

Messenger and Visitor.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER,
VOLUME XLIX.

Published Weekly by The Maritime Baptist Publication Society.

THE CHRISTIAN VISITOR,
VOLUME XXXVII.

VOL. I.

SAINT JOHN, N. B., WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 1885.

NO. 12.

—During the last sixteen years an increase of several millions has been added to the population of Great Britain, and yet the number of prisoners in England and Wales alone has shown a decrease of over 1,700. This diminution appears to have been continuous, and it promises to be well maintained, so that the probability is, that those whose lot is cast in the next century will see better days than any which have gone before. This is very cheering in those days when societies of socialists and anarchists are being formed, and it is a grand witness to the power of the gospel which alone is able to effect such results.

—Mr. Patrick Ryan, of Chicago, who is soon to engage with Mr. John Lawrence Sullivan, of Boston, in a national controversy with H. A. H. has had that affair postponed for a few weeks, it being inconvenient with his religious scruples to engage in such an entertainment during Lent—*Catholic Examiner*.

We have heard of a godless youth who has stopped smoking his cigars, and all his other indulgences during Lent. But he has no intention of forsaking them altogether. If Lent did real service it would compel Ryan and all who observe it, to do better after the 40 days were over. We hope there may come good result from the observance of this season by many; but we are sure that not a few think they have license at other times, because of the rigor with which they keep this period. Better is it to take in the truth than sin in the nature of the not rather than because of the time at which it is done, and try and do right all the time.

—Drummond's "Natural Law in the Spiritual World" is being subjected to a good deal of adverse criticism. Professor Dawson, in a late number of the *Hamilton Review*, shows where he has limped in one of his statements of scientific fact, and an article in the *March Contemporary Review* subjects it to a very severe and searching criticism. While it is a work of great ability, and full of fresh thought, we have felt that laudations have generally been somewhat lacking in discrimination. Prof. Drummond intends to publish a defense, so says the *Expositor*.

—In the *March General Baptist Magazine*, Rev. J. Fletcher, in concluding his article on "Church Leakage," sums up as follows in indicating the "fault of others" for losses of members:—(1) The first relates to the minister. At a Presbyterian Conference on this subject one candid friend had the grace to say that people lapsed "because they regarded their ministers as humdrum to the last degree." Hear it, Ministers! but pray remember that he was speaking of Presbyterians, and not General Baptists. (2) Deacons, elders, etc., are sometimes to blame. A gruff deacon can drive people away; a cross steward can create empty pews; so can a chapel-keeper who has confused ideas about cleanliness and comfort. It is marvellously easy to alienate people. The saints are not shod in such a way as to have their feet perfectly free from corns. We need to tread very lightly. (3) There come neglected visiting, and the little things, which after all are the great things. In short, the fault is not single but multiple. In some way or other, through our ignorance or imperfection, it clings to us all. "He that is without fault" is nowhere to be found.

—Canon Morley held that "the religion of Anglicans was a safe way of salvation, because they imposed nothing but what was clearly taught in Scripture and the Fathers, while Roman Catholics taught much which did not seem to be in Scripture, and Anabaptists were always finding much in Scripture which was not in the Fathers."

The Anabaptists (Baptists) do indeed certainly find much in Scripture which was not in the Fathers, and did they all take the trouble, could find much in the Fathers which is not in Scripture, all the worse for the Fathers. They will probably continue to feel that no religion is a safe way of salvation which imposes anything more or less than the Bible teaches.

—The French prisoners of war, who were removed into the heart of Russia, enjoyed as much liberty there as the inhabitants themselves. Nobody watched them, nobody troubled them, because it would have been impossible for them to escape. Those, however, who came near the frontier, were followed up and harassed. They were held close, for fear they should get out of the country. Even so, the children of this world, who are deep within the territories of the prince of this world, they have no conflicts, they think they are free, because they only change from one province to another within the kingdom of sin, without leaving it. But those who begin to draw near the Lord to be delivered, arouse the attention of Satan on themselves. He hurls his servants against them and attacks them without and within, by every method, to keep them from reaching the boundary of salvation, namely, the cross of Christ, or to tear them from it if they are already there.—*Pelitz Nef*.

