

culture and growth—if they knew indeed that an angel's strength and an archangel's glory lay before them, and within their reach, if they only pursued the right way—they would be furnished with a powerful motive to the faithful use of every endowment bestowed by God, and to the highest development of every good element in their nature. If men were properly instructed in the relations in which they stood to all else—to God, and all which God has made—they would be led to a practical perception of their responsibilities, and a more thorough and conscientious fulfilment of their duties as moral and accountable beings.

We have spoken of outward nature, and adverted to the usefulness of a knowledge thereof. In view of temporal advantages merely, this is highly requisite. An acquaintance with nature's wonderful properties and powers augments the conveniences and comforts of a people. We do not require to illustrate this at any length. In a religious point of view, also, an acquaintance with nature is highly useful. Through nature we are led to nature's God. His works and ways proclaim his power, wisdom and goodness. We have spoken also of a knowledge of God. This is the highest, the saving knowledge for man. Any system of education for the people which left this out of view would be radically deficient. A "godless education" is no fit education for a human being. It may be right to state here, however, that in saying this we should be sorry to be considered in any way identified with those who have in recent times employed this phrase as a party watch-word against certain liberal and well intended educational systems. We regard a godless education as essentially defective. Yet we would not mix up the tortuous questions of controverted theology with the instructions which a people are to share in common. We would not introduce sectarian divinity into our popular schools and colleges. We would build up the people together in religious concord. We would not disturb and scatter them by religious discord. In all education reference should be made to God, for all acknowledge a God. There are also certain great leading principles of religion which are universally acknowledged—love to God and love to man—the duty of "doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly before God," and that of "doing unto all men as we would that they should do unto us." These, and such as these, should form part of every system of popular education. As to the points in controversy between the different sects—transubstantiation, the Trinity, election, predestination, and the like, we would have these taught at home, or by special teachers for such purposes at other places. We do not deny the right of all parents and all sects to train up their people in what dogmas they judge best, but we would have them do so in a manner not to mar the general harmony. Religion has been already sufficiently degraded by the disputes of religionists; and it is time that all true, and good, and serious men should strive to bring such unseemly disputes to a close.

It is only by the judicious education of a people, we repeat, that their power can be guided in a safe and salutary direction. If this education be neglected, and the people permitted to remain in ignorance, there can be no proper social security. The latent passions and powers lie there like the hidden elements of a volcano, and if any sufficient exciting cause call them into action, they will break forth with a tremendous eruption. The exciting cause may be proper and justifiable, or it may be improper and unjustifiable. It may spring from a disregard of justice on the part of the rulers, pressing the patience of the governed beyond their power of endurance. Or it may spring from the machinations of selfish and designing demagogues who move the passions of the people to serve their own interests. An ignorant people cannot distinguish between the character of these causes; but an educated people can. Hence the security of the latter, and the in-

security of the former. An ignorant people rising up like "a great lion," stirred to madness by a false excitement, will blindly overturn the social fabric, and prostrate it in ruins. But a well informed people rising to make a firm remonstrance and resolute opposition to injustice, will not act blindly but wisely, and will take care to leave the structure of society better and more secure than they found it.

The task of educating the masses of the people is one which lies legitimately at the door of national governments. Yet it should not be held for a moment that we, as individuals, are relieved from all responsibility. Let us in the first place see that we have proper knowledge ourselves. And then we shall find that each of us has a sphere in which he may do his part in educating the people. Let such of us as have families instil salutary views and correct principles there. And let all of us cast carefully around us, and we may discover many opportunities to impart to those who require it sound and saving knowledge. Let us strive to learn ourselves, and to impart to others, true views of human nature and human responsibilities, and of the relation in which men stand to one another, and to God. Above all let us go ourselves to Jesus, and bring others to him, who was at once the Son of God and the Son of Man—the visible image of the everlasting Father, and the perfect pattern for humanity. From his lips, and from his life, may all of us, both young and old, rich and poor, learn the highest, the purest, the divinest knowledge. It is the spirit which comes from Him and from His Gospel, which alone can bring to society full security, and crown it with perfect enjoyment. This binds it together by ties celestial, and renders it safe and lasting as the heavens.

CONTROVERSY AT MEADVILLE, PENN.

Meadville is known to our readers as the seat of a liberal theological school. Attacks have been recently made there upon Unitarian Christianity, and the representations put forth from the Orthodox pulpits have not been of the most scrupulously correct character. Meadville, we perceive, fares no better than other places in this respect. A Rev. Mr. Kingsley, it would appear, has made himself quite prominent in this warfare. His activity has aroused that of our friend Mr. Hassall, formerly a Methodist Minister in this city, but now a student at the Meadville School. He has propounded eighteen questions to the Rev. Mr. K., which we subjoin. It will be seen that they are of rather a puzzling nature. Verily it would be difficult to give a satisfactory reply to them. Mr. K. declined to answer them because "the individual whose signature they bore was a stranger to him." Most persons will think it probable that he also had some other and stronger reasons.

