

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for scanning. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of scanning are checked below.

L'Institut a numérisé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de numérisation sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers /
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged /
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated /
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing /
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps /
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black) /
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations /
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material /
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Only edition available /
Seule édition disponible
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion
along interior margin / La reliure serrée peut
causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la
marge intérieure.
- Additional comments /
Commentaires supplémentaires:

Continuous pagination.

- Coloured pages / Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged / Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated /
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached / Pages détachées
- Showthrough / Transparence
- Quality of print varies /
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Includes supplementary materials /
Comprend du matériel supplémentaire
- Blank leaves added during restorations may
appear within the text. Whenever possible, these
have been omitted from scanning / Il se peut que
certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une
restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais,
lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas
été numérisées.

THE CHRISTIAN SENTINEL.

I will stand upon my watch, and set me upon the tower, and will watch to see what he will say unto me, and what I shall answer when I am reproved.—HAB. II. 1.

Rev. A. H. BURWELL, Editor.]

THREE RIVERS, FRIDAY, 22nd APRIL, 1831.

[Vol. I.—No. 54.]

INFANT BAPTISM.

Whether under the law or under the Gospel, the blessing is given by promise, to which the Sacrament was superadded, as the means, and pledge, and sign and seal. The real blessing was under both appropriated by faith; it was the faith of Abraham, the Father of the Church which conveyed the spiritual blessing to his circumcised offspring; and it is the faith of the Church ever since that has conveyed the blessing to her children, whether under the Sacrament of circumcision, or of its succeeding counterpart, Baptism. The Church is still the family of faithful Abraham, her children are still the children of the promise made to him, and the seal of the promise varies with the character of the dispensation under which they are placed.

And this conclusion appears to be just, not only from the reason of the thing, as above, but from the express terms of the Apostle in the epistle to the Colossians:—"In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ—buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." What is the plain sense of the passage? The Colossians were "circumcised with the circumcision made without hands," which circumcision consisted, "in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ," which circumcision consisted in being "buried with him in baptism," in which baptism ye are not only buried, but "wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith," &c. Let the whole passage be read, not as divided into verses, but as one connected sentence, introducing a hyphen between "Christ" and "buried," as above, and difficulty seems to be removed as to its sense; then "the circumcision of Christ" is the being buried with him in baptism, &c. In other words, what circumcision was under the law, baptism is under the gospel of Christ. This appears to be the most natural construction of the passage; it is that which is given to it by names of no mean note; the Belgic confession expressly stating, "For the which cause Paul calleth baptism the circumcision of Christ." And if baptism be admitted to be under the gospel what circumcision was under the law, (and it is apparent, as above, that circumcision conveyed spiritual blessings,) it is clear, that if infants were capable of spiritual blessings, by being partakers of the one Sacrament, they are equally capable of the same blessings by being made partakers of the other.

It is not a little remarkable that the early fathers of the Church, to the time of Augustine, consider baptism as given to us in the place of circumcision; as Origen, Cyprian, Gregory Nazianzen, Ambrose, &c.; and that three of them, Basil, Augustine, and Chrysostom, give to the above passage in the Epistle to the Colossians, the same sense as that ascribed to it above.* The same sentiment prevailed at the reformation; and it cannot reasonably be doubted, that it has been at all times, both anterior and subsequent to that period, the generally received sentiment of the church, that what circumcision was to the faithful Jew under the law, baptism is at least to the faithful Christian under the Gospel. The covenant blessings of the Father of the faithful are sure to all his faithful seed; and as they are sealed by the blood of circumcision under the first dispensation, they are sealed by the milder seal of the

water of baptism under the second. The Church is equally "Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

To the above considerations let it be added, that baptism by water was a practice to which the Jew had long been accustomed before the coming of Christ, and to which he seems to have been especially familiarized during the ministry of our Lord, by the introductory baptism of him who was the last messenger of the law, and the preparatory harbinger of the Gospel, expressly sent, as the messenger of the Saviour, to prepare his way before him.

That the Jews had been long accustomed to this practice, is affirmed by Wall, from sufficient authority. "It is evident," says he, "That the custom of the Jews before our Saviour's time (and as they themselves affirm, from the beginning of their law,) was to baptize as well as circumcise any proselyte that came over to them from the nations. This doth fully appear, both from the books of the Jews themselves, and also of others that understood the Jewish customs, and have written of them. They reckoned all mankind besides themselves to be in an unclean state, and not capable of being entered into the covenant of Israelites without a washing or baptism, to denote their purification from their uncleanness. And this was called the baptizing of them unto Moses." This custom of the Jews continued after Christ's time, and after their expulsion from the Holy Land; and continues (as I showed from Leo Modena,) to this day, if there be any that now-a-days do turn proselytes to their religion. Wherever they sojourned, if they found any of that country that chose to be of their religion, they would not admit him unless he would first be washed or baptized by them."† Thus the idea of baptism as typical of the spiritual washing of the soul, was an idea to which the Jew had long been accustomed.

The Jews were also familiarized to baptism by the preparatory baptism of John, which was just that intermediate dispensation that formed an easy transition from the law to the Gospel. He baptized with water to repentance, which, as it does not appear to have superseded the circumcision of the law on one hand, neither did it convey the full spiritual blessings of the Gospel on the other. We do not find that infants were admitted to the baptism of John, so that circumcision, so far as appears, took place as usual, during his baptismal ministry; while, on the other hand, those who were "baptized unto John's baptism," might "not so much as hear whether there be any Holy Ghost,"‡ and must be referred to Christ for those full spiritual blessings which he alone could communicate, who was to "baptize" them "with the Holy Ghost and with fire."§ Thus John's baptism was an intermediate dispensation between circumcision and baptism, preparing the way for the substitution of the latter for the former.

With the advantage of these considerations, let us conceive a faithful Jew to be the hearer of St. Peter's first sermon, preached on the day of Pentecost, when the Gospel was completed, and when "they that gladly received his word were baptized."¶ Baptized himself, what is he to do with his child? This child has arrived at its eighth day. By the spirit of the new dispensation, circumcision is done away; and is there no sacrament under the Gospel which seals covenant blessings to his child, as circumcision did under the law? At the institution of circumcision, God has pro-

* See Wall's "History of Infant Baptism," introduction, pp. 68—72. It does not consist with the proposed brevity of the above statement to quote the authorities given by Wall: they are well worth consulting by those who entertain any doubt of the fact.

† Acts xix. 2, 3. ‡ Matt. iii. 11. § Acts ii. 41.