—And so it may be said of believers. When they keep within the limits of the kingdom of God, they have less temptation. It is when they come to the boundary between the church and the world, that they are wounded by the darts of the wicked one, and the godless reach out and lay

hold of them to drag them across on their own ground. Let us keep as well away from the border as possible, if we wish to be safe and peaceful.

—Among many good thoughts on Revivals, by Prof. Austin Phelps, in the *Advent*, these seem especially pertinent: "Nothing commits men to a religious life but religious living. Nothing blinds men to repentance but repenting. One and but one thing is the thing to be done. Nothing else assists it, nothing else approaches it. Hence, preaching in time of religious awakening should have a singleness of aim."

—Bro. Hopper has been spending the last two months in canvassing the field for stock subscriptions to the Union Seminary in St. John. Although times are hard our people have generally given a good response to the call. Upwards of ten thousand dollars are already pledged and we hope to see the work continue. It is to be regretted that Bro. Hopper's health did not permit him during the winter season to make the thorough examination of the ground that the necessities of the case required. As Brussels Street Church has requested him to resume the pastorate, April 1st, his time has been exceedingly limited. Yet we hope every member of the Baptist brotherhood will do his utmost to assist this most deserving object.

—Good news comes in to us from many of the churches. In some, extensive revivals, with old-time gospel power, have come, sweeping away every division and all traces of Satan's inroads among the flock. We know of nothing better than this. With the new life of spiritual life the pastor's work moves better, every church interest becomes aroused and our Lord's kingdom spreads with wholesome vigor. In this respect Bro. Davison, at Pennfield, and Bro. Anderson, at Newcastle, N. B., have both alike reason to thank God and take courage. These churches have taken a fresh start in the Christian life.

—The Union Seminary at St. John continues to do good work. The Principal, L. E. Wortman, A. M., is assisted by an efficient staff of teachers in all departments. Miss Hooper, teacher of Elocution, is rapidly gaining for herself and the institution a reputation in every respect highly creditable. All friends of the school will be pleased to hear of its increasing usefulness and prosperity.

—We are pleased to note the marriage of Bro. W. Camp and Miss May Long, of Fairville, on Wednesday evening, 18th inst. The ceremony took place in the Baptist Church in the presence of many friends. We wish the happy couple much joy in the new life upon which they have entered.

—There are several interesting letters and articles, including one from our mission field which we have not room for this week.

The New Movement in Sweden.

(Rev. T. Trive writes in a recent *Examiner* on this subject—While the writer from whom he quotes is very ironical and sarcastic, we can see the trend of thought by what he pens. We give a portion of the article.)

A good many different voices are at the same time heard within the State Church, indicating that here is something going on. A priest within that Church, a sharp-minded and witty writer, has lately written a series of articles about the Church. He is a curate, a man of high learning, has a large influence, and although he has said many things that might cause him trouble, the authorities of the Church do not dare to touch him. In one article called "It goes too fast," he writes about how only a few years ago the priest in company with the policeman went into the houses of Baptists and took the child in the cradle out, and then made the parents of the child pay the expense. The policeman did this many times under oaths and swearing, especially if the child did not keep quiet. "Now"—so he writes in irony about this—"Baptism is necessary to regeneration, and God can do of course, not see the most suitable time for the performance of this regeneration, but this must be determined by the parents and the priest, and if the former neglects it, then the priest and the policeman fix the hour when the child shall be born again. That the children are regenerated through baptism is shown plainly by the levity and the irreverence that is manifested already in their youth, and then in their blasphemy, which even young ones are guilty of, and by the perjury, falsehood and other crimes committed by these when they get older. So the condition of the Christianity within the State Church is very glorious. But now there are about 6,000 un baptized and un regenerated children in Sweden. If the priest, within this concerns, had in company with the policeman done his duty and brought these to the baptism, they had all of them been born again because the royal law of 1749, that the police shall aid the priest in case of such baptisms, is still maintained as law, although it looks as if opinion had abrogated it even before

the Diet has been ready to do so; and that proves that it goes too fast. Yes, it goes fast. Until the year 1855 it was a crime for any layman to speak the word of God except at his devotion in his family. Now there is a law that if the Church council considers anyone to teach such doctrines that may lead to separation from the State Church the council may prohibit such one from speaking, and if he transgresses this law, he may be fined 300 Swedish crowns. This fine remains as an evidence of the Christianity of the State Church. The second chamber of the Diet has been so godless that it wanted to take away this fine, but the first chamber has shown its religiosity in retaining it. The Church Conference was so beset by Beelzebub last year that it voted for the taking away of the fine. And we cannot expect that the second chamber will do better than the first. If then the first chamber should be so bewitched as to make the same proposal, what a loss this would be to the Church."

