALABAMA BAPTIST, an article in which Bob Lacon (whoever he may be) stood too adamant for the rights of lady teachers. This was, perhaps, hallooed with pleasure by every lady teacher who read it. We are glad to know that somebody is for us; we want some one to see that we have fair play. Now, as "time about is fair play," the writer begs Bro. B. L. to allow her to disagree with him on one point, in his much prized and cheering article. He advances the idea that, if a woman must make her living by physical labor she need not be educated; that the money would be better invested if it were given her to "lighten her burden." This doctrine of "utilitarianism" is hurtful to the cause of education. It is a quicksand on which many a brilliant mind has been wrecked; it is a current which the teacher dreads to stem. In this day of money grabbing, every thing must yield that is very desirable article, or not be dealt with at all. This is the current doctrine. But let us remember that man was not created for a money making machine, for if he had been God would have left out of his nature all such things as conscience and sympathy. Neither was he placed on earth simply to secure a livelihood. That is a secondary consideration. His

physical nature requires food and raiment, and he is commanded in the Bible to "provide" these "honestly in the sight of all men." But this is merely a necessity growing out of his existence, not the object of his existence. The noble faculties with which he has been endowed were given him for noble purposes; and though they were so marred and defaced, and lost so much of their God-like appearance, in the fall, yet they are the best that he possesses. To each and every one of us a title in the book of his eternal mercy. No man can lay claim on these faculties and dispose of us, either by truth or perjury. These, none but a merciful Heavenly Father can give or take. This is the little capital with which he starts us in life; this is the only possession of which he does not disrobe us in death. Now, shall we neglect, in the least, this gift of all earthly gifts, (if earthly it may be called) because it cannot be made directly subservient to some secondary matter? No; let us cultivate it. Here is a field more wide, a soil more fertile than all the domain of earth, the cultivation of which is far more important than the amassment of wealth. Let the poor girl cultivate this field to its highest susceptibility. If she be compelled to labor for daily sustenance, let her "burden" be "lightened" by strengthening her mind, for it is a much surer way than saving the money necessary to educate her. May the reader excuse the comparison, but this makes me think of the old man who could get rich so easily. "Why," said he, "all this scrambling for money! I can be as rich as I want to be for *ten cents*. That will buy me a drink of whisky, and after I drink it I will feel as rich as any man in the State, and feeling it is all there is of it anyway." Now, feeling the burden is all there is of it, and the weaker the bearer the heavier the burden will feel. Then, after all of the "lightening" the burden may be heavier for the weak mind that must bear it than it would have been with all its weight for a mind strengthened by education. Life is what we make it. (This has been said a thousand times, but it will bear saying as many more.) The reason why one person has more happiness in this world than another, is not so much on account of difference in situation, as difference in ability to meet the situation. Give the poor girl an education, and she will be able to meet her situation. She will be better situated than the half educated girl, with her half common sense.

Let people disregard the poor, laboring girl, because she is poor; but give her the ability to feel and realize, in her own consciousness, that she is not inferior to white hands and elegant dresses, and her associates will soon be convinced of the fact also. When a person feels equal to those with whom he associates, they are very apt to realize the equality.

B. L. said something about educating girls for the purpose of getting them married off well, and that they made a "mighty smashing of it." No wonder they made a "smashing." Such a motive is not compatible with true education. If the girls have this motive, and their parents have this motive, you need not wonder at any "smash" they make. But, if they study and improve their minds in order that they may, in reality, be a helpmeet for a husband they will scarcely make anything like a smash. They may not marry rich, but their life will not be a failure. Riches have made about as many smashes in life as education has. A girl might study with a view of being worthy of a husband, but never with a view of securing one. This "securing" business would act, in the premises, like Pharaoh's seven head of lean cattle.

A. E. P.

Concerning Collections.

BY THE REV. NEWMAN HALL.

"The very thing I am concerned about. It is the fly in the apothecary's ointment; the twinge of pain in the pleasant dream; the world intruding on the Sabbath rest. I've had enough of money during the week; but when ledger and cash book have been put aside again comes the jingle of coin and the rustle of notes. I have been listening to the blessed offer of salvation 'without money,' and am at once asked for money. I have been feasting on the privileges of adoption and the assurance of God's elect, still my 'willing soul' would sit and sing herself away to everlasting bliss," or have been mounting upward as on angel wings, when ruthlessly I am dragged back by an appeal for the collection!"

There was once a very great preacher, a bishop of bishops, who addressed a memorable charge to convocation at a city renowned for its culture, in the course of which he broke forth into an impassioned strain of electric logic, demolishing the superficial rationalism of the day, and, after raising the minds and hearts of his audience far above the low level of temporal things, thus closed an unrivaled peroration: "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? Thanks be to God who giveth the victory! Now concerning the collection!"