* See Wall's "Defence of the History of Infant Baptism," vol. iii. pp. 272—272. The discussion on the above text which these pages contain will repay toward a patient perusal of them.

mised to be "a God" to Abraham, and "to his seed after" him—that blessing was a spiritual blessing, extending, under the outward emblem "circumcision," to that of "the foreskin of the heart"—the promise was "sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham;"* he hears of a "circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ," which is the "being buried with him in baptism:" Christ has instituted a new sacrament of baptism, and has enjoined his disciples to go and teach all nations, and baptize them; if all nations had been proselyted to Judaism, they must have been baptized at least; he is accustomed to this baptism by the ordinary mode of receiving proselytes; he is still more familiarized with it, having been a partaker of John's baptism: shall not his faith then apply the new sacrament of baptism to his child in the place of circumcision, and thus the child be outwardly acknowledged by the Church as an heir of grace, as well as virtually be such by the covenant of promise? In circumcision his child would have received his covenant name, as the Jewish child did;† at baptism he receives the same—in the former the child receives the seal of the promise; in the latter it receives the same—in the former it is accepted into Church-membership; in the latter it finds the same acceptance—in the former the faith of the Church has enrolled the child in the number of the faithful; in the latter the same faith has admitted the child to the same blessed privilege,—in the former he is educated on the promise as a child of faithful Abraham; in the latter he is educated in faith of the same promise, and of additional and confirmatory promises, as "a member of Christ, the child of God, and the inheritor of the kingdom of heaven."

And if baptism be not the successor of Circumcision, what is the designation of his child? (He is not a Jew, he is not a Gentile, he is not a Christian; he is nothing "outwardly;" he nominally belongs to no church, no "household of God;" for without the pledge of Church-membership, which the initiatory sacraments of either dispensation confessedly are, no visible church acknowledges him; he is consequently without church character, without designation and name.

Let Christian parents, then, place themselves just in the position of the converted Jew, at the first establishment of the Gospel, with all his previous knowledge, preparatory habits, and introductory education, for the substitution of water for blood as the emblem, and baptism for circumcision as the Sacrament; and let them add to this the sweet and blessed character of the Gospel, full of encouragement, and invitation, and promise, demanding faith and discouraging doubt, and hesitation and distance—and will they not see, that the transition from circumcision to baptism is natural and easy, and that baptism is just the very privilege which the church, so richly redeemed, might expect from the kindness and condescension of her covenant God?

I must confess, so deeply impressed is my mind with this view of baptism,—and I would speak it with the utmost lowliness that dust and ashes should assume when speaking of the gracious dispensations of Almighty wisdom and love—that had I been a Jew converted to Christianity at that early time, with all my previous associations and prepossessions, on comparing the two dispensations together, I should have been disposed to have complained, that the archetype did not answer to its type, nor the building correspond with the scaffolding, had baptism been wanting in the new dispensation, as the pledge of covenant mercies to the children of the faithful: and I must yet go further, and say, that if this view be correct, so prepared was the mind of the Church for this substitution of one sacrament for the other, as the initiatory pledge of covenant blessings to the children, as to render the explicit mention of baptizing children, in the final commission to teach and baptize all nations, wholly superfluous; that in the then prepared state of the Christian mind for this application of the ordinance to children, it would have been as unnecessary to say, "administer this baptism to infants," as at the institution of the other sacrament it would have been an unnecessary announcement to have said, "do not you only receive this in remembrance of me, but let your women receive it also." Nor does it appear to me, that the gen-

eral custom of the Church for centuries thus to apply the promise of mercy to infants, would ever have been either interrupted or questioned, had not declining doctrine and declining practice found it necessary to contradict the doctrine, or counteract the practice of infant baptism in earlier times; or a too hasty attempt to prevent the mischiefs arising from the abuse of the practise in the general laxity of a mere Christian profession; having induced some in these latter times, to innovate rather than to reform, and to abolish the privilege rather than to correct the scandal of an undue administration of it.—*Luce.*

[From the Churchman.]

Mr. Editor,

An excellent volume has just made its appearance from the able pen of the Rev. Michael Russel, LL. D. It contains discourses on the *Millenium*, and the *doctrine of Election*, *Justification by Faith*; and on the *historical evidence for the Apostolic Institution of Episcopacy*; and in the opinion of your correspondent, is worthy of the attentive perusal of every Churchman. The following is an extract from the discourse on *Justification by Faith*. By giving it a place in your paper, should it meet your views, you will oblige your friend

"Another evil arising from the practice of applying to Christians in modern times expressions which were suggested by the peculiar situation of the original members of the Church, appears in the aversion entertained by a large class of our countrymen to the sound Scriptural doctrine which attaches conditions to salvation.

"Such persons repeat in our ears, even to satiety, that we are justified freely—that we are saved by grace, and that not of ourselves; it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast. Now, in reply to such arguments, let it be stated once more, that the meritorious cause of salvation is unquestionably the death of CHRIST, and that so far it is a free gift—the gift of God, which no human being could either merit or purchase. But one apostle tells us, that we are saved by faith; while another assures us, that if faith be not accompanied by works, it is useless—it is dead, being alone: hence divines have been in the habit of saying that the atonement made by the REDEEMER is the efficient cause of human salvation, and that faith and obedience are the conditions upon which it is granted to individuals.

"Certain squeamish preachers, however, began their opposition to this plain doctrine by taking offence at works, that is, a man's words and actions, being held even as a condition of salvation; and the only religious value they allowed to holiness, temperance, brotherly kindness, and charity, was confined to the fact that such graces afford evidence of the existence of faith. According to this hypothesis, faith was made the sole condition upon which the MIGHTY GOD extends to individuals the benefits of the Christian mediation; namely, the pardon of sin, and the blessing of eternal life. But this refinement is not now deemed sufficient. It has been discovered, that if even faith be held as a condition of entrance on the Gospel is not completely gratuitous; for if faith must be presented unto God when we ask to be saved, we are making a bargain for heaven, as much as we should do were we to offer our good works, our prayers, and our aims, as the purchase money for the foot of the Eternal. According to the most modern system therefore, all conditions are discarded; faith and good works are equally thrown into the back ground; and all that is required of man, as the recipient of salvation, is a hearty belief that the gift has been already bestowed. We are told by one writer, that "God neither loves nor pardons us on account of our belief in his testimony: but the belief of his love, and of the gift which his love has bestowed, will give a confidence that we are dear welcome to him—that we are his accepted ones—his adopted children. Pardon exists before the faith, and only becomes personal feeling in consequence of being believed. And what we do not know this, or are insensible to it, we are not justified.

"As far as any meaning can be drawn from such a statement we are to conclude that a man is to judge of his spiritual condition, not by any correspondence between his character and the rules of God's law, but by the ardor of his feelings, the intensity of his affections, and the firmness of his assurance. This is a re-

* Rom. iv, 16.