He has written another series of articles called "The manufacturing of Christians." In the first one of these where he speaks of infant baptism, and how the people are made Christians by it, he says: "The manufacturing commences as soon as the child is born. The parents must inform the priest about the birth of the child, and then the day is fixed upon when it shall be regenerated, and made a Christian by baptism. This is a very easy way of making a heathen a Christian, 'a child of wrath' a child of God. But really it cannot go so fast, and no one can fix the day when any one, young or old, shall be born again. The best thing would be to let God take charge of this. But to make people believe that they are regenerated through baptism is to keep them in the greatest self-deception, and make them embrace such a doctrine, that drunkards, swearers and others are as such regenerated." This is the way in which this priest writes. His statements are very bold, considering that the State Church teaches very strongly regeneration and salvation through baptism.

He mentions a case in the same paper about a priest who some time ago came into a house where a little child was sick, and asked to be allowed to bless it. He knew that it was not worth while to ask to be allowed to baptize it. The mother of the child thought he was going to pray for it, and gave her consent. The older children stood around a table, where they had a bowl of soup they had been eating, and the priest asked the oldest of these to go and fetch some water in the bowl. When this was done, the priest took the child out of the cradle, and commenced to read, "Suffer the little children to come unto me," etc., and after that he baptized it, contrary to the protest of the mother. She who was weak on account of fever, got so excited that they thought she would die. And it is very evident that such baptism shall make the priests of the Swedish Church despised."

The Power of the Tongue.
BY ELLA WILSON.

The Bible says a great deal about the tongue. We read: "Death and life are in the power of the tongue, and they that love it shall eat the fruit thereof." Ah, do we not eat the fruit of it, and sometimes it is bitter.

How much good or evil a word can do—only a word accompanied perhaps by a scornful look, but like a poisoned arrow it rangles in the heart of our brother or sister, making life's cross seem harder to bear. Only a word, kindly spoken, but it blesses both giver and receiver lifting the cloud from the brow of the former and making the hearts of both lighter. Only an angry word, and friends are parted, brothers and sisters become enemies, and domestic bliss is destroyed.

Only a word—a gentle word—wrath is turned away, wounded hearts are healed, sorrowful ones comforted, and peace takes up her abode with us. We sometimes sing—"Kind words can never die," and how often words spoken years ago, by loved ones whose voices we shall no more hear upon earth, linger still and as we realize how precious, how helpful the remembrance of them is, we desire that when we too shall have gone our words may not die, but continue to exercise an influence for good upon those who shall live after us.

The tongue of the just is as choice silver. A just man will never speak ill of his neighbor. He knows the faults of others should not trouble him until he has none of his own. We should make the most of the good in everyone, and cover up the bad with the mantle of charity.

"He who keepeth his mouth and tongue keepeth his soul from troubles." How many live unhappily, almost continually, because their words are seeds, that spring up speedily, and bring forth bitter fruit. Only a few words whispered by one sister in the church to another, and the ball of scandal is set in motion, gaining in speed

and also, causing sad havoc as it advances, and finding many, alas! ready to give it fresh impetus. "A house divided against itself cannot stand." And, surely the church should be one united family in Christ. Our Lord himself of whom men testified, "never man spoke like this man," said—"I am the vine, and he the branches." Now you cannot injure a branch without hurting the vine; when we say anything against one of Christ's "little ones" we touch the Master.

How great is our responsibility in this regard! We should watch and pray lest we enter into the temptation to speak ill of our brother or sister. We should also pray for grace to speak well of them; for there is good in all, and we shall discover it, if we do not search only for evil.

