house, he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel." And in the same manner ought he to be able to justify every other action and expression of his lip or life. But by what sacred authority, direct or inferential, can any one argue in favor of those idle or profane expressions? By what scriptural example, or precept, or doctrine, can it be shewn that a man is at liberty to take the name of God, or any thing that approaches to his name—any of his attributes or perfections, into his lips without thinking?

Will it be maintained that such exclamations are emphatic? they serve to convey our ideas with greater brevity and force than any The fact, upon careful examination, will be found quite the reverse. For the most part they indicate no idea, no state of feeling whatever; they only serve to destroy the beauty and harmony of our periods, to break the sense and disturb the connexion; and if our taste were not absolutely perverted by continual use, they would be as disgusting as salt mingled with sweetness, or oil added to wine. They are utterly unmeaning appendages to the general tenor of the discourse.

But the truth is, they who plead for it as a venial crime are not aware of its deleterious effects, and have not considered its evil tendency. have not considered that to use the name of that Being so frequently without reverence, will beget a want of esteem for Him to whom it belongs—that iniquity constantly committed will harden the conscience, blind the eyes, and expose to the commission of others—that their example is likely to influence a wide circle, and to prove exceedingly injurious, especially to the unconverted or irreligious part of mankind. They have not considered how the least indulged, under whatever limitations, by them, is a ground of

confidence to the young, and the thoughtless, from which they infer the perfect innocence of the most unhallowed language, and whence they have presumptuously carried the evil to the most dangerouss extremes.

If, instead of these light expressions, a suitable dignity of style were maintained—a holy caution against every unsuitable word, what eminent advantages are likely to ensue? How many would be struck with the difference and the superiority of those who had learnt to converse in the Christian school? What opportunities would thus be afforded for making salutary impression on careless minds? How favourable would be the inference as to the nature of that religion which produced effects at once so conspicuous and salutary.

Let, then, those who have been in the habit of indulging these useless, injurious, and anti-scriptural terms, adopt a new and improved method. Taught by the sacred oracles, let their "speech be always with grace seasoned with salt, that it may minister to the edification of the hearers." Let the example of HIM, who spoke as never man spoke, be set up as the standard of language, as well as of conduct. Let them consider they are bound to glorify the name of the Great God, not to pollute and profane it. Let them feel that while no good results from their practice, or can possibly accrue from it, either to themselves or to others, the greatest evils may follow And oh! let them think with what shame and confusion of face they will hear their idle and unprofitable diction read in the last day, and before, not an applauding, but a condemning universe, from the faithful records of heaven. Let them realise the more completely this effect; let them keep a journal of their conversation, and, if it be only for a few days, let them attempt to write before hand every sentence they