† Luke i, 59, and ii, 21.

startling sort of theology, and which cannot fail to unhinge the minds of weak persons, who trust less to the plain truths of the Bible than to the exposition which is given them by bold theorists. In former times it was customary to teach, that if a man did not believe and act like a Christian, he could not enter the kingdom of God. It was generally held, that if Christ and his apostles impressed any one truth with greater emphasis than another, it was that the favour of God, reconciled through the mediation of the cross, is to be obtained by reposing faith in his Gospel, and by walking in his commandments: and it was thought that the duty of man consists not only in loving God, but in his fearing him, imploring forgiveness, and soliciting mercy. These plain maxims are now attacked by a contemptible species of sophistry, drawn from a perversion of the apostolic language.

"I cannot better expose the absurdity and danger of rejecting faith and obedience as conditions of salvation, than by quoting a passage from the famous Mr. Hall, one of the ablest preachers and most ardent Christians of the present day. 'For presuming,' says he, 'to speak of conditions of salvation, the author is accused of employing anti-evangelical language, and suspicions of his orthodoxy are pretty loudly insinuated. When the term conditions of salvation or words of similar import, are employed, he wishes it once for all to be understood, that he utterly disclaims the notion of meritorious conditions, and that he intends by that term only what is necessary in the established order of things, a *sine qua non*, that without which another thing cannot possibly take place. When thus defined, to deny that there are conditions of salvation, is not merely to approach to Antinomianism: it is to fall into the gulf. It is nothing less than a repeal of all the sanctions of revelation, of all the principles of moral government. Let the idea of conditional salvation, in the sense already explained, be steadily rejected along with the terms, and the patrons of the worst of heresies will have not further to demand. That repentance, faith and their fruits in a holy life, supposing life to be continued, are essential pre-requisites to eternal happiness, is a doctrine inscribed as with a sunbeam in every page of revelation; and must we, in deference to the propagators of an epidemic pestilence, be bound to express, by obscure, and feeble circumlocution, a truth which one word will convey, especially when that word, or others of a precisely similar meaning, has been current in the productions of unquestionable orthodoxy and piety in every age? The author is at a loss to conceive on what principle or for what reason, dangerous concessions should be made to Antinomianism; that thick-skinned monster of the ooze and mire, which no weapon can pierce no discipline can tame. While this heresy is making rapid strides through the land, and has already convulsed and disorganized so many of our Churches, it is not the reason for half measures; danger is to be repelled by intrepid resistance, by stern defiance, not by compliances and concessions: it is to be opposed, if opposed successfully, by a return to the wholesome dialect of purer times. Such is the intimate alliance between words and things, that the solicitude with which the term *condition*, and others of similar import have been avoided by some excellent men, has contributed more than a little to this wide-spreading pestilence. As almost every age of the Church is marked by its appropriate visitation of error, so little penetration is requisite to perceive, that Antinomianism is the epidemic malady of the present, and that it is an evil of gigantic size and deadly malignity; it is qualified for mischief by the very properties which might seem to render it only an object of contempt—its vulgarity of conception, its paucity of ideas, its determined hostility to taste, science and letters. It includes within a compass which every head can contain, and every tongue can utter, a system which cancels every moral tie, consigns the whole human race to the extremes of presumption or despair, erects religion on the ruins of morality, and imparts to the dregs of stupidity all the powers of the most active poison. The author will ever feel himself honored by whatever censures he may incur through his determined opposition to such a system."

DIVINE COMMISSION OF THE MINISTRY.

As the discoveries of the Gospel are of Divine Revelation—so is the preaching of the word and the administration of the

Gospel, by a Divine Commission—'How shall they preach except they be sent?'

On this point, but little would be required to be said, was it not for the operation of those dissensions and divisions in Christianity, which by length of time, and established habits of thought and the power of prejudice, and the pertinacity of party feeling, and I may add, the apathy and indifference of an unbelieving age, have fulfilled the predictions of the author and finisher of our faith, defaced the beauty and simplicity of the Gospel, and cut the nerves of revealed religion.

Yet, my hearers, in this, as in all others, the appointments of heaven for our good, God hath not left himself without witness, or placed his creatures under any necessity of erring from his way, or of defeating the comfort and assurance derived from the Gospel, by reason of uncertainty in the administration of the word of his truth, and the means of his grace. By an undeniable appointment of the first preachers of the Gospel, certainty and assurance were given to the first converts to Christianity, that their faith was not built on a cunningly devised fable, the contrivance of human wisdom, but on the power of God, certified to their senses by the mighty power of the Holy Ghost. On this foundation the Church of Christ is built up, and on this foundation it must continue to the end of the world, or cease to be the Church of the living God. For, while faith shall continue to be the essence of religion, it must be derived from the same source: while revelation shall continue to be the only ground of faith, it must be derived from the word of God; while the word of God shall continue supreme for the direction of man in his spiritual concerns, it must be certified to his senses, as the standard of all duty and of all hope; and, while it shall continue to be preached to all nations for the obedience of faith, it must be accompanied with the same divine commission and authority, by which it was verified at the beginning, as the truth of God, for man's salvation. Now, as faith, considered as a religious principle, is inseparable from Divine operation and Divine warrant for what is believed, not only is the revelation itself, but all other ministrations connected with the religion thus established, dependent for certainty and effect on the same principle. As it is competent to no man to declare the will of God without revelation, so neither is it competent for any to administer the affairs of Christ's kingdom, except he be sent—that is, as the apostle evidently means, except he be duly authorized thereto—a conclusion so clear and so reasonable, and at the same time so wise and so profitable to creatures dependent on the use of means for spiritual attainment, as to create wonder that it should ever have been, or yet continue to be, overlooked and disregarded by Christian people.—*Bishop Ravenscroft.*

SCRAPS OF CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITY.—No. III.

Moreover he [Egesippus] declareth, that Vespasian after the siege of Jerusalem, caused inquiry to be made, of such as were of the line of David, lest any should remain among the Jews of the royal blood, so that thereby was raised again a great persecution among the Jews.—*Euseb. Ecc. Hist. Book iii. Chap. xii.*

When Vespasian had reigned ten years, Titus his son succeeded him in the Empire; in the second year of whose reign, LIXUS, after he had been Bishop of Rome the space of twelve years, deceased, and him succeeded ANACLETUS. When Titus had reigned two years and two months, his brother Domitian took the imperial crown. In the fourth year of the reign of Domitian, ANIANUS the first Bishop of Alexandria, (having continued there two and thirty years) died, after whom succeeded ANILITUS.—*Ib. Chap. xiii.*—[Titus was crowned in 81, and Domitian in 83. Anianus died in 87; from which deduct 32, and it leaves 55, the year of his consecration to the See of Alexandria.]

INNOCENTS. (December 29.)

