

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. 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 filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé 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 filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur

Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur

Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée

Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées

Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée

Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées

Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque

Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées

Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Pages detached/
Pages détachées

Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)

Showthrough/
Transparence

Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur

Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents

Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue

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

Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index

Title on header taken from:/
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
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 filmées.

Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison

Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison

Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments:
Commentaires supplémentaires:

Wrinkled pages may film slightly out of focus.

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
							✓				

THE GOSPEL TRIBUNE,

FOR ALLIANCE AND INTERCOMMUNION

THROUGHOUT

Evangelical Christendom.

VOLUME I.]

APRIL, 1855.

[NUMBER 12.]

"ONE IS YOUR MASTER, *even* CHRIST: AND ALL YE ARE BRETHREN."

The Topic for the Month.

THE ORONO DEBATE.

(Continued from page 234.)

QUESTION.—Is it in accordance with reason and scripture that man should incur endless misery by the violation of the moral law, and that the infliction of the penalty (upon the transgressor,) should be inevitable unless he here repents and believes?

The accordance of Scripture is so full, clear, and perfectly explicit, as to render our labor under this head exceedingly light and easy. We have only to produce a small number of the immense array of passages which exist—lay them down openly, without note or comment, and leave them in all their native unbroken strength, to lie before us as massive rocks, on which the opposition may break and wound itself, by falling upon them; while we conduct a formal and systematic examination of the *ground, work* of Universalism, laying bare the HIDING PLACES of its boasted strength, that all may discover them to be but refuges of lies, that the deceived may fly from them, in horror, and from the "wrath to come," and through grace be led to lay hold upon ETERNAL LIFE. The few passages of the immense array, to which reference has been made, are as follows:

The penalty of sin is the first and the second death.

Gen. 2: 17. Of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it, for the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.

Ezk. 18: 4. The soul that sinneth, it shall die.—33: 11. Say unto them, As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live; turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel?

Rom. 6: 23. The wages of sin is death: but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ, our Lord.

Jam. 1: 15. Sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death.

Rev. 21: 8. The fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death.

The hopes of some perish at death.

Job 27: 8. What is the hope of the hypocrite, though he hath gained, when God taketh away his soul? 9. Will God hear his cry when trouble cometh upon him?

Job 8; 13. The hypocrite's hope shall perish.—

11: 20. The eyes of the wicked shall fail, and they shall not escape, and their hope shall be as the giving up of the ghost.

Pr. 10: 28. The hope of the righteous shall be gladness: but the expectation of the wicked shall perish.—11: 7. When a wicked man dieth, his expectation shall perish; and the hope of unjust men perisheth.

The endless misery of those whose hopes perish at death.

Mat. 25: 41. Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels:—46. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal.

Mk. 9: 43. If thy hand offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: 44. Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.—14: 31. The Son of man indeed goeth, as it is written of him: but woe to that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! good were it for that man if he had never been born. [Mat. 26: 24.]

Lk. 3: 17. Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and will gather the wheat into his garner; but the chaff he will burn with fire unquenchable.

Jn. 3: 36. He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.

Ph. 3: 18. (For many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, *that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ*: 19. Whose end is destruction, whose God is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things.)

2. Th. 1: 7. The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels; 8. In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; 9. Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.

Jude 6. The angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day. 7. Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. 13. Raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame; wandering stars to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever.

Rev. 14: 9. And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand. 10. The same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: 11. The smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name. 20: 10. The devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever.

Preaching life to the wicked—not a new crime.

Gen. 3: 4. The serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die.

Dt. 29: 19. And it come to pass, when he heareth the words of this curse, that he bless himself in his heart, saying, I shall have peace, though I walk in the imagination of mine heart, to add drunkenness to thirst.

Ezk. 13: 22. With lies ye have made the heart of the righteous sad, whom I have not made sad; and strengthened the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his wicked way, by promising him life.

2 Pet. 3: 5. This they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water: 6. Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed

with water, perished. 7. But the heavens and the earth, which are new, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men.

The second death of the sinner inevitable unless he believes.

Gal. 3: 21. If there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law. 22. But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.

Ac. 4: 12. Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved. 13: 38. Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; 39. And by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses.

Gal. 2: 16. Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law; for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified. 20. I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless, I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me. 21. I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain.

Mat. 18: 11. The Son of man is come to save that which was lost.

Jn. 1: 12. As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name.—3: 16. God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him, should not perish, but have everlasting life. 18. He that believeth on him, is not condemned; but he that believeth not, is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. 36. He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him. 8: 24. If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.

Leaving these passages of Scripture, in their own keeping, as rocks that cannot be moved, while they toss in foam every assailing surge, and break and wound all who fall violently upon them, I proceed at once to examine the *groundwork* of Universalism, that we may lay bare the hiding places of its strength, as already proposed.

We have affirmed it to be not only in accordance with Scripture, that man should incur endless misery by the violation of the moral law, but also that it is in accordance with reason. Universalism exclaims, menacingly, *that is impossible!—absolutely impossible!*—Man being a finite creature under all circumstances, is utterly incompetent to do that which is infinite, but his sins are his personal acts, and there-

fore must be finite like himself under all circumstances, and never infinite in any case. In appointing the punishment of the sinner, a just God must see that it is in strict proportion to his sin: but man's sins are only finite, and endless punishment, of whatever kind, necessarily infinite; and therefore it follows, as a perfectly legitimate conclusion, that man never can incur endless misery, even should his actions or his sins be of the worst possible description.

