

## FATHERS' DEPARTMENT.

## THE BROTHERS.

"FATHER, Alonzo struck me," said Julian.

"Well, my son," said the father, very quietly, "what then?"

"Why—why, father," said the boy, "I thought you would like to know it."

"What will you do about it, my son?"

"Why, father, I thought you would like to see to it," said Julian.

"You, my son, can do all that ought to be done to him."

"But, father, you have often told me I must love him, and never strike him, if he did strike me?"

"Is it because you love your brother, my son, that you did not strike him when he struck you?"

"Yes, father," said Julian, faintly.

"Well, my son, I am glad that you did not strike him, but rather come to me with your complaint. What do you want me to do with him?"

"Why, father, you said you would whip him, if he struck me again."

"Do you wish me to whip your brother?" asked the father.

"You said you would, father; and you always tell us that you will help us to settle our disputes if we will come to you."

"So you would be glad to see him whipped would you, Julian?"

Julian hung his head, and made no answer.

"Alonzo! my dear son, come here," said the father.

Alonzo came near, and the two brothers stood by their father.

"Alonzo," said the father, "Julian says you struck him, and he wishes me to whip you."

"Julian kicked me, father, before I struck him," said Alonzo.

"That alters the case," said the father. "Julian did not tell me that he had done you any injury."

"I should not have struck him, if he had not kicked me," said Alonzo.

"Whoever saw the like of this? Here are two brothers, each trying to enlist their father in a quarrel against the other. How often have I said to you 'Children, love each other, and never fight; and now each of you wants me to punish the other.'

Alonzo was an affectionate little boy, and loved Julian much, except when he was angry with him.

"Alonzo," continued the father, "do you wish me to help you punish your brother?"

Alonzo did not answer immediately, but looked at Julian. After a while he said,—

"No, father, I do not wish to have him punished."

"But Julian wishes me to help him whip you, Alonzo."

"No matter, father," said Alonzo, "I do not wish to have my brother whipped."

"What!" said the father, "not if he wishes to have you whipped?"

"No, father," said Alonzo, whose little heart began to yearn for his brother; and by this time he had come round close to him and taken his hand.

"Well Julian," said the father, "do you still wish me to whip your brother?"

"No, father," said Julian, subdued by the gentle affection of his brother; "I do not wish little brother to be punished."

"See Julian, my son, how it looks! Just now you prayed me to take sides with you against your dear brother, and help you to punish him."

"That was when I was angry with him," said Julian as he stood with his arm drawn around his brother. "I do not want you to hurt him now. I had rather you would whip me."

"Next time, then," said the father, "when your brother hurts you in any way, wait till your anger is all gone, and till you can put your arm around him, and love him as you now do, before you come to ask me to help you fight him, and whip him. Never strike him yourself, nor kick him, whatever he does to you, till you can fold him in your arms and love him as you do at this moment."

"Why, father, then I should never strike him at all," said Julian, "nor tell you if he struck me."

"All the better," said the father; "then you would never get into a quarrel."

So let your children do. When others strike you, never strike them back, nor ask your parents or teachers to strike them, till you can put your arm around them in gentle love and affection.—*Kiss for a Blow.*

GREATNESS may build the tomb, but it is goodness must make the epitaph.

## SELECTIONS.

## MISSION IN THE FRIENDLY ISLANDS.

Dr. Harvey, Professor of Botany in Trinity College, Dublin, in a recent letter bears testimony to the efficiency of the Wesleyan Mission in these Islands. "You know," he says, "my predilections are not in favor of sectarianism, and hitherto I have abstained from supporting any but the missionary societies of the English Church, nor should I now depart from this line of conduct, did I regard the Wesleyan Missionary Society as a sectarian body. Here, at least, the mission is conducted in a truly catholic spirit; the natives hear only the plain unadulterated Gospel which we all receive; nor would they be aware, but for the presence of a Jesuit mission among them, of the unhappy differences which have rent the Christian Church.—The missionaries take the New Testament in their hand, and expound the truths of Christianity in their fullness and broadness, without troubling the natives with curious questions and speculations. They have also translated into Tongue an abridgment of our noble liturgy, which is always used in the chapel service. The result has been the total extinction of heathenism in these islands, accompanied by a change in manners truly wonderful, considering the short time that the mission has been established. The last human sacrifice occurred but fourteen years ago; previous to that time they were common, and always on the death of a high chief, either one of his children or wives was strangled, and others of his relatives often maimed or grievously wounded. At that time, too, the natives (with all their 'friendliness' to strangers) were thieves and liars, and, though less savage than the Foejeans, were living in the habitual sins of heathenism. Now, they are a quiet, peaceable, and well-ordered Christian community; and many have given unmistakable evidence of the reality of their conversion, and become able assistants to the missionaries in carrying out the work of Christianization. Recently, comparatively, the Society has established a mission in the Foejean group, where already the converts number 10,000, including several chiefs. About twelve years ago, after the islands had in a great measure become Christian, the Jesuits commenced an opposition, purposely to overthrow the good work, and to introduce the Romish superstition in its stead. But they have made but little progress. The natives are shrewd, and ready to answer them at once out of the New Testament, but refuse to listen to any other authority, so that controversy here has invariably injured the 'cause.' In one of the controversies, which were more numerous formerly than now, when the Jesuit had, in the course of the discussion, shifted his ground and changed his assertions more than once, the native controversialist, in his reply, called the Jesuit a *Feko*, (or 'cuttle-fish,') because he changed color. This tickled the fancy of the other natives, who were all familiar with the habits of the cuttle-fish, which formerly was one of their gods. So the word *Feko* has become the common synonyme for Jesuit; and they illustrate the nickname by ludicrous comparisons of the habits of both animals. The cuttle-fish, with his many-grasping arms, sticks fast by its suckers to the object it attacks; its large mouth and sharp jaws are hidden under the arms, and only found out when it bites and devours; its great staring eyes are ever looking for prey; it has a habit of squeezing its body into narrow holes, where it sits ready to pounce on a passing fish; it squirts out clear water as it swims at ease, and throws dirt all round it when attacked, and then scuttles off under cover of the fouled water; or it lies down flat, and takes the color of the stone it lies on, when it is cowed, and has no other means of escape. Thus they talk among themselves, as they point at the *Feko, Feko.*"