Come to the home circle; look at the influence of the mother's tongue! The loving accents of that tongue give the baby mind its first impressions of the Great Father; and point it to the tender shepherd.

The influence of the mother's tongue is shown in the child's after life. In manhood and womanhood its fruit can be seen, and if she has been faithful to her trust it will be good fruit. All the influences, good or evil, brought to bear upon the child in its subsequent life, cannot wholly erase the impressions stamped on his mind in infancy by her teaching.

How we should thank our Heavenly Father for the power of speech! Surely we should use it in His praise. I often feel sad at the thought of those who profane His holy name, who proclaim doctrines as blasphemous as their author, Satan, and of the infidelity, scepticism, and all the other abominations that seem to be flooding the civilized world with its dark waters. But the Lord omnipotent reigneth, though wickedness seems to prevail.

Let our words, to each other be dictated by love, and let us not be backward in speaking, to those who are in darkness, words that may bring them light.

Let us speak tenderly to the weak ones; kindly to the erring. Let our words comfort those that mourn, cheer sad hearts, and cause the flower of Hope to lift up its bright head once more in the atmosphere that is so dark and dreary.

And let us remember, "Thou speakest with the tongues of men and angels and have not charity; 'we are become as sounding brass and tinkling cymbals.'"

Ministerial Support.
This is a subject of the gravest importance. On its right solution depends, largely, the growth and expansion, if not the very existence of our denomination. We see our young people, often the flower of our churches, drifting one by one across the border, giving their consecrated hearts and trained intellects to the service of the churches of that country. This is in great measure owing to the inadequate support offered by our own churches. Still further, the same thing has a most depressing effect on the ministers actually settled over our churches. It chills their ardor and represses their growth.

Brethren in the ministry I sympathize with you. I can imagine the feeling of humiliation with which you must often receive the sums which barely suffice for your maintenance; and the sickening sense of shame for the parsimony of your brethren who render so pitiable a return for labors that are always trying and often arduous.

"If that," you sadly ask yourself, "is that the measure of their appreciation for us and for our work?" And on looking over our Provinces you see our Presbyterian brethren just completing a scheme for providing a comfortable competency for every one of their ministers; and in the city of Halifax you find their smallest stipend excluding that from a small church in the suburbs, to be \$1200 with a manse. This is an amount about equal to the largest salary paid by any Baptist church in Nova Scotia.

On the other hand, it was openly stated not long ago, at a public meeting, by one of our most prominent ministers, that a graduate of Acadia of several years' standing is now in receipt of only \$350 from the church for which he labors.

Now, what is the reason for this state of things, and what is the remedy? Probably there are more reasons than one. In the nature of things it cannot be that the base principle of our church polity is incapable of awakening an enthusiasm as deep, and a devotion as loyal, as the basis principle of the Presbyterian ecclesiastical structure. Surely the idea instilled in the great Baptist family—the kingdom of God made up solely of those who have been born again—ought to evoke a stronger devotion, and elicit larger sacrifices than any other principle whatever. But it is certain that Baptist churches are not generally made up of wealthy people. They never have been. Paul records of his own day, "Not many

rich, not many noble are called," and the rule holds good, still. This, however, is not the main reason. Rising high above and behind all our admitted inability to equal the contributions of our brethren of other communions, lies the paramount cause—The want of a due sense of obligation to our Master, and to his earthly representative, the church.

This is put most forcibly and pointedly by the *Presbyterian Witness* of October 11th, 1884:

"There are large and prosperous sections of country, where the people are all in the enjoyment of the comforts, and many of the elegancies of life, where the gospel has been preached for more than a century, but where to this hour there is no fitting idea of the claims of God upon our property. 'A' has a fine farm and a richly laden orchard. He has flocks and herds, horses and carriages. He subscribes and pays \$5 a year towards the support of the minister. For missions and other objects he gives three dollars more, making it all \$8. He ought to give at least \$120 a year; and at this moment he owes the Lord's cause about \$5,000. 'B' is similarly wealthy and comfortable, and being a 'deacon' he gives one half more than A. About a hundred families might thus be gone over, not one of whom has ever given to the limit of ability. They are extremely orthodox; they claim to be Christians of the cleanest type. Yet if we are to judge by their liberality, manum is their goal, to whom they offer sacrifice. Never yet have they sacrificed anything for the sake of Christ. They will not give the product of one apple tree for the promotion of the Gospel! The congregation we have thus tried to describe is not a Presbyterian congregation, but we fear it would not be altogether impossible to match it from among our own congregations. The people we have described pay their pastor \$600 a year and make him some donations, visits besides. This, for a people so wealthy, is eminently discreditable."

