

ve been them. which i r letter rring to you had ondenoe the Dio- termine m of the d' judg- e Priest- declared d with a mit to." a in the inion in he words e, D.D., o being omment- rs in the cons and atonage rally of Bowen, e, Stone, ee edit, re author peaks of spect to would be the vari- Church, Bishop, ch, from State to nment of I suppose the lead- have del- to the uthority, t circum- e asked, question ss of the answer of admo- clesiasti- ource to ard, that he, as he y other od." e which address- hich, for y, but in do what ase may shall an- on could - Bishop accon. I nction of so many ig the in- rdination arkable, r should r in this language o alleged , officiat- stance nce has limit to and al- exist, as by, here, ve been re is an point at may ho- a case. r Presby- and dis- nis prolix limit the e gospel? this city, tidings of se anxiety from the ew York shall suc- ce to the ow flood- Right orten the we had es within

our own communion, to meet this alarming swell of unevangelized population. Alas! we have not. I look beyond our own communion, and perceive the various Evangelical and Protestant denominations, differing with us in matters of ecclesiastical organization, but agreeing with us and "teaching apostolic doctrine," to use the words of Archbishop Sumner, and I rejoice to believe that again to use the words of the same distinguished writer, "they may yet be owned of God," and I believe they are, "as faithful ministers of his word and sacraments, and enjoy his blessing on their ministrations." I thank God for every voice that directs the lost sinner to the Shepherd of Israel. St Paul rejoiced that Christ was preached even of contention; and shall not we, when we know that He is, by these brethren, preached of love? While we cannot yet all "see eye to eye," surely many of us are enabled to feel heart to heart. Beautiful is that saying of the late Doctor Archibald, "Christian love pants after unity with all the real children of God." What would our country be, this day, if these various bodies of Protestant Christians around us were silenced?—They are doing a great work, and none more than the Methodist clergy. When we can do them a service, why should we refuse it? We shall reach them more effectually by love than by invective. O! then, Right Rev. Sir, strive not to "limit" the liberty which you so kindly admit, to preach the gospel wherever and whenever we have opportunity and strength to say, "Behold the Lamb of God." I was happy in being permitted to give my testimony to the truth as it is in Jesus, before a thousand people, in the Eutaw Street Church, and to receive from my Methodist brethren, on that occasion, such truly considerate kindness as I can never forget. But I now candidly confess the existence of a sorrow, that continually arose in my mind; it was that in preaching the gospel of Christ to an audience gathered from every section of our city, I could not have had your full and cordial approbation. What would I not have given, if your views of duty could have allowed you to be present! I think the spectacle then exhibited would have swept away your objections, from first to last.

Having waited thus long to hear the decision of the Standing Committee, on the case submitted to them, and aware of their having met and adjourned since your last communication to me, may I beg to hear from you, and to have a copy of the minutes of the Committee relating to this subject, Your friend and obedient servant,
HENRY V. D. JOHNS.
(To be continued.)

Obituary Notices.

Charles Rickards, of Windsor.

CHARLES RICKARDS, aged fourteen years, sweetly fell asleep in Jesus, on Sabbath morning, May 2, 1852. His end was peace. His illness was lingering and painful. Under the blighting influence of consumption, his form was wasted almost to a shadow; but his mind was kept in perfect peace, being stayed on God. He suffered much from violent spasms in his stomach and side; but, in the midst of his pains, all his hopes were fixed with unshaken confidence on his Redeemer. He longed to be at home with Jesus, and with those of his friends who had gone before. Many Christian friends came to see him during his illness, and when they prayed with him, he was greatly comforted. We trust that his sufferings and death will be sanctified to the good of his surviving friends, and also to the community at large. How true is the saying, "In the midst of life, we are in death." It is necessary that we should give the more earnest heed to the things that belong to our peace; that we should, while in health, place our hopes on a sure foundation. Truly life is short at its greatest length, and none can be sure of the morrow.
J. A. S.
Windsor, May 3, 1852.

Prayer should be the key of the day, and the lock of the night.

Literary.

Mental Science.

THE EXISTENCE OF THE HUMAN MIND.

THE positive existence of the human mind is unequivocally demonstrated from the SACRED SCRIPTURES. Here we enter upon *divine ground, divine proof, and divine declarations!* We have not now to investigate, in proof of the present and future existence of the human soul, either united to, or separated from, material organization, the mere assertions and reasonings of fallible men, but the *infallible words* of God himself. Our position is exalted and absolutely conclusive! Heaven and earth may pass away, but "not one jot or tittle," of what God has asserted, shall fail. To the "law and the testimony," then, in proof of the doctrine in question.