- I. Did not you, in one of your present course of Lectures, declare that the Unitarians did not believe in the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures?
- II. Do all Trinitarian commentators believe in the plenary inspiration of every book, chapter, verse and phrase of the common version of the Scriptures?
- III. Does Luther, Calvin, Clark, Griesbach, Wesley or Arch-Bishop Whately believe in the plenary inspiration of every book, chapter, verse and phrase of the common version of the Scriptures?
- IV. Do you believe in the plenary inspiration of every book, chapter, verse and phrase of the common Scriptures?
- V. Does Calvin believe in the plenary inspiration, or even in the genuineness of the 2nd Epistle of Peter? Does he believe that the epistle to the Hebrews was written by Paul?
- VI. Does Luther believe in the plenary inspiration, or even genuineness, of the epistle of James?
- VII. Do not Wesley and Dr. Adam Clark reject portions of the common version?
- VIII. When Channing says, page 80, vol. III, as quoted by you, "These latter passages we do not hesitate to modify and restrain, and turn from their obvious sense," etc., does not the term "we" evidently include all christians, and does he not by the expression "later passages" refer to a class of passages which Trinitarians interpret as he does?
- IX. When Trinitarians read these passages "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you have no life in you." "But

to us there is but one God, the Father." "But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know ALL THINGS." Do they, in interpreting them, take their literal meaning, or do they not "modify and restrain and turn them from their obvious sense?"

X. When Christ says, "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father," is it not the literal and obvious sense that the Son is not omniscient? and do not you, and Trinitarians generally in interpreting this passage, "modify and restrain and turn it from its obvious sense?"

XI. Do you know of an Unitarian church in the United States where the "Improved Version" referred to by you, is used?

XII. Do not the Unitarians assert that there is no Unitarian congregation in the United States which uses the "Improved Version?" and do they not deny that it is of authority in the denomination?

XIII. Does not Rev. John Wesley, when writing on the Calvinistic view of Predestination, say to the Calvinistic view: "Then you have either found a new God or made one! This is not the God of the Christians. Our God is just in all his ways, he reprobeth not where he hath not strewed?"

XIV. Does not Mr. Wesley again say when writing on the same subject,—referring to the Calvinists, "And thus by these men's account, our Lord lost his labor of Love, and accomplished a SOLEMN NOTHING?"

XV. Does not Mr. Wesley also say that "If Christ died not for all, then those who obey Christ, by going and preaching the gospel to every creature, as glad tidings of grace and peace, of great joy to all people, do sin thereby, in that they go to most people with a lie in their mouth?"

XVI. When Dr. Channing says "that they take from us our Father in heaven, and substitute for him a being whom we cannot love if we would, and whom we ought not to love if we could," is it not plain from what follows, as well as from what precedes, that he is referring to the same system of religion which Wesley says has "found or made a new God" a God which is "not the God of the Christians?"

XVII. Does not Mr. Wesley say that "the doctrine of absolute predestination naturally leads to the chambers of death?"

XVIII. Is it proper for a person holding the views of Wesley to fellowship with Calvinists?
R. HASSALL.

WAR.

A pamphlet entitled "Considerations Respecting the Lawfulness of War under the Gospel Dispensation," has just reached us through the Post-office. We do not know by whom it was sent, but it was highly acceptable. It was issued, as the subscription indicates, by the Society of Friends, at their last yearly meeting in New York city, and bears the signature of their clerk. We wish that every body of Christians would make it a rule to utter their annual testimony against a practice so palpably abhorrent to the plainest principles of the Gospel.

With reference to the alleged unavoidable necessity of war, and the attempted justification of it from the Old Testament history, the pamphlet contains the following paragraphs:

"It is indeed to be regretted, that no instance of strictly national character has yet occurred, to test the practicability of the principle for which we plead,—an unreasoning reliance upon the Omnipotent Arm for protection and defence.—There is, however, a case to which we may refer, of a strong character, and sufficiently national for all the purposes of our argument. Pennsylvania, it is known, was settled by men who believed that Christianity forbade war under any and every pretext. They acted in strict accordance with this belief. They planted themselves in the midst of savages. They were surrounded by men who knew nothing of written treaties, or the obligations of revealed religion; by men who were addicted to war in its most sanguinary and revolting forms;—and yet, for more than seventy years, and up to the time that the government of the Colony passed into other hands, they enjoyed uninterrupted peace.

"The Pennsylvanians," says Clarkson, "became armed, though without arms; they became strong, though without strength; they became safe, without the ordinary means of safety. For the greater part of a century, and never, during the administration of William Penn, or that of his proper successors, was there a quarrel or a war."—Whatever the quarrels of the Pennsylvania Indians were with others, they uniformly respected and held sacred, as it were, the territories of William Penn.