This is a vivid picture. Do you recognize it? Does it not portray, not one only, but many of our churches in these provinces?

Now my brethren in the ministry, who are receiving \$600 a year, and a few donations visits besides, does not a share of the blame for this discreditable state of things rest upon your own shoulders. What have you done to develop a spirit of benevolence in your flock? Have you faithfully and strenuously urged upon your people their obligation to obey the Saviour's last command, and preach the gospel to every creature, by proxy, if not in person? Have you often preached from the text, "Ye are my friends if ye do the things which I command you?" If you have, what reply can they give to the sharp and searching question: "Why call ye me Lord! Lord! and do not the things which I say?"

Do you imagine that if you fail in laying upon your people this obligation to the Lord and his work in the earth, they will not also fail in their sense of duty to you? Adopt a new method. Never rest until it will be impossible to draw such a picture as that given, of any Baptist church in these Maritime Provinces at least.

Last year a revival spirit prevailed very largely over our churches; many were added to the fold; but, have our benevolent contributions increased in proportion? That the young converts suffer from the same want of training in active benevolence as their elders, is abundantly evident. The eloquent example of Barnabas ought to be held up for imitation, and depend upon it, abounding love for the Lord's cause in the world at large, will, by an un-failing reflex influence, give our pastors more freedom from caring cares, and a larger ability to lead the way when pleading for missions at home and abroad.

H. H. R.

A Ridiculous Proposition.

BY REV. A. M. DUBOUC.

We noticed not long ago, the following little squib in a Chicago daily: "Rev. Minot J. Savage is going around the country delivering a lecture in which he says that he would not accept of heaven for himself if he knew that the meanest man on earth was subject to eternal torment." This is a very fine sentiment. We presume the audience loudly applauded this profession of heroism; and that, as George Elliot says of Savonarola, Rev. Minot J. Savage experienced at that moment all the joy, without the pain, of martyrdom. Who ever heard of devotion so chivalric? Jesus Christ left heaven to suffer and die, in order to save men from eternal misery; but Rev. Minot J. Savage tells us that he would surrender heaven, not for the purpose of saving anybody—nay when he knew that nobody could possibly be saved by it—but simply through unwillingness to fare better than the meanest man in existence. Now such devotion is ideally very beautiful; but it is of a lofty nature that an ordinary mortal may be pardoned for not being able to contemplate it without a certain sense of disincense. To our gross and carnal minds it appears so ethereal as to awaken a suspicion that it cannot be very substantial.

We have no other means of judging how a man is likely to act in the world to come, than by the manner in which he is acting in the present world. It is very well for Mr. Savage to boast of the heroism he will or would display in the future life; but we would like to know whether he dare claim that he is acting on any such exalted principle now, in this life. Does he refuse ever, for example, to enjoy the beauties of nature because there are so many blind people? Does he deny himself all the pleasures of music because there are those who are deaf? Did he ever, when thirsty, refuse to drink because he happened to reflect that, way off on the burning plains of the Soudan, some poor wounded soldier was even then dying from fever and thirst, who would exchange a fortune for one cool, refreshing draught? If he could not enjoy heaven while he is known that a single human being was in torment, how is it he can enjoy himself so well in this world, where not only one but thousands of beings are in torment? What imagination can picture, or what arithmetic can compute the amount of suffering which each day witnesses in the earth? The sun which shines with pleasing radiance through lace curtains into the comfortable study of Rev. Minot J. Savage is at the same moment looking down upon innumerable woe and men writhing with anguish. It is speaking despair to the criminal doomed to die before another dawn; and is peering into the garret of the invalid mother who, racked with bodily pain, is enduring the worse torment of not being able to answer her children's cry for bread.