"The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." (Gen. ii. 7.) Here the Lord assures us in the most distinct manner, that man is a compound being, possessed of a *body* and a *spirit*, created distinctly and separately: the *body* being formed of the dust of the earth, but the *soul* immediately infused into him from God himself. These two separate acts of the Almighty strongly evidence, that the *soul* and the *body* are not the *same thing*. The *body* derives its origin from the earth; hence, being earthly, it is decomposable and perishable. The *soul* is the "breath of life," breathed into him by the Divine Being. No sooner was this *life* infused into the organized body, than man became a *living soul!* It is, therefore, un-compounded and imperishable. This language is sufficiently explicit to convince us that the soul of man is very different to mere matter, however modified, or even to the souls of beasts.

When Rachel was in the agonies of death, it is said, "Her soul was in departing, for she died." (Gen. xxxv. 18.) Or, as the original signifies, *in the going away of the soul*, her body died. This is another proof that there is an immortal spirit in man, which can exist independently of, and separated from, the human body. When she died her soul departed, but her body did not go away. Her soul took its flight into the untried regions of eternity; but the lifeless corpse remained behind to go to corruption. The soul and the body must, therefore, have been distinct.

Moses, of old, died, and was buried, but his spirit survived death. This is demonstrated by his appearing with Christ on the Mount of Transfiguration. (Matt. xvii. 3.) Here we have a plain, positive, proof, that human spirits live after their separation from the body.

Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob died, and their bodies saw corruption; but their spirits live, and God is designated their God. If both soul and body were dead, God could not possibly be called their God; for he is not the God of the dead, but of the living. This is the argument by which our Saviour refuted the Sadducees, who denied the resurrection, and the existence of either angels or spirits. (Matt. xxii. 32; Acts. xxiii. 8.) And it is an argument which cannot be answered, either by the Sadducees, or their successors, the materialists.

The prophet Elijah, when "he stretched himself" three times upon the dead body of the widow's son, at Zarephath, and prayed—"O Lord my God, I pray thee, let this child's soul come into him again"—the Lord heard "the voice of Elijah; and the soul of the child came into him again, and he revived." (1 Kings xvii. 21, 22.) Does not this imply that the spirit must take possession of the body in order to produce and maintain the flame of animal life? And did he not become alive from the circumstance of the immaterial principle coming again into him? Dr. A. Clarke says, "The words and mode of expression here appear to me a strong proof, not only of the existence of an immortal spirit in man, but also that that spirit can and does exist in a separate state from the body. It is here represented as being in the midst of the child, like a *spring* in the centre of a machine, which gives motion

to every part, and without which the whole would stand still."

Solomon declares, "The dust shall return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." (Ecc. xii. 7.) In process of time putrefaction and solution having taken place, the body becomes decomposed, and is reduced to dust, from which it was originally taken; but that spirit which God first breathed into man's nostrils, in consequence of which he became a *living soul*, a rational, immortal, and accountable being, returns to God who gave it. Here Solomon makes a most manifest distinction between the soul and the body. They are not the same; for one is matter and the other spirit. The body, which is matter, returns to its original dust; but the spirit, which is immaterial, goes to God, its Author. It is utterly impossible that two natures can be more distinct, or more emphatically distinguished, than matter and spirit.

Christ states, "Fear not them who kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." (Matt. x. 28.) Men, we perceive, may kill the body; but they are not able to kill the soul. That lives, and it will live, when the body shall have returned to dust. Hence the body and the soul are distinct substances, although, for a season, mysteriously united; for the body may be killed and the soul escape. Here we have the mortality of the body, and the immateriality and consequent immortality of the soul; for those who murder the one have no power to injure the other. If the soul and the body die together, our Lord makes a distinction without a difference; but this cannot be charged on him, who is infinite in knowledge, and must be perfectly acquainted with the nature, properties, and duration of all beings and things, in both the visible and invisible world. God only can kill the soul, which after all the efforts of men, survives the dissolution of the body; but as Almighty power created that soul immortal, it never will be employed in its death and destruction.

When Jesus was suspended upon the cross, he commended his spirit into the hands of his Father, and to the dying thief, he said, "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." Here we have plain, decisive proof that his own spirit, as well as the malefactor's, would survive the body, and would live with God when it was dead. (Luke xxiii. 43, 46.) This saying of our Lord strongly demonstrates the immateriality of the soul, and its separate existence after death. The spirit of the penitent thief accompanied the Saviour to paradise, while his body was left to mingle with the dust.

When our Lord first appeared to his disciples, as they were assembled together, soon after his resurrection, and said to them, "Peace be unto you," they "were terrified and affrighted," supposing "they had seen a spirit." But if there be no such beings as disembodied spirits, would not our Lord have corrected their mistake? This, however, we are assured, he did not. He confirmed them in their opinions; and indorsed their sentiments as true, by saying, "A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." This assertion of Jesus is a strong proof, not only of the immateriality but of the immortality of the soul. They probably imagined that they only saw the *soul* of Christ; nor were they convinced to the contrary, until they perceived the identity of his person by handling him. They were then assured of the reality of his resurrection; that Jesus himself, in his compound nature, was, of a truth, before them. Here we may consider the *soul* and *body* as perfectly distinct; that the *spirit* exists independent of the body; that the body will rise again, as Christ's resurrection is a type of ours; and that the immortal nature of man will, after the resurrection of the dead, be united to the body, and thus exist forever.