## THE BIBLE AND SCIENCE.

THOUGH the Bible is not a revelation of science, it may be expected to be free from error, and to contain under reserved and simple language, much concealed wisdom, and turns of expression which harmonize with natural facts, known perfectly to God, but not known to those for whom at first the revelation was designed. This expectation is just; and in both respects the Bible presents a striking contrast to the sacred books of heathen nations.

All ancient systems of religion, and all eminent philosophers of antiquity, so far as they are known, maintained notions on science no less absurd than their theology.

In Greek and Latin philosophy, the heavens were a solid vault over the earth, a sphere studded with stars, as Aristotle called them. The sages of Egypt

held that the world was formed by the motion of air and the upward course of flame; Plato, that it was an intelligent being; Empedocles held that there were two suns; Zeno, that the stars were kindled by their motions, and that they nourished the sun with their fires.

All Eastern nations believed that the heavenly bodies exercised powerful influences over human affairs, often of a disastrous kind, and that all nature was composed of four elements—fire, air, earth, and water,—substances certainly not elementary.

In the Hindu philosophy, the globe is represented as flat and triangular, composed of seven stories—the whole mass being sustained upon the heads of elephants, who, when they shake themselves, cause earthquakes. Mahomet taught that the mountains were created to prevent the earth from moving, and to hold it as by anchors and chains. The "fathers of the church" themselves teach doctrines scarcely less absurd. "The roundness of the earth is a theory," says Lactantius, "which no one so ignorant enough to believe."

How instructive, that while a very ancient system of idolatry may be overthrown by its false physics, not one of the forty writers of the Bible, most of whom lived in the vicinity of one or other of the nations who held these views, has written a single line that favors them. This silence is consolatory, and furnishes a striking confirmation of the truth of their message.

The exactness of Scripture statements, and its agreement with modern discovery, is also remarkable.

The Scriptures, for example, speak of the earth as a globe, and as suspended upon nothing, Isa. xi. 22; Job. xxvi. 7-10; Prov. viii. 27. In treating of its age, they distinguish between the creation of an organized matter, and of the heavens and the earth, Gen. i. 1, 2. They give to man a very recent origin, and their accuracy in this respect is attested by the ascertained state of the earth's surface, and by the monuments of antiquity. They describe the heavens as boundless space, not as a solid sphere; and light as an element independent of the sun, and as anterior to it, anticipating the generally received theory of modern inquirers. When they speak of air, they say that God gave it weight, as Galileo proved; and of the seas that he gave them their measure—a proportion of land and sea such as now obtains being essential to the health and safety of both animal and vegetable life. The waters above the expanse have an importance attached to them in Scripture which modern science alone can appreciate, many millions of tons being raised from the surface of England alone by evaporation every day.

When they speak of the human race, they give it one origin; and of human language, they indicate original identity and subsequent divisions, not into endless diversities of dialect such as now exist, but rather into two or three primeval tongues; facts which though long questioned, ethnography and philosophy have confirmed, Gen. xi. 1 x. 32.

When they arrest the course of the sun, that is, of the earth's rotation, they stay the moon too; a precaution which could not have been supposed necessary, but on the supposition of the diurnal motion of the earth. When they speak of the stars, instead of supposing a thousand, as ancient astronomers did, (Ptolemy says 1022; Ptolemy, 1026,) they declare that they are innumerable; a declaration which modern telescopes discover to be not even a figure of speech. 'God,' says Sir John Herschel, after surveying the groups of stars and nebulae in the heavens, 'has scattered them like dust through the immensity of space.' And when the Scripture speaks of their host, it is dependent, material, obedient things, Isa. xl. 2-27.

Generally, however, (it may be added,) Scripture speaks in relation to physical facts in the language of common life, and sometimes that language is strictly accurate; as in Job. xxxviii. 6; ix. 6; civ. 3; Prov. iii. 20. And the reason is plain. If strictly philosophical language had been employed, Scripture must have been less intelligible; and by its language describing natural facts not as they appear, but as they really are, would have made such facts matter of revelation. It must have excited doubts among the ignorant, and prejudices (from the necessary incompleteness of Scripture teaching on such questions) among the philosophic; destroying among all, the unity of impression which the Bible seeks to produce. The Bible would have become, in that case, a divine though incomplete hand-book of science—an arrangement so little conducive to the cultivation of a truly philosophical spirit as to be a profane insult to religion itself.—*Dr. Angus's Bible Hand-book.*