Mr. Savage may choose to deny the reality of suffering in the future world; but he certainly cannot deny its reality in the present world. During the very winter, while he has been going around receiving applause for his fancied heroism, how much hard, unrelieved suffering there has been in Boston, almost within stone's throw of his study? How many men and women have been without employment and without sufficient food and shelter! Now we would like to know whether Mr. Savage has ever refused to draw his pay, on the ground that he would not live on a good fat salary while others were without any means of livelihood. When called to his savory breakfast, has he ever left it un-tasted, in order to send it to some poor tramp who had been without breakfast and supper too? He may be in the habit of doing all this, but we have never heard of it. The probability is he has been eating and drinking like others, and altogether leading a very comfortable life. Now if he can enjoy himself so well in a world where so many are enduring all the pangs of disease hunger and remorse, is it not mockery for him to claim that he would refuse to accept a heaven from which he knew a single human being was excluded, no matter how justly?

We have exposed at greater length than it might seem to deserve, this ridiculous pretension of Mr. Savage, because we often hear the same sentiment from Universalists. They are anxious to have the world think that if they do not believe in eternal punishment it is because of their superior liberality, which could not allow them to endure the thought that the meanest man on earth should suffer eternally. This, however, is mere mock generosity. It is not by vehement denials of the existence of misery, but by its efforts to relieve it, that love reveals itself. A disinclination to believe in the sufferings of others often springs from want of sympathy, and an unwillingness to have one's feelings harrowed by the contemplation of pain. It is the skinflint, not the philanthropist, who is confident that the sufferings of the poor are greatly overdrawn, and that none are really needy but the indolent and the vicious. It is so much pleasanter, as relieving us of a burden of responsibility toward others to assume that this is a very comfortable world, and that if any one does not find it so it is his own fault. So there are thousands who reject the belief in eternal punishment, simply because it saves them all painful efforts for their own salvation or that of their fellow-men, to believe that God will not deal very strictly with the sins of anybody, and that the meanest man on earth is sure eventually to be transformed into an angel of light.

We would by no means assert that this is true of all Universalists. But when they lay claim to superior liberality on account of their belief, we have a right to demand proof a little more substantial. What are they doing above others to lessen the crime and misery of the world? Let them produce their list of confessors and martyrs in the cause of truth and humanity. Where are their Pauls, their Luthers, their Judsons, or their Careys? What great missionary enterprise have they carried on? What cannibals have they converted? Or what Indian tribes have they civilized. It must be admitted that these noble achievements have been chiefly, or altogether, the work of men who, believing in the terrible consequences of sin, both in this world and that to come, have sacrificed all, "if by any means they might save some." Which then is the most truly liberal?

acting in the present world. It is very well for Mr. Savage to boast of the heroism he will or would display in the future life; but we would like to know whether he dare claim that he is acting on any such exalted principle now, in this life. Does he refuse ever, for example, to enjoy the beauties of nature because there are so many blind people? Does he deny himself all the pleasures of music because there are those who are deaf? Did he ever, when thirsty, refuse to drink because he happened to reflect that, way off on the burning plains of the Soudan, some poor wounded soldier was even then dying from fever and thirst, who would exchange a fortune for one cool, refreshing draught? If he could not enjoy heaven while he is known that a single human being was in torment, how is it he can enjoy himself so well in this world, where not only one but thousands of beings are in torment? What imagination can picture, or what arithmetic can compute the amount of suffering which each day witnesses in the earth? The sun which shines with pleasing radiance through lace curtains into the comfortable study of Rev. Minot J. Savage is at the same moment looking down upon innumerable woe and men writhing with anguish. It is speaking despair to the criminal doomed to die before another dawn; and is peering into the garret of the invalid mother who, racked with bodily pain, is enduring the worse torment of not being able to answer her children's cry for bread.