We know that universalists will give us credit for having placed this argument, which is the sheet anchor of all their hopes, in its best possible light; and we deeply lament that an argument so plausible was ever constructed: because though faultless in structure, and seemingly sound and perfectly invulnerable in all its premises, it is nevertheless rotten to the very core; and hence the thousands who have been deceived by its fair show of truth, and who have placed their souls under its shelter, are in the sad condition of those who have made lies their refuge: to render which apparent is only necessary to observe,

That in a just appointment of punishment, the allotment is never made in proportion to the ACT of sin, but always made in degree equal to its GUILT! This *vital truth*, underlying as it does the whole argument, and yet completely ignored in its ground work, tears up on coming in to view the entire foundation, and tumbles the whole fabric into a worthless heap of ruins. It is readily admitted that sin lies at the door of every one, who is so endowed as to be justly held responsible for the morality of his conduct, wherever that conduct is either not conformed to the law of God, or violates any one of its precepts; so that sin in its most positive form, is simply the act of a finite creature, and therefore *so far as the act is concerned necessarily finite*; but, before any sin can be properly punished, it is necessary to determine the amount of *guilt* involved in it, as necessarily conceded even by universalist writers. Smith the ablest among them, in his treatise on "Divine Government," contends that guilt is to be "*measured*" in all cases, by the sinner's "*ability to understand, connected with the causes and means of knowledge*"; unfortunately, for himself and his adherents however, while Smith thus saw a part, his rule for the measurement of guilt falls *infinitely* short of the truth; for let two brothers, sons of the same father be seen contending in angry altercation, till trampling upon their common humanity, and brutally bursting the bonds of brotherhood, they mutually fall upon each other with blows—the father approaches and suddenly, with grief and anguish agitating his frame, laying his hands upon them both, he commands them to desist from their beastly strife; and pressing in between them, shoves them apart; provoked by this interference one of the sons lifts his hand from smiting his brother and instantly STRIKES HIS FATHER!!! Shocked by such a scene, human society is prepared to hurl such a wretch from its sympathies, and to allow his name to rot in infamy; while

the sentence of Heaven is heard in the utterance of a still deeper execration, proclaiming he that smiteth father or mother LET HIM DIE THE DEATH! But why all this immense increase of horror and indignation? The person who has just struck his father, is the same who the moment before smote his brother—the sin, in both cases, so far as the act is concerned, is precisely the same, it is the sin of smiting. In the moment that intervened between his sins, the sinner's "*ability to understand,*" could not have changed, nor "*the causes and means of knowledge,*" and hence, if Smith's rule for the measurement of the guilt of sin be perfect, the guilt incurred by the son in striking his father, could not be greater than that which he incurred in smiting his brother; a conclusion most glaringly erroneous; and hence truth demands another mode of measuring the guilt of sin.

The Emperor of the French may heap a thousand indignities upon a private British subject, but let him venture to treat in the same manner, the official representative of the British Empire—let him refuse the demanded explanation—and immediately the British Lion lashed to fury will roar against him; and every engine of destruction with which the strength of the British navy can invest his shores, will pour in its murderous wrath upon him—and all the millions of Britain, with every bayonet bristling—with every sword uplifted—and with every gun open-mouthed, will fall upon him in destructive wrath; to avenge an indignity offered to *one* individual, while the nation takes no notice of a *thousand* indignities offered to another! Why is this?

In the case of the son's transferring his blow from his brother to his father; and in the case of the Emperor's transferring his indignity from a private subject to the British plenipotentiary; it is clearly obvious, that the enormous increase of guilt consequent on the transfer in each instance is not attributable to any change in the ability or circumstances of the offender, and *still less* to any change in the *act* of transgression; and hence the cause of the overwhelming increase of guilt observable in each case, must be sought for in something connected with the relative position of the respective parties sinned against.

The position of the father, let it be observed, is that of the founder, ruler, head and representative of the family—that every member reverence and honour him, is essential to the harmony and well being of the household, and the same being true of all the families of the earth—this connected with the fact that irreverence is diffusive in its nature, susceptible of being spread by example, renders an act of direct irreverence shown to the father of any family, by any member thereof, a positive injury to every family upon earth; and hence the fearful enormity of the guilt incurred by the son who lifts his hand against his father; the guilt of striking a brother, great as it unquestionably is, sinks in the comparison into utter insignificance. The British minister at the court of France, is the direct representative of the British nation, and hence of every individual composing it.

and therefore an indignity offered to him, by France or by her official representatives, is equally as offensive as though it were offered to each citizen of the empire personally, so that the guilt incurred by such an act, is as much greater than that incurred by offering the same indignity to a private subject, as the value of the united interests of all the millions of the British Empire, is greater than the interests of one individual. And thus, by a close observance of facts, we are enabled to lay it down as a fixed principle, THAT OTHER CONDITIONS REMAINING UNCHANGED, THE GUILT OF EVERY SIN IS ALWAYS IN PROPORTION TO THE VALUE OR IMPORTANCE OF THE RELATIONS WHICH THE PERSONAGE SINNED AGAINST SUSTAINED TO OTHER INTELLIGENCES. But as this formula is too long for convenience; and as rightfully sustaining important relations to other intelligences, always gives true dignity to such a personage, in proportion to the importance of the relations which he honourably sustains: the formula may be thus stated.—THE GUILT OF SIN IS ALWAYS IN PROPORTION TO THE DIGNITY OF THE PERSONAGE SINNED AGAINST.