This collection was for poor saints at Jerusalem. The dense population there was chiefly from the poorer class, the financial results of the community of goods, which had not been enjoined and was now discontinued, together with persecution, had impoverished the Jerusalem Church. Paul, when sent forth to the Gentiles, had promised the other Apostles that he would "remember the poor." He was now fulfilling his pledge. The

benevolent society yonder was in urgent need, and because the poor could not put off being hungry and sick, nor put off dying unless relieved, Paul, though by his being delaying the grave and anticipating glory, would not put off saying: "Now concerning the collection!"

Perhaps, some said: "What have we Greeks at Corinth to do with Jews at Jerusalem? We live far apart and are of a different race and language. Let them look after themselves." But the collection was urged and cheerfully made. It was a new thing in the world. Alien nations had been in alliance for predatory war or profitable commerce, but never before for philanthropy. Christianity had infused a new life into humanity. Men of all lands were drawn to the one Father, and so to each other in the one Brotherhood. There was no longer "Jew nor Greek," etc., but all were "one in Christ Jesus."

St. Paul lays down many useful principles "concerning collections." (See 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2.) These were to be 1. *Individual*: "Let every one of you." A member of a church, sometimes says: "We do so much for charity! We spend so much on missions, etc., etc." I'd do it. Yet the individual so boasting does nothing. There is no obtaining pardon in common. "Every one" must repent, believe, and be saved. So "every one" must aid in doing good. 2. *Proportional*: "As God has prospered him." The giving should be in a suitable ratio to the getting. If more can be spent on ourselves, more laid by, so more should be given to God; not as some, the ratio of whose giving diminishes as their income increases. It is a fearful thing to be spending or hoarding beyond the proportion of giving. The poorest have an equal privilege with the richest. That church is not truly a "poor man's church" where the poor have only to be receivers, without the greater privilege of being givers. In God's esteem, the subscription-list that the dollar, just as the widow who put in two mites, put in more than the rich who gave gold. The treasurer always reckons the value of what is given by the amount of what is kept. 3. *Grateful*: "As God hath prospered him." The rewards of industry and skill are his gifts, entrusted to us as his stewards, and, therefore, should be used by us as his faithful servants and grateful children. 4. *Periodical*: "On the first day of the week." If not weekly at some stated period, we should not surplus. Without waiting for a surplus, every week we spend money on ourselves for luxuries not essential. Should we not do this equally in works of beneficence? Every quarter or every year we pay our rates or rent. Should we not with equal regularity and system arrange for what is due to God? 5. *Devoutly and conscientiously*: "Let every one lay by him in store." Privately, prayerfully, not from the impulse of external circumstances, or the opinion of men, but contingent on exciting meetings, eloquent appeals, or fine weather on occasion of the annual collection.

In harmony with these principles, "systematic beneficence" is recommended. Some proportion of our income should be prayerfully consecrated to Him. This should be employed not for payment of service rendered to ourselves (as for a pastor's stipend), or for comfort enjoyed (as for church expenses), any more than paying for our doctor, or lawyer, or the furnishing of our own homes, or in literature, or art, or music; but simply for the temporal and spiritual good of others. "Then all we have to do is to appropriate, according to the claims presented, the sum which has already been given. We should thus give each case and much more would be given. Christians generally succeed in industry and commerce, and they save what others squander in frivolous amusements. Some Christians leave frightful amounts of money behind them. Are there not members of churches whose gains, whose expenditures, whose savings are such that the amount they willingly contribute for the good of others, if set down in a *per contra* account, would shame and ought to alarm them? Are there not those who have suffered heavy losses, out of all proportion to the voluntary gifts they have placed on God's altar, suggesting the thought that he may permit such losses as a reproof of the littleness of those gifts, so to say his children from the perils of repletion? If we generate too much steam and will not turn it off into the works of beneficence, may not God take the weights off our safety-valve, and so save us from an explosion? There is that scattereth and yet increaseth. There is that withholdeth more than is meet, and it tendeth to poverty."

There can be no question that God has already entrusted so much wealth to the responsible care of individual members of the Christian Church that, if all would thus systematically devote a proportion of their income, there would be such a superabundance for all the purposes for which help is generally sought in religious services that there would be very seldom any necessity to close a sermon with: "Now concerning the collection."—*Independent*.

WHERE THY MIGHT LIES.—When Saladin asked to see the sword of Richard the Lionhearted, he was surprised to find it of no better steel than his own, and said that bold warrior with what he had slain so many. Baring his arm, he replied