Mr. Savage may choose to deny the reality of suffering in the future world; but he certainly cannot deny its reality in the present world. During the very winter, while he has been going around receiving applause for his fancied heroism, how much hard, unrelieved suffering there has been in Boston, almost within stone's throw of his study? How many men and women have been without employment and without sufficient food and shelter! Now we would like to know whether Mr. Savage has ever refused to draw his pay, on the ground that he would not live on a good fat salary while others were without any means of livelihood. When called to his savory breakfast, has he ever left it un-tasted, in order to send it to some poor tramp who had been without breakfast and supper too? He may be in the habit of doing all this, but we have never heard of it. The probability is he has been eating and drinking like others, and altogether leading a very comfortable life. Now if he can enjoy himself so well in a world where so many are enduring all the pangs of disease hunger and remorse, is it not mockery for him to claim that he would refuse to accept a heaven from which he knew a single human being was excluded, no matter how justly?

We have exposed at greater length than it might seem to deserve, this ridiculous pretension of Mr. Savage, because we often hear the same sentiment from Universalists. They are anxious to have the world think that if they do not believe in eternal punishment it is because of their superior liberality, which could not allow them to endure the thought that the meanest man on earth should suffer eternally. This, however, is mere mock generosity. It is not by vehement denials of the existence of misery, but by its efforts to relieve it, that love reveals itself. A disinclination to believe in the sufferings of others often springs from want of sympathy, and an unwillingness to have one's feelings harrowed by the contemplation of pain. It is the skinflint, not the philanthropist, who is confident that the sufferings of the poor are greatly overdrawn, and that none are really needy but the indolent and the vicious. It is so much pleasanter, as relieving us of a burden of responsibility toward others to assume that this is a very comfortable world, and that if any one does not find it so it is his own fault. So there are thousands who reject the belief in eternal punishment, simply because it saves them all painful efforts for their own salvation or that of their fellow-men, to believe that God will not deal very strictly with the sins of anybody, and that the meanest man on earth is sure eventually to be transformed into an angel of light.

We would by no means assert that this is true of all Universalists. But when they lay claim to superior liberality on account of their belief, we have a right to demand proof a little more substantial. What are they doing above others to lessen the crime and misery of the world? Let them produce their list of confessors and martyrs in the cause of truth and humanity. Where are their Pauls, their Luthers, their Judsons, or their Careys? What great missionary enterprise have they carried on? What cannibals have they converted? Or what Indian tribes have they civilized. It must be admitted that these noble achievements have been chiefly, or altogether, the work of men who, believing in the terrible consequences of sin, both in this world and that to come, have sacrificed all, "if by any means they might save some." Which then is the most truly liberal?

We would by no means assert that this is true of all Universalists. But when they lay claim to superior liberality on account of their belief, we have a right to demand proof a little more substantial. What are they doing above others to lessen the crime and misery of the world? Let them produce their list of confessors and martyrs in the cause of truth and humanity. Where are their Pauls, their Luthers, their Judsons, or their Careys? What great missionary enterprise have they carried on? What cannibals have they converted? Or what Indian tribes have they civilized. It must be admitted that these noble achievements have been chiefly, or altogether, the work of men who, believing in the terrible consequences of sin, both in this world and that to come, have sacrificed all, "if by any means they might save some." Which then is the most truly liberal?

We would by no means assert that this is true of all Universalists. But when they lay claim to superior liberality on account of their belief, we have a right to demand proof a little more substantial. What are they doing above others to lessen the crime and misery of the world? Let them produce their list of confessors and martyrs in the cause of truth and humanity. Where are their Pauls, their Luthers, their Judsons, or their Careys? What great missionary enterprise have they carried on? What cannibals have they converted? Or what Indian tribes have they civilized. It must be admitted that these noble achievements have been chiefly, or altogether, the work of men who, believing in the terrible consequences of sin, both in this world and that to come, have sacrificed all, "if by any means they might save some." Which then is the most truly liberal?

We would by no means assert that this is true of all Universalists. But when they lay claim to superior liberality on account of their belief, we have a right to demand proof a little more substantial. What are they doing above others to lessen the crime and misery of the world? Let them produce their list of confessors and martyrs in the cause of truth and humanity. Where are their Pauls, their Luthers, their Judsons, or their Careys? What great missionary enterprise have they carried on? What cannibals have they converted? Or what Indian tribes have they civilized. It must be admitted that these noble achievements have been chiefly, or altogether, the work of men who, believing in the terrible consequences of sin, both in this world and that to come, have sacrificed all, "if by any means they might save some." Which then is the most truly liberal?