It may now be observed, that this method of measuring the guilt of an offence, is universally acted upon among all families, peoples, nations and languages: so universally, indeed, that it is deemed utterly impossible to find a single exception in any nation barbarous or civilized; or, in any age ancient or modern. Of this, while in the city of Kingston, last Thursday, I was furnished with a striking exemplification. Stepping on board the small steamer *Juno*, I entered into conversation with a man who had evidently been an old seaman, and incidentally learned from him, that on a certain occasion he and six others deserted from their vessel, in one of their boats—this was near the coast of New Zealand. After sailing some time, they were compelled to land on one of the islands. In a difficulty that occurred between them and the Islanders, two of the white men struck the chief; the two guilty of this offence, were instantly killed—their flesh pulled off their bones, and eaten in the presence of my informant and his four associates, as they stood bound in their midst. I then asked him why the cannibals did not make food of him and his companions? "Oh!" said he "they never kill people *simply for food*, we **DO NOT STRIKE THE CHIEF!!** They killed only the two who did—they regard *his person* as sacred—whoever **TOUCHES HIM MUST DIE!**" Lost then as these cannibals were to all the less palpable principles of moral responsibility, they still retain the knowledge of the fact, that the guilt of an offence is in proportion to the dignity of the personage sinned against—a principle in relation to which it would seem, that nothing but the shocking necessities of error could ever induce any man to call in question its rectitude for a moment; inwrought as it evidently is, into the texture of man's moral constitution by the finger of the living God.

As the propriety of the application of the principle for which we contend, as necessary to the attainment of a correct estimate of the guilt of offences, must now be considered as fully established, so far as it affects all offences committed by man against his fellow; it is now necessary to enquire—does the principle reach any higher? Is its application acknowledged in Heaven?—*Must it be applied to the offences committed by man against his God?*

We have now reached a point where all must feel that we are dealing with an issue of appalling magnitude. And you who have staked your eternal destinies upon the *truthfulness* of the finite nature of your guilt, unable any longer to shut your eyes to the fact, that everywhere, and in all ages, the guilt,

of every offence has been rated in proportion to the dignity of the party sinned against; the question with you now is, can you retain the hope, that this principle is not applicable to your offences committed against God. Knowing that the failure of this hope is the conviction that your guilt is infinite, and that you have fully merited *endless misery*, you refuse to let it go. Like the wretched victim of heedless folly, who, week before last, sprang from his boat as it sped, careering to inevitable destruction, through the foaming surges that crown the brow of Niagara's face of death! To avoid the experience of its horrors, he sprang from his boat, ere yet it quivered, half length in air, o'er ruin's gulph—he sprang,—*alas!* what necessity was there! and clenching in agony the foam-clad trunk of a forest tree that had been wedged between sunken rocks, by the downward sweep of the raging torrent, he clung to this last and only object that could stay the instant consummation of his doom; and as he tightened his embrace of his last refuge, as quivering, it seemed ready to be wrenched from its moorings, so *you* cling to the hope we have named, while the force of this argument makes it tremble in your grasp. But here the analogy ends; for when the moment came, as come it did, that he could retain his grasp no longer, the skill of the multitude assembled having been baffled in every effort made for his rescue, springing upwards in the agony of despair, and uttering a wail, which none that heard can ever wish to hear repeated, he fell into the boiling flood that feeds the cataract, and was lost! In your case, however, the abandonment of your refuge is essential to your safety; for on making the discovery that your guilt is infinite, driven from a refuge of lies, your eyes will be opened to see the necessity of an Omnipotent Saviour: placed by the enormity of your guilt infinitely beyond the reach of created assistance, you will indeed find yourself floating on the tempestuous fiery surge that feeds the cataract, whose gulf is hell; and on whose face of clouds and darkness the lightnings of God's just indignation has traced "*Eternal Death*;" but though floating on such a surge, you are saved from dying with a lie in your right hand—the truth that you are lost, and which your lie did not annul, now takes full possession of your soul; and finding that all created help is placed at an *infinite distance* from you, you have, for the first time, reached a position in which you can appreciate the deliverance of God. And as in your *absolute impotency*, you desecrate the Omnipotent God, making bare his holy arm—and looking upon you, you hear him exclaim, "Save from going down to the pit for I have found a ransom." A ransom! You soul hangs on the sound—with you, its necessity is no longer a question—Gethsemane and Calvary sweep before you—your soul absorbs the strange depths of their meaning—like a worm, helpless on the bosom of a mountain torrent, you find yourself on the flaming surges of the curse of a broken law, and hell and destruction before you; still you find a passion more absorbing than fear, rapidly gaining the ascendancy as you gaze on the bleeding, anguished form of the Son of God—fear, shame and remorse all merge into contrition, and in brokenness of spirit you plead for pardon at his wounded feet; in faith believing that his blood cleanseth from all sin. Your prayer is heard—peace fills your soul—your guilt is cancelled—and your mouth is opened, to sing the high praises of God, who has plucked you as a brand from the burning. It is for the attainment of this end, and not because of the love of alarm, that we now press the questions of this issue upon you. The questions have been distinctly stated, for proof of what the answers should be, we now appeal to the word of God