—These were they who suffered death under the cruel decree of Herod, who thought by a general slaughter of young children, to have accomplished the death of the infant Jesus. They are so called from the Latin term *innocentes* or *innocent*, harmless babes, altogether incapable of defending themselves from the malice of their inhuman prosecutors. The celebration of the martyrdom of these innocents are very ancient.—*Sword's Almanac.*

THE CHRISTIAN SENTINEL.

THREE-RIVERS, FRIDAY, 22d. APRIL, 1831.

EXTRACTS from MACLAINE'S APPENDIX, No. III. to his Translation of MOSHEIM'S ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, concerning a projected union of the English and Gallican Churches in 1718.

Concluded from last week.

Concerning the xiiith article the doctor observes, "that there will be no dispute, since many divines of both communions embrace the doctrine contained in that article," viz. *that works done before the grace of Christ are not pleasing to God, and have the nature of sin.* He indeed thinks "it very harsh to say, that all those actions are sinful which have not the grace of Christ for their source;" but he considered this rather as a matter of theological discussion, than as a term of fraternal communion.

On the xivth article relating to works of *supererogation*, undoubtedly one of the most absurd and pernicious doctrines of the Romish Church, Dr. Du Pin observes, that "works of *supererogation*, mean only works conducive to salvation, which are not matter of strict precept, but of counsel only; that the word being new, may be rejected, provided it be owned that the faithful do some such works."

The doctor makes no objections to the xv, xvi, xvii, and xviii, articles.

His observation on the xixth is, that, to the definition of the Church, the words, *under lawful pastors*, ought to be added; and that though all particular Churches, even that of Rome, may err, it is *needless* to say this in a confession of faith.

He consents to the decision of the xxth article, which refuses to the Church the power of ordaining any thing that is contrary to the word of God; but he says it must be taken for granted, that the Church will never do this in matters which are *essential points of faith*, or to use his own words *quæ fidei substantiam evertant*.

It is in consequence of this notion that he remarks, on the xxth article, that general councils, received by the Universal Church, cannot err; and that, though particular councils may, yet every private man has not a right to reject what he thinks contrary to Scripture.

As to the important points of controversy contained in the xxiind article, the doctor endeavors to mince matters as nicely as he can, to see if he can make the *cablé* pass through the *eye of the needle*: and for this purpose observes, that souls must be *purged*, i. e. purified from all defilement of sin, before they are admitted to celestial bliss; that the Church of Rome doth not affirm this to be done by fire; that indulgencies are only relaxations or remissions of temporal penalties in this life; that the Roman Catholics do not worship the cross, nor relics, nor images, not even saints before their images, but only pay them an external respect, which is not of a religious nature: and that even this external demonstration of respect is a matter of indifference, which may be laid aside or retained without harm.

He approves of the xxiiird article, and does not pretend to dispute about the xxivth, which ordains the celebration of divine worship in the vulgar tongue. He, indeed, excuses the *Latin* and *Greek* Churches for preserving their ancient languages; alleges, that great care has been taken that every thing be understood by translations; but allowed that divine service may be performed in the vulgar tongue, where that is customary.

Under the xxvth article he insists, that the *free* Romish sacraments be acknowledged as such, whether instituted immediately by Christ or not.

He approves of the xxvith and xxviith articles; and he proposes, expressing that part of the xxviiith that relates to *transubstantiation*, which term he is willing to omit entirely, in the following manner: "that the bread and wine are really changed into the body and blood of Christ, which last are truly and really received by all, though none but the faithful partake of any benefit from them." This extends also to the xxixth article.

Concerning the xxxth, he is for mutual toleration, and would have the receiving the communion in both kinds held indifferent,

and liberty left to each Church to preserve or change, or dispense, on certain occasions, with its customs.

He is less inclined to concessions on the xxxist article, and maintains that the sacrifice of Christ is not only commemorated but *continued*, in the Eucharist, and that every communicant offers him along with the priest.

He is not a warm stickler for the celibacy of the clergy; but consents so far to the xxxiind article, as to allow that priests may marry, where the laws of the Church do not prohibit it.

In the xxxiiird and xxxivth articles he acquiesces without exception.

He suspends his judgment with respect to the xxxvth as he never perused the homilies mentioned therein.

As to the xxxvith, he would not have the English ordinations pronounced null, though some of them perhaps are so; but thinks that, if an union be made, the English clergy ought to be continued in their offices and benefices either by right or indulgence, *sic ex jure, sic ex indulgentia Ecclesie*.

He admits the xxxviith, so far as relates to the authority of the civil power; denies all temporal and all immediate spiritual jurisdiction of the pope; but alleges, that, by virtue of his primacy, which moderate, he ought to have said *immoderate*, Church of England men do not deny, he is bound to see that the true faith be maintained; that the canons be observed every where; and, when any thing is done in violation of either, to provide the remedies prescribed for such disorders by the canon laws, *secundum leges canonicas ut malum resarciatur, procurare*. As to the rest he is of opinion, that every Church ought to enjoy its own liberties and privileges which the pope has no right to infringe. He declares against going too far: the expression is vague, but the man probably meant well; in the punishment of heretics, against admitting the inquisition into France, and against war without a just cause.

The xxxviiith and xxxixth articles he approves. Moreover, in the discipline and worship of the Church of England he sees no thing amiss; and thinks no attempts should be made, to discover, or prove, by whose fault the schism was begun. He further observes, "that an union between the English and French bishops may be completed, or at least advanced, without consulting the Romish pontiff, who may be informed of the union as soon as it is accomplished, and may be desired to consent to it; that, if he consents to it, the affair will then be finished; and that, even without his consent, the union will be valid: that in case he attempts to terrify by his threats, it will then be expedient to appeal to a general council." He concludes by observing "that this arduous matter must first be discussed between a few: and if there be reason to hope that the bishops, on both sides, will agree about the terms of the designed union, that the application must be made to the civil powers to advance and confirm the work;" to which he wishes all success.

