

Missionaries: it ascribed those complaints to prejudice—it accused the accuser of a want of enlightened liberality,—which is always, it seems, to show itself in respecting the opinions of others, however low and erroneous they may be, and in suffering any horrible practice when it is done in religion's sacred name. And so the national conscience was untouched, or its slight qualms tranquilized, till it was pierced by the discovery that it had not been merely tolerating idolatry, but supporting it,—not merely refraining from persecution, but conniving at licentiousness,—not merely allowing liberty to the pagan, but establishing his superiority over his Christian brother. Thus, while in all our churches the ministers were proving that to help in spreading the gospel is a constant duty from which no Christian can disengage himself or be relieved,—while the churches were cordially acknowledging that duty, and meeting with liberality the appeals that were being founded upon it,—we find that the same people, in the capacity of Indian rulers, were placing the most determined obstacles in the path of the Christian Missionary, and were meeting with frowning looks or heavy penalties those endeavours to diffuse the Word of Life which, even under such discouragements, the unquenchable zeal of some devoted Christians impelled them to attempt.

But to return to the Mutiny. If, instead of provoking it, we are charged with this guilty indulgence of their vicious system of religious orders and ceremonies, at the expense of our own Christian honor, it then becomes an important question to ask, who were its crafty authors? It is easy enough to say who took part in its commencement, but that does not answer the question; who before the outbreak projected it? Who conceived the scheme of the conspiracy? Who, in fact, were the principals, and who were the tools? No doubt remains but that the army of Bengal was the author of its own disaffection. It needed no tampering from Russian agents; I