In I. Samuel, ii. 25, we read: "If one man sin against another, the judge shall judge him: but, if a man sin against the Lord, who shall intreat for him?" This passage clearly takes the position, that an earthly judge may treat an offence committed by man against his fellow, but the sin of man against his God it lifts infinitely above the power of human adjudication; the whole bearing of the passage being obviously to awaken the conviction, that for a man to sin against his God, makes him immeasurably more guilty, than if his sin consisted chiefly in an offence against man. Indeed, to deny this meaning of the passage, is to reduce it to contemptible bombast. In this connection might be quoted all such passages as Ex. xix. 12,—"Take heed to yourselves that ye go not up into the mount to touch the border of it. whosoever toucheth the mount shall be surely put to death: 13, There shall not a hand touch it but he shall surely be stoned or shot through." I. Samuel, vi. 9, "And he smote the men of Bethshemish, because they had looked into the ark of the Lord; even he smote of the people fifty thousand and threescore and ten men: 20, And the men of Bethshemish said, who is able to stand before this holy Lord God? Lev. x. 1: "And Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, took either of them his censer, and put fire therein, and put incense thereon, and offered strange fire before the Lord, which he commanded them not. 2. And there went out fire from the Lord, and devoured them; and they died before the Lord. 3. Then Moses said unto Aaron, This is it that the Lord spake, saying, I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me, and before all the people I will be glorified. And Aaron held his peace." And thus page after page might be filled with quotations from the Old Testament, which set at defiance every attempt at exposition which ignores the principle, that the guilt of every offence committed against God is in proportion to the supreme dignity and glory of his character. On appealing to the New Testament, however, the evidence is so positive, that the principle universally applicable to the measurement of the guilt of offences committed by man against his fellow, is also applicable to his offences committed against God; that all doubt upon the subject must be dispelled by a single passage. Passing by the texts which relate to the sin against the Holy Ghost, which never hath forgiveness, and also passing by a multitude of others, in which the principle is unquestionably involved, Acts v., 3, 4, and 5 is selected:—"But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land? Whiles it remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power? Why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God. And Ananias, hearing these words, fell down and gave up the ghost: and great fear came on all them that heard these things."

Here the magnitude of the guilt of Ananias—its overwhelming and measureless turpitude is made to rest wholly upon the fact that he had NOT LIED UNTO MEN BUT UNTO GOD. So that now it must be considered as proved, not only that the guilt of offences committed by man against his fellow, rises in proportion to the dignity of the personage sinned against, but also, that this principle reaches higher—that it is admitted in heaven—and must be applied to the offences committed by man against his God. But if the guilt of offences committed by man against JEHOVAH be in proportion to his INFINITE DIGNITY, it follows inevitably that the guilt of every offence committed against God MUST BE INFINITE; for the proposition admits of no denial, that whatever is

proved to bear any proportion to that which is known to be infinite, that thing, be it what it may, must in itself be infinite; and therefore every one who has sinned against God, stands in the sight of the universe justly charged with INFINITE GUILT; but if chargeable with infinite guilt, then, as it is certain that every sinner incurs by his sin a punishment in proportion to his guilt, it follows inevitably that every sinner of our race has incurred INFINITE PUNISHMENT. Now as man is only a finite being, and therefore not possessed of infinite powers of endurance, it follows that he cannot suffer the infinite punishment he has incurred, by sin, in any limited period, and therefore if he suffers infinite punishment at all, it can only be by its being made infinite in duration and not in pungency; but punishment infinite in duration is punishment without end, and therefore the conclusion is absolutely inevitable, that every one who sins against God, does thereby necessarily incur ENDLESS MISERY.

The line of argument just closed, being perfectly invulnerable in itself, the attempt has been ignorantly made to reduce the whole to an absurdity. That the objection such as it is, may be fully met, I will present it in its strongest possible aspect, as follows:

If the guilt of every sin is necessarily infinite, then it follows that the sinner's first sin renders him infinitely guilty, so that he never can become more guilty, sin as he may; and it also follows, that all sinners must be alike or equally guilty; for, if the sin of the least guilty be really infinite, that of the most guilty cannot exceed it—but the impossibility of a sinner increasing his guilt, and the absolute equality of the guilt of all sinners, are doctrines, each of which is utterly at variance with both reason and Scripture; and therefore the argument which proves that the guilt of every sin is infinite, is an argument that proves too much, and hence UTTERLY WORTHLESS.

In answer to this objection, let it be observed, that its whole strength lies in what the logician calls a fallacy of false assumption. It assumes that whatever is infinite admits of no increase; also, that all infinities are necessarily equal to one another; both of which are not only mere assumptions, but assumptions so gross as to be susceptible of being proved utterly false. Of this the mathematician can need no proof—having often added infinite quantities together—squared them, cubed them, and raised them to as high powers as the arithmetician ever raised his finite quantities, and to far higher; he can but smile at that ignorance which would teach him that all infinite quantities are equal: and knowing also, as he does, that he can, with the utmost ease, descend from dealing with infinite quantities, to deal with those in the other extreme—to add, subtract, multiply, and divide infinitesimals, *i. e.*, quantities infinitely small, and then amuse himself by multiplying the infinitely great by the infinitely small, and both of these by finite quantities; reversing the process in each case at pleasure; developing, at every step, results of deep and absorbing interest; exhibiting truth in its most reliable forms, as more startling, by far, than the vagaries of the wildest imagination:

Having said more than enough to satisfy the mathematician of the utter fallacy of the assumptions on which the objection is based, it is now necessary to present these fallacies in a light in which all must see them with equal clearness to be absolutely false.

Let it be observed, then, in the outset, that the term infinite has two leading significations. In its first and highest sense, it represents that which admits of no increase—no addition or multiplication. This is a sense in which the term is applicable to God alone. In its secondary use, it represents that