It is from the effect which these proposals and terms made Mr. archbishop Wake, that it will be most natural to form a notion of his sentiments with respect to the Church of Rome. It appears evident, from several passages in the writings and letters of this eminent prelate, that he was persuaded that a Reformation in the Church of Rome could only be made gradually; that it was not probable that they would renounce all their follies at once; but that if they once began to make concessions, this would set in motion the work of Reformation, which in all likelihood, would receive accessions of vigour, and go on until a happy change were effected. This way of thinking might have led the archbishop to give an indulgent reception to these proposals of Du Pin, which contained some concessions, and might be an introduction to more. And yet we find that Dr. Wake rejected this piece, as insufficient to serve as a basis, or ground work, to the desired union. On receiving the piece he immediately perceived that he had not sufficient ground for carrying on this negotiation, without previous consulting his brethren, and obtaining a permission from the King for this purpose. Besides this, he was resolved not to submit either to the direction of Dr. Du Pin, nor to that of the Sorbonne in relation to what was to be retained, or what was to be given up, in the doctrine and discipline of the two Churches; nor to agree with the Church of Rome upon any other footing, than that of perfect equality in point of authority and power. He declar-

more especially, that he would never comply with the proposals made in Dr. Du Pin's *Commonitorium*, of which I have now given the contents; observing that, though he was a friend of peace, he was still more a friend to truth; and that, unless the Roman Catholics gave up some of their doctrines and rites, an union with them could never be effected. All this is contained in a letter written by the Archbishop to Mr. Beauvoir, on receiving Du Pin's *Commonitorium*. This letter is dated August 30. 1718, and the reader will find a copy of it subjoined to this appendix. About a month after, his Grace wrote a letter to Dr. Du Pin, dated October 1, 1718, in which he complains of the tyranny of the Pope, exhorts the Gallican doctors to throw off the papal yoke in a national council, since a general one is not to be expected; and declares, that this must be the great preliminary and fundamental principle of the projected union, which being settled, an uniformity might be brought about in other matters, or a diversity of sentiments mutually allowed, without any violation of peace or concord. The Archbishop commends, in the same letter, the candour and openness that reigns in the *Commonitorium*; entreats Dr. Du Pin to write to him always upon the same footing, freely and without disguise and reserve; and tells him, he is pleased with several things in that piece, and with nothing more than the doctor's declaring it as his opinion, that there is not a great difference between their respective sentiments: but adds, that he cannot at present give his sentiments at large concerning that piece.

SECTARIAN PRESUMPTION.

[The reader is requested to read in connection with the following, an article on another page copied from the Churchman, particularly the extract from Mr. Hall, with which it concludes.—We here see a consequence among many of denying the Scripture doctrine of baptism; namely, that it constitutes regeneration and unites us to the Church of Christ. We shall be happy to hear often from "AUDITOR."]

Rev. Sir,

April 8, 1831.

If the following remarks be deemed suitable for "The Sentinel," their insertion will oblige me.

I have often thought that if men reflected seriously upon the awful malediction with which the Spirit of God terminates the volume of Revelation, it might make them pause, and perhaps tremble, ere for personal and party purposes, they presumed "to handle the word of God deceitfully." In our day of unhappy departure from the simplicity of the Gospel, of novelty and innovation; in which we see system succeed system with such alarming rapidity; in which we see creeds and modes of worship undergoing continual revision, as if perfection consisted in mutability; we very frequently see the Bible perverted to the very worst of purposes, and compelled, notwithstanding the immutability of its Author, to speak the ever varying language of fanaticism and folly.—In fact, so long as men claim the right of throwing off all constituted authority, of setting up their own private judgments in place of the positive ordinances of God, and of forming systems for themselves irrespective of the Church, "The pillar and ground of the truth" this must always be so. In such a case, if they go to the word of God, it is not that they may try their opinions by this touchstone of truth, but that they may wrest it from its obvious and connected meaning, and force it to give a coloring to their favourite dogmas, and something like a foundation to the creations of an unstable imagination.

* We must maintain the right of private judgment, and the necessity of being guided by it in every thing: but we must also maintain the necessity of having proper evidence on which to found it. In this case, a correct private judgment is nearly the same as correct knowledge. A private judgment formed in ignorance of truth and fact is and must be erroneous. It is in this way that ignorance and presumption, and a sovereign contempt of all the means of knowledge, wrest the Scriptures to the destruction of the ignorant and unlearned, as saith St. Peter.

But if the Word of God contain "all knowledge and all truth," if it be the foundation of every doctrine connected with our salvation, we should surely divest ourselves of every prejudice when we consult its pages, and hold ourselves manfully open to conviction; and above all, as we tender our souls, we should carefully guard against the adoption of any opinions however pompously and confidently inculcated, until we have first carefully searched the Scriptures—the whole Scriptures in connection, "whether these things be so."

Such reflections have often been suggested to the mind of the writer both in reading and in hearing, but never with more painful force than lately when he attended the funeral of a deceased neighbour. It was conducted by a teacher of the sect of Methodists who delivered a discourse upon the occasion, and in doing so he afforded a melancholy proof of what men will do in the defence of a system, and of the daring and presumptuous attempts that are sometimes made to bend and forcibly adapt the word of God to preconceived opinions.—The passage of Scripture which he read as his text was that which mentions the death of Jacob. "He gathered up his feet into the bed and yielded up the Ghost." He began by giving a rather rapid sketch of the life of the Patriarch, and held him up as a religious example to his audience.—But in doing so he brought forward the favorite notion that it is necessary to know precisely the time of conversion,—that no man can be in a state of favour with God without being able to tell the particular moment when he entered that state, and to countenance this idea, he boldly pointed out the exact time of the Patriarch's conversion, and quoted a part of his history to prove his conjecture.—For mine own part, in reading the history of Jacob, who was the object of the plans, purposes, and promises of God even before his birth, I should have been sadly puzzled to fix on the critical moment.—It was not so, however, with the speaker; and if he did not satisfy, he certainly surprised me by stating without hesitation that Jacob's conversion took place at Beth-el where he saw the vision of the ladder reaching from earth to heaven! He explicitly stated, and repeated his statement, "that he lay down in repentance and arose justified!" He said, "he marked and dated the day of his fact" so necessary to be known, and cursed—yes CURSED, with a bitterness that made me shudder, "the man or the minister" who should presume to remove "the land-mark of spiritual regeneration which Jacob had set up as a memorial to all future generations." Now in reading the 28th chapter of Genesis on which he founded all this, the most prejudiced and system-loving mind must acknowledge that its every verse and word are as silent as the grave upon the subject of the "repentance" and "justification" of Jacob, and that not one syllable is said, or a single hint given of the one or of the other; or is there ought to excite the belief, but the very contrary, that he who was a child of promise while yet unborn, the inheritor of the "blessing of Abraham," had up to this time, lived in impenitence a "stranger to the covenant of promise," and an enemy to his father's God.—There is every reason to believe that Jacob was a pious and regular worshipper of God from his earliest youth; and the more likely, as he had lived fifteen years with that grandfather of whom God said, "I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord;" besides the almost certainty that such godly parents as Isaac and Rebecca had done their duty to their son in his childhood, and taught him the ways of the Lord: and so far is the vision at Beth-el from importing a sudden conversion from a life of sin, that it is rather a positive token of the approbation of the Almighty and a repetition of the covenant made with Abraham, having a more explicit reference to Christ in these words, "in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Among the miraculous conversions mentioned in the New Testament, it would have been easy to cite something far more to the point, and which might have satisfied a mind disposed to adopt upon the ipse dixit of a teacher; but the cherished dogma rushed upon the mind of the speaker; its reception was all important to the hearers! the life of Jacob was the subject of discourse; and without deigning to step aside, the vision at Beth-el was pressed at once into the service, and forced, *nolens volens*, to prove at once the identical moment of Jacob's conversion, and that all who are in a state of grace must know the exact moment of its commencement.