"The settlers of Pennsylvania, relying upon Divine protection, placed themselves in the midst of savages, without the means of resisting aggression; and even savage magnanimity felt the appeal,—suppressed the war-cry—and permitted them to possess the land in undisturbed repose. What a lesson, may we not ask, to Christian nations!"

"How painfully, how instructively, does the situation of other American colonies contrast with this! We will not attempt to portray it; but refer to the blood-stained pages of colonial history.

cerity and truth, towards nations professing the benign religion of the Gospel, would be more dangerous, or less successful? We trust not—such a conclusion would be a libel upon mankind—a denial of the efficacy of the Christian religion—and an inexcusable distrust of the Providence and moral government of God.

"It is not unusual to attempt a justification of war under the Gospel dispensation, by referring to the wars of the Jews, under the dispensation of the Law. It is conceded that many of these wars were authorised by the Supreme Ruler of the universe, for purposes of his own inscrutable wisdom; but this high authority cannot be claimed by Christian nations; and it has been shown that the two dispensations are essentially different—that holy men during the continuance of the legal dispensation, predicted, under the influence of the spirit of prophecy, that the time would come when nation should cease to lift up sword against nation, or to learn war any more. We have seen that the Divine Author and Founder of the existing dispensation, called the attention of his followers to those violent and vindictive passions, the indulgence of which were allowed under the Law, for the express purpose of excluding them from the code of morals which it was His purpose to establish; and that His immediate followers, and their successors for nearly two centuries, firmly believed that war was forbidden by their Divine Master. We have shown that the conviction was so solemnly sealed upon their consciences, that when called by the rulers of that day to serve as soldiers, no earthly consideration or suffering could induce them to swerve from this article of primitive Christian faith.

We would further quote the concluding reflection:—

"In conclusion, we would ask attention to one view of the subject of war, which commends itself with awful solemnity to the consideration of all, and with peculiar force to those we are now addressing. We refer to the ultimate—to the unseen consequences of war—to the final state of the myriads of spirits, disembodied, it is greatly to be feared, while under the influence of the most ferocious passions, and sent uncalled, into the world of righteous retribution.

"The reflection is awful indeed—and must, we would fain hope, command the most serious attention;—and by producing a firm conviction of the utter incompatibility of war with the meek, forgiving, and peaceable spirit of the Gospel, lead to increased and earnest efforts to eradicate from the earth this scourge to the family of man.

"If, then, the fruits of war be anguish unpeakable, and bitterness in the latter end—how strong—how powerful is the claim upon our efforts to oppose it, and restore the Church to the state of purity in which it stood in the primitive period of its existence!

"May the Lord in his mercy hasten the day this shall be effected;—when nation shall no longer lift up sword against nation, and the people shall learn war no more; but the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of the Lord, and of his Christ."

BOOKS FOR SALE,
AT
C. BRYSON'S BOOK-STORE,
ST. FRANCOIS XAVIER STREET.

- THE Entire Works of WILLIAM ELLERY CHANNING, D.D.; in two volumes.
- The Entire Works of the Rev. ORVILLE DEWEY, D.D., Pastor of the Church of the Messiah, New York, one volume, 8vo. pp. 887.
- A COMMENTARY ON THE FOUR GOSPELS. By the Rev. A. A. Livermore.
- THE ESSENTIAL FAITH OF THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH, Deduced from the Sacred Records. By Harriet Martineau.
- LA FOI DE L'EGLISE UNIVERSELLE; D'APRES LES SAINTES ECRITURES. Par Dlle. Martineau. Traduit de l'Anglais.
- SCRIPTURE PROOFS AND SCRIPTURAL ILLUSTRATIONS OF UNITARIANISM. By John Wilson. 3rd Edition, revised and enlarged.
- A COLLECTION OF PSALMS AND HYMNS for Christian Worship. By the Rev. F. W. P. Greenwood, D. D.
- PRAYERS for the use of Christian Families. With a Preface recommending the Practice of Family Worship. By the Rev. J. Scott Porter.
- LECTURES ON CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. By the Rev. A. Peabody, Pastor of the South Congregational Church, Portsmouth, N. H.
- THE APOLOGY OF THE REV. THEOPHILUS LINDSAY, M. A., on resigning the Vicarage of Catterick, Yorkshire.
- THE REMONSTRANCE OF A UNITARIAN. Addressed to the Right Rev. Thomas Burgess, D.D., Lord Bishop of St. Davids. By Capt. James Gifford, R. N.
- LETTERS ADDRESSED TO RELATIVES AND FRIENDS, chiefly in Reply to Arguments in Support of the Doctrine of the Trinity. By Mary S. B. Dana, author of the "Southern and Northern Harps," "The Parted Family," &c.
- THE RECOLLECTIONS OF JOTHAM ANDERSON. By the late Rev. H. Ware, Jr., of Cambridge University, New England.
- SERMONS. By the Rev. F. W. P. Greenwood, D.D., Minister of King's Chapel, Boston. In two volumes.