which transcends or oversteps, in any direction or manner, all finite limits—all assignable boundaries. In this lower or secondary sense, the existence of each human being is properly termed infinite, because endless or eternal; that is, in the direction of the future, it oversteps all finite or assignable limits. But before man was formed, his Creator had existed from eternity; the past of his being is as truly infinite as its future; and hence in the existence of the SUPREME—from eternity to eternity—we have the meeting of two infinities, forming one so perfect as to admit of no increase—one, which beautifully represents the absolute perfection of all his attributes. The duration of God's existence, then, is infinite in the first or highest sense of the term—a sense evidently applicable to God alone. The duration of man's existence—from now to eternity, is also infinite, but evidently only in the secondary use or sense of the term—a sense which clearly admits of increase. This is an illustration of the two classes of infinities, which happily is so easily comprehended, as to render it impossible for any reflecting mind to doubt the existence of at least one infinite quantity that admits of increase. But in order that all may obtain a glimpse of the endless diversity of infinities which admit of increase; start now with me from the surface of our earth, and let us commence writing the figure 1, say 4 of them in every inch, on a line which we will suppose to be extended from our earth's surface to the sun; now as we can determine the exact length of this line in miles and inches; and know the number of times 1 is written in each inch, it is easy to determine the exact number or sum of the figures inscribed in the line. Now let the line be continued straight onward past the sun till it reaches the remotest star, the distance of which from the earth is known; and admitting that the writing of the figure 1, has been as exactly attended to along the whole line, as between the earth and the sun; it is still very easy to determine the number or sum of the figures. But, let the line be now produced beyond this remotest star, onward, and still onward to infinity, and the inscribing of the figure 1 upon it completed equally to infinity—and the number or sum of the figures inscribed on the line, is no longer finite but INFINITE; because in one direction the line has overstepped all finite limits—all assignable boundaries.

Now produce another line exactly like the first, in all respects, and parallel with it; but opposite to every figure as found in the first line, write in the second line the figure 2; these lines equally extend to infinity, and the first contains just as many figures as the second, but the value of each figure in the second line, is double that of the first, and therefore the sum of ALL the figures in the second, is just double that of ALL the figures in the first line, that sum INFINITE notwithstanding.

Let two other lines be now constructed parallel with the first two; and like them equally extended to infinity. We have now four parallel lines, all equally extended to infinity: the first two are filled with figures—let the figure 4 be now inscribed in the third line, opposite to every figure 2 that appears in the second line; and in like manner write the figure 8, in the fourth line—the sum of the figures in this fourth line, is clearly DOUBLE the sum of the third line, FOUR TIMES that of the second line, and EIGHT TIMES that of the first; and yet all are compelled to grant, that the sum of this first line is necessarily INFINITE. Here, then, we have one quantity undeniably infinite, another, lying alongside of it, twice as great!—a third, double the second!—and a fourth, eight times as great as the first, notwithstanding its absolute infinity!!! How blind, then, that ignorance which

would teach us, that all infinities are necessarily equal! But this is only the beginning: as instead of arithmetical figures, algebraic symbols may now be used to represent any number—an infinite one if desired, and if necessary that raised to an infinite power. But enough, as we have already produced a greater variety of infinities than can ever be necessary to represent the various amounts of guilt that men can possibly incur. The line of argument particularly referred to in the promise given to publish, is now completed. The detailed application of the argument and the sequel, may be expected to appear in the next Volume of the *Tribune*.

SAURIN'S DESCRIPTION OF A DYING INFIDEL.

"O, were my tongue dipped in the gall of celestial displeasure, I would describe the state of a man expiring in the cruel uncertainties of unbelief. Ah, see everything conspires to trouble him now. I am dying; I despair of recovering; physicians have given me over; the sighs and tears of my friends are useless; the world cannot cure me; I must die. It is death itself that preaches to me. Whither am I going! What will become of my body! My God, what a spectacle! The horrid torches, the dismal shroud, the coffin, the tolling bell, the subterranean abode! What will become of my soul? I am ignorant of its destiny, I am plunging into eternal night. My infidelity tells me my soul is nothing but a portion of subtle matter; another world, a vision; immortality, a fancy; but yet I feel, I know not what, that troubles my infidelity. Annihilation, terrible as it is, would appear tolerable to me, were not the ideas of heaven and hell to present themselves to me in spite of myself. I see heaven, that immortal mansion of glory, shut against me. I see it at an immense distance. I see it, but my crimes forbid me to enter. I see hell; hell, which I have ridiculed; it opens under my feet. I hear the horrible groans of the damned; the smoke of the bottomless pit chokes my words, and wraps my thoughts in suffocating darkness.

Such is the infidel on his dying bed. This is not an imaginary flight; it is not an arbitrary invention; it is what we see every day, in those fatal visits to which our ministry engages us, and to which God seems to call us to be sorrowful witnesses of his displeasure and vengeance. This is what infidelity comes to; this is what infidelity is good for; thus most skeptics die.

ERASMUS ON WAR.—If there is in the affairs of mortal men any one thing which it is proper uniformly to explode, and incumbent on every man by every lawful means to avoid, to deprecate, to oppose, that one thing is, doubtless, war. There is nothing more unnaturally wicked, more productive of misery, more extensively destructive, more obstinate in mischief, more unworthy of man, as formed by nature, much more of man professing Christianity.

Neal Dow has prepared a new liquor bill, which is now before the special committee of the Main Legislature, with a fair prospect of becoming the law. It inflicts for the first offence of selling liquor, fifty dollars and costs, and four months imprisonment, the second fifty dollars and six months, the third one hundred dollars and one year. Persons intoxicated must disclose where they got their liquor or go to the house of correction. Express, railroad and steamboat agents will be liable to fine and imprisonment for conveying liquors to or from those not licensed, and no action is to lie against any officer for seizing and destroying liquors where the warrant issues from a competent court.

Moral and Religious Miscellany.

From the British Messenger.

THOMAS FOWLER, THE BOATMAN.

"Is there a spare room hereabouts to be let, ma'am?" said an elderly gentleman to a fisherman's wife, who stood at her cottage gate.

"Will you please to walk in, sir," said she, curtseying, "and then you can tell me what you want."

The stranger entered the neat parlor, and instinctively walked to the parlor window facing the sea.

"You know," said he, "the new house that is building yonder? That house will be mine, and till it is built, I am lodging at the next town with my family, but I must be over backwards and forwards every day; and I want a room to be quiet in when I am tired; such a room as this would be just the thing."