As the whole transaction at Beth-el was miraculous, we can easily conceive that God could communicate himself to the Patriarch in a dream, but surely we are not to be compelled to believe, even if our incredulity should endanger a beloved notion, that he repented of a life of prior iniquity in his SLEEP, that he experienced that godly sorrow for sin which worketh repentance unto salvation not to be repented of while his faculties were locked in slumber, or entranced in heavenly vision, and that finally, he AWOKE JUSTIFIED!!

Without denying that men in particular cases may know the time when they first became the subjects of religious impressions, that they may specify with some degree of accuracy the time when by the grace of God, they "ceased to do evil and learned to do well," may we not deplore, as in the case above, that men for the sake of some darling theory, should press the word of God into their service at all hazards, "wrest it to their own destruction," and not only so, but endanger the salvation of those who hear them? How deplorable is it to see that Book which should be the bond of union turned by every teeming fancy into the very rallying point of division, and that which declares "*one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism,*" forced in spite of truth and in spite of common sense, to support the baseless visions of every self-conceited enthusiast.—While Christians leave the "*Old Paths,*" and fight and quarrel about *new discoveries,* and quote the Bible to prove that all before them, Apostles and Martyrs and all have walked in the road to hell; the infidel stands by the while and smiles, and in the venom of these unholy animosities he dips his arrows and scatters among the mingled combatants indiscriminately desolation and death. If St. Paul was moved when he saw one city only given to idolatry, what Christian can avoid feeling intensely the same sensations when he sees almost the whole Christian world desolated by an evil more deadly than the superstition of others, where the idol worshipped is a new fangled system, the high priest,—self, and the sacrifice *peace, unity, and love* the very essentials of our holy religion.—And surely it is the duty of every humble and rational believer to expose, as he has opportunity, the presumption, and above all, the danger of moulding the Word of God to party and selfish ends, of teaching for sound doctrine what the apostles of Jesus never heard of, and by stirring up to groundless fears, and exciting to the more than useless research after the day and hour of conversion, of depriving sincere though weak believers of the consolations of religion.

If the perusal of the above imperfect strictures upon a very important subject should place only one individual more upon his guard when he hears the Scriptures boldly adduced as undoubted proof of party doctrines, and be instrumental in exciting but one "to prove all things, and to hold fast that which is good," the Writer will deem himself abundantly rewarded.

AUDITOR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN SENTINEL.

Rev. Sir,

I was sorry to find by a paragraph in the 30th No. of the Sentinel, taken from the London Standard, that infidelity had again raised its demon head, and that it is now stalking through the land so openly, that the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has felt itself called upon to make an appeal to all true Christians for contributions, to enable them to reprint large editions of books and tracts adapted to existing circumstances, in order to counteract these dreadful doctrines. From the contributions already received, (£1367 11s.) we see that the religious part of the community are not backward in advancing the "good cause," and it is to be hoped that these excellent publications, through the blessing of God, may be the means of stopping the mouth of the infidel and blasphemer.

It is really a matter of great surprise to me, how men who have the smallest pretensions to education and research, (if there are indeed any such among them) can be so ignorant of the writings of many of our best authors, as to deny, or even question what has been so ably discussed and clearly proved over and over again, by the first men of the age—I mean the authenticity of the Holy scriptures.

In fact, from a candid consideration of the character and habit of very many who profess unbelief and call themselves free-thinkers, the greater number will probably be found to have deceived themselves, or to be acting a part to deceive others. Their characters are a compound of licentiousness, ignorance and vanity; they are quite profligate enough to wish to be infidels, too ignorant however to be so from conviction, and nevertheless sufficiently vain to wish to appear to be unbelievers, because they think a profession of unbelief supposes an understanding above the common level. The doubts of these men are those of licentiousness, not of unbelief; it is their licentiousness which first caused their doubts, and not their doubts that gave rise to their licentiousness, it is to their passions and not to their doubts, that they are in bondage: they attack religion because its awful truths stand opposed to their vicious indulgencies: they have neither investigated the alleged difficulties, nor the strong and satisfactory proofs of religion: in fact they hate it, for how is it possible for them to love their own condemnation?

In order to check the rise and progress of such a class of men, we ought to shun and despise them; by that means they will be deprived of the deplorable glory after which they seek; from the moment they are despised and avoided, unbelief will be more rare among us, and the same vanity which prompts them to avow their scepticism, will soon induce them to conceal it, when impiety shall meet with the disgrace which it merits.

As to the writings of those men, who have endeavored to overturn the foundation of our faith, and who deny salvation, and the promises made to our forefathers—they have all been ably answered and refuted; the numerous objections* contained in them against Christianity removed, and the contradictory doctrines† proposed by the most eminent opposers of revelation in order to evade the reception of the Scriptures as a standard of belief "pointed out." The absurdity of their notions is well exposed in the following compendium executed by the author of the "Connoisseur" (one of those numerous collections of periodical essays, which reflect so much honor on British literature); who has thrown together a few of the principal tenets held by free-thinkers under the title of

"The Unbelievers Creed."

"I believe that there is no God, but that matter is God, and God is matter; and that it is no matter whether there is a God or no.

"I believe that the world was not made; that the world made itself; and that it had no beginning; that it will last for ever, world without end.

"I believe that man is a beast; that the soul is the body, and that the body is the soul; and that after death there is neither body nor soul.

"I believe that there is no religion: that natural religion is the only religion, and that all religion is unnatural.

"I believe not in Moses; I believe in the First Philosophy; I

* The late excellent Bishop Horne, upwards of forty years ago, when speaking of the disingenuity of infidels in bringing forward objections against the Scriptures has the following remarks:—"Many and painful are the researches usually necessary to be made, for settling points of this kind. Pertinence and ignorance may ask a question in three lines, which will cost learning and ingenuity thirty pages to answer. When this is done, the same question shall be triumphantly asked again the next year, as if nothing had ever been written upon the subject. And as people in general, for one reason or other like short objections better than long answers, in this mode of disputation (if it can be styled such) the odds must ever be against us: and we must be content with those of our friends, who have honesty and erudition, candour and patience to study both sides of the question."—*Letters on Infidelity*, page 82.