GEORGE JOHNSON.
Point de Bate, N. B., April 24, 1852.

It is difficult to conceive anything more beautiful than the reply given by one in affliction. When he was asked how he bore it so well. "It lightens the stroke," he said, "to draw near to Him who handles the rod."

Correspondence.

The Christian Visitor against Methodism.

Charity had benignantly begun to hope, that the editor of the above-named paper had grown weary in his unprofitable warfare against his neighbours, but it seems not; for in his paper of the 16th inst he comes out again, less rampant than formerly, it is true, but with not less disregard to justice and truth.

He had in a former number mentioned that a Convention had been called at Philadelphia, to adopt a memorial to the General Conference in favour of Lay Delegation, and in his last he notices another called by those opposed to the views of the former. To this, he says, "none but those opposed to lay representation were invited," but takes care not to say that the former none but those in favour of their movement were invited. This is misrepresentation first.

He adds, "an address to the Church at large was adopted, in which the subject of the late Convention is discussed, and the brethren of the Church are invited to send delegates to the Convention to be held in St. George's Church, in the city of Philadelphia." Here is a self-contradiction to the above.

Of the Convention held by the advocates of change, he says, "Its proceedings were marked by a christian spirit, as will be inferred from the following abstract." Now, why did he not say the same of the other? Were its proceedings less christian? I seriously question whether the editor knows what is a "christian spirit," not that I mean to say that such a spirit was not shown in the Convention. There is one thing refreshing in the "abstract," viz. the Chairman repudiated the diabolical counsel of some, who recommended them to *starve the Ministers* into compliance with their demands, as attempted by the party in England, to which "Mr. Manly," the admired of the editor of the *Visitor*, adhered; but after all, his remark shows that they have been in the hands of bad counsellors. Perhaps the editor of the *Visitor* sent them a bit of advice of this kind; or after all, they may have evil counsellors, even among themselves.

But the editor is not content with sainting the Convention; he dubs it "respectable" also, and terms their published conclusions "honest," while the counter Convention, alas! is passed by with a silence which significantly intimates to his readers, that he could not say as much respecting its respectability, honesty, and Christianity. Ah! luckless body! What hast thou done to prevent thy exaltation in the organ of scandal? Alas! Very has passed a decree of proterition. Thou art passed by. Thou wilt ask, why, what have I done? Thou art unwilling to disorganize the Church of thy choice, and make it, like some other denominations, a chaotic mass of disassociated parties, floating on the surface of human society, the exposed plunder of every lawless wrecker.

But the most glaring and reckless misstatement in the article under consideration, is the following: "The honest confession of this respectable Convention, it will be seen (?) is what has been charged as the malignant slander of enemies when others have alluded to this anomaly among Protestant Churches." Now what is it, that is dubbed as the "honest confession," &c. in the above extract? Why stripped of verbiage, it is this. It is assumed that the Methodist Episcopal Church has conferred the exclusive power of legislation on the Clergy, (which is not true, as all who read their Book of Discipline know)—that this is "very detrimental" to the prosperity of the Church—that there are "murmurings, and contentions" in the Church—that it is *unlike* all other Churches, in the States, in not having lay representatives in Conference—that the cure of these evils is, lay delegation, and that the time has fully come by the indications of Providence for seeking a change.

Now is this a true confession? It probably is, so far as it relates to "murmuring," "contention," and disaffection; for what Church or Churches are without these?—There were "divisions" in the Churches of Corinth and Galatia, and "murmurers and complainers," in the time of Jude; and "wars and fightings" in the Church in the time of James the Apostle; but who ever attributed these to the want of lay delegation in the Assemblies of Ministers? Apostolic minds attributed them to the want of "a Christian spirit," to their "lusts" and "carnality." See 1 Cor. i. 11, James iv. 1, Jude 16 verse. And even the Model Churches, with lay representation, are much more affected by these same evils. Read the following hint from the *Visitor* of Jan'y 2, 1852. It means a great deal:—

"We wish a half dozen of excellent men, like him, (Rev. Mr. Burton) could be induced to come from the States here. We believe that number would find more to do here, and be happier in doing it than is often the case there!" They have rather unhappy times "there," it seems, even in those Churches that boast of lay influence.

It may be true, that the M. E. Church is unlike all other Protestant Churches; but whether this is an advantage, or "very detrimental," may well admit of a doubt—and more.

Facts are stubborn things, and the fact that in