The bargain was struck, and not many days after, the stranger, whom we will call Mr. Holt, said to his landlady, "I like to have an hour in the middle of the day to read God's word; now if you would come in, and invite any of the neighbours, I will read to you."

"I shall like it very much, sir," replied she, "though I don't know what my husband would say if he should ever come home while we were all together—but at present he is out fishing and we can but try."

The neighbors were invited, many gladly came; and though old Tom Fowler himself some time after discovered what was going on, yet he contented himself with skulking into the kitchen, and swearing at the goings on in the parlor, and perhaps giving his wife an extra blow afterwards, and a few harsh words.

Tom was a very hardened sinner; he had grown old in sin; he had known what it was to be taught the right way when a child, but he had chosen the paths of death, and "was in almost all evil in the midst of" his wicked associates.

Meanwhile Mr. Holt went on daily with his labor of love, and his audience increased, so that the little room would not hold them, and those who could not find seats, stood in the passage.

More than once he fancied, while reading, that he heard the voice of a man sobbing in the passage, but he did not think afterwards to inquire.

On one day, however, he was speaking to his little company concerning the love of God to poor sinners, as shown in the death of Jesus, when he spoke to them as follows:—

There were two men of bad character, they were thieves, they were hardened against God and man; feared not God, they neither regarded man, and at length they were caught and condemned to die.

The day of their death was the most momentous day that has ever dawned on man since the fall. It was the day on which the Son of God, having been betrayed by one of his own followers, and accused by his countrymen to the Roman authorities, had been condemned to death by Pontius Pilate as a malefactor unworthy to live.

In order to make his death more ignominious, he was placed between these two convicted thieves, who, in spite of the nearness of their own death, and the extremity of their present suffering, were as hardened and wicked as ever. For, hearing the priests and Pharisees blaspheming the holy Jesus, they employed their dying breath in echoing the imprecations.

Was there ever greater guilt than this? Could there be any doom for such sinners short of eternal punishment?

But even for such sinners as these there may be mercy! Even at the last hour the grace of God touched the heart of one of these men.

Is there such a sinner now listening to these words? then say to yourself, is there not mercy for me also?

The dying thief first turned to his companion in sin and rebuked him, asking him if he feared not God, and owning that *they* indeed suffered justly, receiving the due reward of their deeds.

He declared, at the same time, his conviction of the innocence of the Lord Jesus, acknowledging that *He* had done nothing amiss.

Then turning to him who was hanging between himself and his fellow malefactor, he said, "Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom."

And the immediate answer of the Lord Jesus was, "Verily, I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in paradise."

"Now," said Mr. Holt, "one of the snares by which Satan keeps poor sinners to himself is this. When they hear of Jesus, and His grace to lost guilty creatures, he says to them, you are too bad; remember what you have done; you have been a thief and a drunkard, you have taken God's name in vain, you have beaten your wife and neglected your children, and you have led others to be as bad as yourself.—You cannot expect God to forgive you in your present state, but you must wait and lead a new life, and then, perhaps, you may be forgiven."

But see now how different is God's way; see this poor wretch; he had lived in sin and was dying for his sins, blaspheming with his latest breath the only one who could save him, the very one who was bleeding and dying there, that He might be able to save him.

Is there such a sinner here? Do you not see by this dying thief's example that there is hope for you?

Turn to Jesus as *he* turned; believe in his love and power as *he* believed; and this very hour there is pardon and joy in store for you.

But you must observe that this dying criminal believed in Jesus. He saw him hanging on the cross near to death, yet he believed he should live again—that he should come in his kingdom. He believed also that Jesus could forgive sin, and that he was willing to do so. He wasted not his dying breath in many words, but his faith clung to one who possessed almighty power, and who had exhaustless grace.

Poor sinner, look on Jesus as he is—lifted up on the cross, know that he hung there for sin, and if you are a sinner, no matter how vile, only look unto Him, turn from your sin to him, and say, "Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom."

Jesus will not upbraid you with your past offences, "though they be red as scarlet, and many as the sand on the sea-shore."

"Sir," said Mrs. Fowler, next day, before the reading, as she brought in a loaf of bread, and a pot of fresh butter on a little tray, with a jug of spring water, "Sir, haven't you heard somebody a-crying sometimes lately when the door has been open?—Well, sir, that's my poor husband; he has been taken on sadly; he was home last night, but I do not think he slept a wink, and he kept crying out what a sinner he is, and how he wishes he could see Jesus, and ask him to forgive him, but he don't believe he shall ever be forgiven. He is now out again fishing."

"Indeed, Mrs. Fowler," replied Mr. Holt, "I am

very thankful to hear this; I will take the first opportunity of speaking to him."

Mr. Holt was not long before he met Tom, and found that indeed the arrow of God's word had pierced that hard heart; at first he could hardly credit the assurance that there was mercy for him—full, free, present mercy and salvation. But his was a desperate case, and Mr. Holt made him see that, however the moral and religious may try to get to heaven by some good deeds of their own, there could be no hope of so vile a sinner as Tom doing anything to wipe off such a long score as he had run up against himself; and so Tom was wise enough to come to Jesus just as he was, without any attempt to mend his case by patching up excuses, or by multiplying prayers. So Tom Fowler resolved to come to Jesus like the thief on the cross, and ask Jesus to remember *him* when he should come into his kingdom, not because of what Tom had done, or could do, but because of what Jesus had suffered for sinners.

Had it not been for this, Tom might have died hardened in sin, like the other thief, for he was quite as bad as the man who died hardened in his unbelief and blasphemy.

Instead of which Tom believed in the power and willingness of Jesus to forgive even such a blasphemer as he had been, and he found that this belief was a mighty engine of strength against the power of sin.

