

has been a missionary in China, translated. He speaks very good English, and translated it very well, except for one word, in which he represented us as separating from the State-church; but I thought it on the whole better to let it pass.—Our friends said that they would have considered my mere presence in the meeting an advantage, for which they could not be too thankful, though I had not spoken a word. What they wanted, and indeed what was all that was practicable for me in such a meeting, was so to direct the minds of the ministers to the Free Church, as to originate inquiry about it. There has been overflowing gratitude expressed for my visit, and Ehulla in Stockholm. Bergum in —, and Hamman at —, are men of whom we have no cause to be ashamed. The last, especially, is out and out most thorough-going, upright, and hard-headed. All the time of the meeting they were listened to with marked attention, *however often they spoke*. And though Hamman's place is in the far south, I am told his name is respected even in Stockholm even by those who are unfriendly. 'What kind of a man is Dr Bergum?' I asked of the old priest in the steamboat. 'Most talented man, doctor of philosophy, doctor of medicine, a great speaker, but somewhat of a politician.'—'And Hamman, do you know him?' 'En stir theolog,' he answered with great respect, 'a great theologian.' Hamman's whole heart seems to be in the Free Church; and he is learning English as hard as he can.—It was he who was so much impressed by reading Rudliff's history. With great emotion, he said to me a few days ago, 'From my youth I have been a Presbyterian in my heart.' It is very instructive to notice how far Rudliff's history has carried the knowledge of us. The second night that I was in Stockholm, before the meeting had begun, I was introduced to a venerable old priest from the country—as a minister from Scotland. 'Of the Free Church of Scotland?' he asked, in a great hurry. When the question was answered, he grasped me by the hand, and broke out into a long and earnest burst about John Knox's fatherland, the martyrs, and so on, in such a torrent that I could not catch a word so as to answer him. Rudliff had been his author too; and fortunately he is a man of high standing and influence among them. Inasmuch as he invented some peculiarly simple kind of musical instrument which supersedes, in country congregations, the more expensive organ."

*From the H. & F. Record of the Presbyterian Church in the United States.*

### THE TWO MITES.

The distinction of rich and poor has existed in all times and in all countries.

Nor is there any state of society in which it does not appear. Very different ideas of riches and of poverty may be entertained, but the two conditions are always distinguished from each other. Some of Christ's disciples live in affluence; others experience the pinchings of poverty. One has everything that heart can wish for; another is constrained by stern necessity to restrict his desires within very narrow limits. The arrangement is a wise one, like the inequalities of the earth's surface and soil. It gives rise to a profitable interchange of moral commodities, to a lucrative commerce of love, to the cultivation of benevolence and gratitude.

In the mixed assembly whom the Saviour saw casting their gifts in the treasury, (Mark xii. 41.) there were, doubtless, persons from all the walks of life; rich and poor, old and young, male and female. The contribution seems to have been universal. The Saviour's eye was intent upon the interesting scene. And when it was over, and the last shackle had been dropped into the chest, the great Teacher commented on it for the instruction of his disciples. Different are his comments from what his disciple would probably have made. He calls their attention to a poor, forlorn woman, who had cast in two mites, that make a farthing; he also notices the munificent offerings of the rich people, and he makes the extraordinary declaration, that she had "cast in more than they all." And he relieves the astonishment produced by this statement in his disciple's minds, by showing them in what sense it was more. It was not absolutely so, for they had given much and she little, and no arithmetic can change the relation of more and less, but it was more, in proportion to what she possessed. All are stewards, and are required to apportion their offerings according to the amount entrusted to them; she had done this. All are required to give, as the Lord enables them, as the Lord prospers them; this she had done. She had received but little, but of that little she had returned into the Lord's treasury a larger proportion than they had of their abundance. Therefore, she had cast in more than they. From this incident:

1. We learn that poor people, even very poor ones, may give to the cause of the Lord. No contribution has had higher praise than this poor widow's; yet it did not amount to more than half