† A work has lately appeared entitled "Difficulties of Infidelity" by G. S. Faber, D.D. The learned author has therein most forcibly pointed out the difficulties and contradictions of that system, and clearly proved that they far exceed the alleged difficulties attendant upon Christianity. "Hence," says he, "results this plain and self-evident conclusion, that since Infidelity is encumbered by more and greater difficulties, than Christianity, to adopt the Infidel system evinces more credulity than to adopt the Christian system."—I would strongly recommend this work to all young men.

believe not the Evangelists; I believe in Chubb, Collins, Toland, Tindal, Morgan, Mandeville, Hobbes, Shaftsbury; I believe in Lord Bolingbroke, (Hume, Voltaire, Diderot, Boulanger, Volney and Thomas Paine:); I believe not in St. Paul.

"I believe not revelation: I believe in tradition; I believe in the Talmud: I believe in the Koran: I believe not the Bible. I believe in Socrates: I believe in Confucius: I believe in Sancho-mathon: I believe in Mahomet: I believe not in Christ.

"Lastly, I believe in all-unbelief."

Before closing this article I will subjoin another *Creed* equally as absurd and contradictory as the foregoing, which I met with a few days ago; it should properly have been placed *first* in order, as a belief in it would naturally lead to a belief in the former, and therefore it ought to take precedence; it is styled,

"Lord Chesterfield's *Creed*," adapted to certain *Youths of a Superior Class*.

"I believe that the world is the object of my hopes and morals, and that the little prettinesses of life will answer all the ends of human existence. I believe that we are to succeed in all things by the graces of civility and attention; that there is no sin but against good manners, and that all religion and virtue consist in outward appearance. I believe that all women are children, and all men are fools, except a few cunning people who see through the rest, and make their use of them. I believe that hypocrisy, fornication and adultery are within the lines of morality: that a woman may be honorable when she has lost her honor, and virtuous when she has lost her virtue."

"This, and whatever else is necessary to obtain my own ends, and bring me into repute, I resolve to follow: and to avoid all moral offences, such as scratching my head before company, spitting upon the floor, and omitting to pick up a lady's fan; and in this persuasion I will persevere, without any regard to the resurrection of the body, or the life everlasting. Amen."

I am, Rev. Sir,

Yours, very Respectfully,
SBLACTOR.

ALARMING STATE OF PARIS.

From our files by the late Packet.

A funeral mass for the Duke of Berri was celebrated on the 14th Feb. at the Church of St. Germain-Auxerrois, and against the advice of the magistrates of Paris. In that old sanctuary all the celebrities of the Carlist faction had a rendezvous, and collected money for the wounded of the ex-Royal Guard. A bust of the Duke de Bourdeau was paraded in the church, and the consequence was, that the crowd assembled without, rushed into the church, and put to flight the whole assembly. The people then broke into the presbytery, and were prevented with the utmost difficulty, by the National Guard, from precipitating in the Seine several priests. The multitude around the church was immense the whole afternoon. In a short time the fine gilded cross, with the fleurs-de-lis at its angles, which crowns the steeple, raised a general cry of rage. The national Guard joined the people in demanding its destruction. Workmen were sent for, and under the protection of the National Guard, at torch light, with municipal guards about the church, the cross was precipitated, and fell with a thundering noise, amidst the thundering applause of the people, and the full chorus of the Marseillois. The night was pretty calm, but immense parties of people shouting, "Down with the priests!" filled the streets. On the following morning, another scene took place, of which it is impossible to give any description. The multitude succeeded in taking possession of the Church, and not an altar, nor a glass, nor a chair, nor a bit of wood is left. All the gold and silver ornaments were conveyed to the Louvre, in mock ceremony, and some of them thrown on the tombs of the victims, opposite which the curate of the church had thought proper to perform this Carlist exhibition. However, nobody perished. The National Guard saved every priest who was attacked. Paris was in the most violent state of effervescence for several days.

On the 13th, the church of St. Paul was attacked, and all the objects ornamented with fleurs-de-lis destroyed; many in wood were brought out and burnt before the church.

Destruction of the Palace of the Archbishop of Paris.

On the 16th, the popular fury was directed against the Archbishop of Paris. We copy from the *Constitutionnel* of the following day:—

A considerable crowd went yesterday, to Conflans, where the Archbishop of Paris resides, but he was absent.—Thanks to the assistance of the National Guard of Berey, the project of burning the house, which appeared to have been formed, was not executed, but his furniture and pictures were destroyed. The plate and linen were saved by the efforts of M. Michel, junr.

Towards seven o'clock crowds formed before the church Sainte Marguerite, and the mob loudly demanded that it should be pulled down, and that a stone, which had its angles fleur-de-lis, should be broken to pieces. Mr. Jacquemin, Commissary of Police of the Faubourg St. Antoine, gave orders to this effect, and the cross and the stone soon disappeared. A few minutes afterwards, information came that the Seminary of Piepus had been attacked and delivered up to pillage; the same Commissary of Police went there immediately with a large detachment of National Guards, and succeeded in clearing it of the mob, and in conducting to the Prefecture several individuals upon whom were found stolen articles.

Yesterday at one o'clock, by order of the authorities, scaffolding was put over the beautiful arch of the Carousal; and workmen, with hatchets, destroyed the bas-relief of the Tsocadero, and the emblems of the victories of the Duke d'Angoulime. General Pajol, accompanied by his staff, was present.—*N. Y. Albion.*

In obedience to the Commands of the mob, the King has issued a royal ordinance surrendering the right to retain the fleurs-de-lis on the state seal, and providing that in future it shall represent an open book with the words, "Charte de 1830," surmounted by a crown, with the sceptre, and hand of justice crossed; and tri-coloured flags behind the shield. Poor Man! happy may it be for him if his "Dear Comrades" allow him in future to wear his head on his shoulders instead of a crown on his head. It further appears that an attempt has been made to declare a Republic.

CHILDREN'S DEPARTMENT.

PARABLES.

We are in the habit of reading many children's books, that we may know what kind of food is prepared for our young friends. We have just read one published some time ago, called 'The Well-Spent Hour.' It is written by a person who well knows what kind of reading suits young minds, and is well able to provide it. But it is a pity that he (or she for very likely a lady is the author,) does not know our Saviour as the Bible teaches us to know him—the Son of God as well as the Son of man—who was the Lord of Glory at the same time that he condescended to take our nature, and be the meek and lowly Jesus.

The piece that follows, however, has none of the wrong notions of the writer in it; and is such an excellent explanation of the nature of those beautiful parts of the Bible called 'The Parables,' that we cannot refuse to give it to our young readers. Let them attend to the sentence with which it ends.

"Now mother," said Catharine, "I want you to tell me what a parable means exactly; because though our teacher told me, I don't think I understand it well enough to tell any body myself. What is the difference between a parable and a fable? though I know they are not alike."

"Do you remember any parable that you can repeat?" said Mrs. Nelson. Catharine related the parable of the good Samaritan.