Tom, from that day forward, became a true Christian, and by God's grace has been enabled to walk as such, and to adorn the doctrine of that holy Saviour whom once he blasphemed.

Tom has now walked in this holy way for more than eight years, an ornament to his Christian profession; and when he ceases to dwell on earth, he will go forever to be with the dying thief in the presence of that Jesus whom he once hated and despised.

And there, reader, *you* may join him if you will. Jesus is ready to receive you, if you are ready to come. *This day* you may be translated out of the kingdom of Satan into *His* kingdom, if you will but come to him acknowledging that your only desert is death, but believing that He whom you have hated and despised, is ready and waiting to accept and receive you as soon as you come unto him.

Old Mr. Holt, also, still lives; his house was built in course of time, and he became a great blessing in the little hamlet. He continued to read to the poor fishermen and their wives, meeting them at their different cottages in rotation. Tom Fowler is not the only hardened sinner who has been reclaimed and converted through these simple meetings; and no wonder, for the word of God is the appointed instrument by which sinners are converted; and if, when we know the grace of God ourselves, we would be used in communicating that knowledge to others, let us use this sword of the Spirit, and we shall not use it in vain; for it is written, "My word shall not return unto me void, but shall accomplish that which I please, and prosper in the thing whereto I sent it."

Use the word of God! it will convert the sinner!
Use the word of God! it will hold up the believer!
Believer, use the word of God; it will feed you, and make your soul grow strong. Use the word of God! it will make you quick to discern between good and evil.

PROTESTANTISM NOT DECLINING.—Do any tell you that evangelical Protestantism is on the decline? How strange their error! Every school that tells the story of Luther and the Reformation—every unmuz-

zled press—every tract that speaks of Christ's blood as the only atonement for, and cancelment of, sin—every sermon that preaches him, God and man, the one, and the sufficient, and the only Mediator—every Protestant Bible sent on its glad errand—is a new triumph—is a new protest of a living Protestantism against the presumptuous edict that calls her *dead*, in the murderous hope of *burying her alive!*—*Dr. Williams.*

From Evangelical Christendom.

THE PERSECUTIONS IN MECKLENBURG, AND OTHER STATES.

INTERVIEW ON THE SUBJECT WITH THE KING OF PRUSSIA.

Hamburgh, Jan. 26th, 1855.

My dear Brother,—Your favour of Dec. 24, 1854, enclosing bill on your banker for £30 10s., was duly received, for both of which I beg to tender you my cordial thanks.

A part of the above sum has been already forwarded to our suffering brethren in Mecklenburg, where the most rigorous measures against our brethren are carried out with an iron hand. The cow which brother Wegener, at Ludwigslust, purchased with the money you kindly sent him, has been again confiscated and sold by the authorities, and, at the present moment, brother Kleppe, at Wismar, has been sentenced to pay a fine of 75 thalers, or, in default thereof, to suffer three weeks' imprisonment.

In Prussia, similar measures are being applied, so that the above contributions of brethren in England will greatly tend to ameliorate the sufferings of our dear brethren. May our gracious Lord richly compensate you for the continued interest you evince in our weal and woe, as also all those brethren who continue to aid us by their contributions.

I now beg to enclose a statement of our interview with the King of Prussia, which took place on the 10th inst. As the particulars are stated in the accompanying paper, I need not repeat them here.—The reception was most gracious, and yet my hopes of obtaining a concession—the concession promised to Mr. Barnard*—are much weakened; not because I doubt the King's friendly disposition towards us, but I fear the influence of the men by whom he is surrounded is such, that his wishes will be paralyzed. Our interviews with Mr. Niebuhr, and afterwards with Dr. Hoffman, one of the pastors, have produced the conviction on my mind that it requires a firmer character than the King of Prussia possesses to carry his point. I fear that the Evangelical party, especially the clergy in Germany, are more determined than ever to stay our onward course if they can, and that, instead of an extension of religious liberty, we shall ere long have to pass through new trials and sufferings. May our gracious Lord prepare us for the struggle, if my forebodings should be realised, and make us faithful even to the end.

Nothing material has been altered in the position of our brethren in Schleswig-Holstein, with the following exceptions—that the little church at Tangsted, in Holstein, has been threatened by the authorities with the infliction of fines, &c., if they continued to hold their public religious services; whilst, on the other hand, two of our members at Altona have obtained permission from the Government at Copenhagen to be married by their own minister, and which was performed by me accordingly, about three weeks ago.

In the midst of all the hostile elements by which

* The United States Ambassador.

we are surrounded, and which now and then assume a threatening aspect, it is consoling to know that the Lord reigneth, and that, with Him and His Word on our side, we need not fear what man can do unto us. His past dealings towards us forbid all distrust for the future, and his gracious promises secure to our faith a final and glorious victory.

With much esteem and affectionate regard,
Yours in the Lord,
J. G. ONCKEN.

The Rev. Dr. Steane.

REPORT OF AN INTERVIEW OF REVS. J. G. ONCKEN, C. SHAUFFLER, AND G. W. LEHMANN WITH HIS MAJESTY THE KING OF PRUSSIA.