"Is there any thing impossible in this story?" said Mrs. Nelson.

"No, mother, I should think it was true."

"Could the fable you told me, about the bee who was punished for being passionate, be true?" asked her mother.

"No, mother, bees never talk as we do."

"Then how are they alike, Catharine?"

"Why, mother, do you think the parables were really true stories?"

"No, my dear, I do not."

"Then fables and parables too, are stories made up," said Catharine.

"Yes but fables cannot be true."

'And parables,' interrupted Catharine, 'might be true.'

'Was there not any part of your fable true, Catharine?'

Catharine hesitated and seemed to be thinking.

'What part of it,' said her mother, 'that James said you need not write down?'

'The moral,' answered Catharine; 'Jemmy called it the meaning.'

'And what was that,' said her mother.

'It meant, mother, that passionate people, if they do not conquer their temper, may do some dreadful things that they may suffer for all their lives.'

'And is this true or not?'

'Oh yes, mother,' said Catharine; 'aunt told me it was very true.'

'Well,' said Mrs. Nelson, 'can you see any resemblance now between a parable and a fable?'

'Yes, mother, I think I can; they both teach us something true.'

'And what part of the parable of the good Samaritan do we know is true—what does that mean?'

'That we must take care of every body that we see suffering, just as if they were our neighbours and friends,' said Catharine.

'And now,' said Mrs. Nelson, 'cannot you see any resemblance between a parable and a fable?'

'Yes, I think I can; they both teach us something true, and that is the moral; still a fable cannot be true, but a parable might be. Then, mother, why is it not called a story, just like any other story?'

'That is a sensible question, my dear, and I will do my best to answer it. I believe a parable means not only a story, that might be true, and this is to teach something that is true, to have what James calls a meaning, but it must also be a story, bearing resemblance to a real state of things, so as to make you see directly, that the story that is not true, is just like the one that is, so that you see directly what is its design. I will explain this to you by the parable of the good Samaritan.'

'You know that the ten commandments were given to Moses, and the Jews all acknowledge their authority. Our Saviour wished to reprove the Jews for keeping the words of their law merely, and not attending to their meaning or spirit, and to teach them at the same time that the Samaritans whom they despised, might have much more goodness than they had, and obey the laws of that Being whom they pretended to serve better than they did themselves.'

'The conduct of the Priest and Levite was exactly like the conduct of the Jews in general—but more especially of the rulers, who were almost always Priests or Levites. And the Samaritan meant those people of other nations that the Jews despised and called idolaters, and yet who really, even according to their own law, were often more obedient to the will of God, and understood their law better than they did themselves.'

'This parable too was related to a lawyer; so you see in every part there was a meaning and a resemblance, that made it apply exactly to the purpose and showed its design, and made it different to any common story. Do you think you understand my dear?'

'Yes, mother, I think I do,' said Catharine.

'The Eastern nations were very fond of parables, as we find in the Old Testament. Their prophets took that method to reprove kings when they did wrong. And they sometimes called their poems parables. It is supposed by some, that the book of Job is one of these poems—teaching us what great sufferings might be inflicted upon a good man, and teaching us also, at the same time, the goodness of God, and that all that he does is right, and that he never forsakes his children.'

'And now, my dear child I think you had better put down your work, and take a little run, for I fear your poor brains may be puzzled.'

'I shall try,' said Catharine, 'to repeat what you have to aunt, and if she can understand it, then you will know that I do.'

'This is a very good method, that we recommend to all little girls and boys to follow, when they are not sure that they quite understand a thing.'—*Children's Magazine*.

[From the Churchman.]

THE CONSECRATION.

There was a sound of triumph and of joy,
Through all the city's mingled multitude:
A mighty nation rising to destroy
Oppression's blood-stained throne; the glorious feud
For liberty, without that dark alloy,
The elder Revolution's sea of blood—
Such was the tale of triumph fame had told;
And shout on shout through mingled thousands rolled.
Earth reigned without, in all her pomp and pride—
Within God's temple was another scene:
There they that all ambition might deride,
Save that which on eternal hope doth lean,
Were gathered; and at that pure altar's side
Met Faith, and Hope, and Love, and Joy serene:
Angels were there from round the sapphire thron;
And He was there—the High and Holy One.
It was a solemn scene, and touched the heart—
That aged man! That Bishop of four score!
And weeping o'er his unthought doom, to part
With one so loved—the one whom all deplore!
That solemn charge! That motto set apart
To God, robed in the laws a mottoe wore!
O! how doth scene like this transcend in worth,
To angel's eye, all pride and pomp of earth!

[From the Churchman.]

There is beauty on earth when it wears
The gay young green of the spring;
Or the rich bloom of summer bears,
That poets have loved to sing.
There is beauty in heaven, when the sun
Throws a blush o'er the glorious blue;
Or the stars in their nightly circles run,
Beaming out with their diamond hue.
There is beauty in man when the face
Is lit up with the spirit's flame;
Or when feeling joined with female grace
Forms the charm, which hath no name.
But O! there is beauty, that nought
On earth or in man can express;
Yet how seldom seen, and how little sought!
'Tis 'THE BEAUTY OF HOLINESS.'

* Bishop White of Pennsylvania.—*Ed. Sen.*

Terms of the Christian Sentinel.—Fifteen Shillings per annum, (postage included), if paid within six months from the date of the first number taken, which will be considered the time of subscribing; if paid after that time, four dollars per annum. Subscriptions for less than six months cannot be received. After our Subscriptions are brought in, and the first Subscribers supplied with files from the beginning, it is our intention to give to our voluntary agents one copy for gratis distribution for every twelve Subscribers procured in their immediate neighborhoods.

AGENTS FOR THE CHRISTIAN SENTINEL.

The CLERGY generally throughout the Diocese of Quebec.
Mr. T. CARY, Bookseller, Quebec.
Mr. H. H. CUNNINGHAM, Bookseller, Montreal.
GUY C. WOOD, Esq., Postmaster, Cornwall, U. C. and Vicinity.
Mr. GEO. F. CORBETT, Bank Office, Kingston, U. C.
R. STANTON, Esq., His Majesty's Printer, York, U. C.
JAMES STUART CLARKE, Esq., Halifax.
W. B. PHAIR, Post Master, Fredericton, N. Brunswick.
THOMAS HEAVISIDE, Esq., St. John's, New Brunswick.
Rev. LUCIUS DOOLITTLE, Paspébiac, Bay Chaleur.
Messrs. T. & J. SWORDS, 127, Broadway, New York.

All Communications to be addressed to the Editor, *post paid*.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY G. STOBBS, AT THE OFFICE OF THE CHRISTIAN SENTINEL, THREE-RIVERS.