In consequence of a resolution passed at the Conference of German Baptist Churches, held at Hamburg, in September, 1854, which empowered the executive brethren of the Union to take further steps for the attainment of a concession, the brethren J. G. Oncken, C. Schaufler, G. W. Lehmann, J. Köbner, and the secretary of the Union, assembled at Berlin for consultation, January 3rd, 1855. Agreeably to a previous arrangement, they decided on seeking an interview with his Majesty the King of Prussia. For this purpose a memorial and petition were prepared, and, provided with these documents, the brethren J. G. Oncken, C. Schaufler, and G. W. Lehmann, proceeded, January 6, to Potsdam. There (they write) we first called on the court preacher, the Rev. Dr. Krummacher, who received us in a very friendly manner, and encouraged us to apply forthwith to the court marshal, Count Keller, who would not fail at once to announce us to the King. We followed this advice, but found with regret that we had arrived too late to secure an audience on this day. Count Keller, however, noted down brother Lehmann's address, and promised to inform us in Berlin when the interview could take place. After having waited in vain until January 10 for the anticipated intimation, we decided on going to-day to Potsdam, where we at once proceeded to the royal palace. There we again met with a courteous reception from the court marshal, who told us the King had hitherto been prevented from seeing us, owing to the indisposition of the privy councillor, Mr. Niebuhr, with whom—as he is acquainted with our affairs—the King wished previously to have some conversation. Count Keller now offered to apprise his Majesty of our presence at Potsdam, as a favourable moment for our admission to the royal presence might occur, and soon he returned, announcing "His Majesty will see the gentlemen." We were then conducted to the royal antechamber, where an inspection of the fine paintings with which it is adorned shortened the time of waiting. We had been told the King would receive us here, but as he passed through the corridor we heard him giving other orders; and in a few moments we were ushered into the room which the King had entered, and which, from its appearance, we judged to be a council-chamber. Scarcely had we entered when his Majesty, in a friendly voice, said: "Come nearer, gentlemen;" and when we had done so, continued—"What is your actual wish? I have not been able to read your paper." (The King held our memorial in his hand.)

Brother Lehmann spoke first as follows:—"The gracious assurances given by your Majesty to the American Ambassador, the Hon. Mr. Barnard, have been communicated to us, and have filled us with hope and joy. We now cherish the deep-felt wish that our churches should actually receive the graciously promised concession. The scruples raised against such a concession on account of the absence

of a fixed organization, with a representative corporation, are now fully removed. The corporation bears the name of 'Executive Brethren of the United Baptists' Churches in Germany, Denmark, Sweden, and Switzerland, and on their behalf we now present our humble petition to your Majesty. The painful and uncertain position of our churches in the Prussian state occasions many grievances. We have repeatedly been under the necessity of troubling your Majesty with petitions on account of judicial sentences, penalties, &c.; several of these petitions have been granted by your Majesty, others, doubtless, could not be granted. The grievances to which we are subjected are a necessary consequence of our undefined position in the state, as we are thereby exposed to every incidental disfavour, while quite the reverse would result from a positive acknowledgement of our Churches on the part of your Majesty."

The King replied:—"I am amazed to find this has not yet taken place; I thought the matter had been attended to long since. Religious persecution is entirely opposed to my conviction; and, independently of my own conviction, I deem it unwise. It is also quite opposed to the former procedure of Prussia."

Brother Lehmann again spoke and remarked:—"Also in regard to Bible-colportage, a concession is highly desirable. The Bible Societies in Prussia possessing a legal acknowledgement, are so far favoured that they may freely send out colporteurs, which we cannot do."

"Yes," answered the King, "but this has its ground in the fact that no hawking of books is permitted."

Brother Lehmann remarked: that "his Majesty's Minister Von der Heidl had issued a rescript permitting the colportage of Bibles and religious books, under certain conditions and guarantees."

"But," interposed the King, "is not a special permission or something of the kind necessary?"

"Certainly, your Majesty; but this is willingly granted to the acknowledged societies, while it is withheld (a few cases excepted) from us. Besides," continued brother Lehmann, "another point, which renders a concession desirable, is the fact that we have chapels and meeting-houses, for which the Churches have no guarantee that they will retain possession of them. In this respect the greatest uncertainty exists."

"How many chapels have you in Prussia?" asked the King.

"Three or four, your Majesty."*

"No more?" said the King.

"The erection of several others is in contemplation."

"What is your relation to the Mennonites?" asked the King. "Can you not unite with them, and thereby remove all difficulties? We have in the Evangelical Church various parties, yet all are united in one. Can you not identify yourselves with the Mennonites?"

"Your Majesty," said brother Lehmann, "everything has been done on our part to promote a hearty fraternal intercourse between the Mennonites and us, but they refuse to respond to such overtures."†

"And wherein does the difference between you and the Mennonites consist?" asked the King.

Brother Oncken replied: "Your Majesty, the Mennonites baptise all their children, indiscriminately, at the age of 14-16. They receive their whole natural progeny into their communion. We act on the

* We did not remember at the time that six or seven chapels already exist. The King, in saying "no more," probably thought of Churches (Gemeinden.)

† Particularly in East Prussia.

principle of receiving those who have received the truth in their hearts, who have attained to faith in Christ, and have given public testimony of this in the Church. And in the administration of baptism there is this difference, that we baptise by immersion."

"How do the Mennonites baptise?"

"By pouring or sprinkling."

"There is another circumstance," remarked brother Lehmann, "which commends the Baptists to the favour of the state more than the Mennonites.—The latter, as is well known, neither take oaths, nor perform military service, both of which our confession of faith authorises us to do."

"This is new to me, and I am happy to hear it," replied the King.

"Perhaps it may also speak in favour of the granting of our petition," continued brother Lehmann, "that the Baptist Churches, even beyond your Majesty's dominions, would thereby be very favourably influenced. Our position in Prussia is a trying one; yet, in comparison to that of our brethren in other countries, it is enviable. In the latter they are fined, their goods are confiscated, and themselves exposed to every species of persecution."

"Where is this?" asked the King.

"In Denmark, † Mecklenburg, Schwerin, Bückeburg, Hessa, &c."

The King: "Yes, there I have no power."

Brother Lehmann: "But the august example of your Majesty would everywhere exert the most salutary influence. I have travelled in the company of influential men; wherever we put forth efforts, on behalf of our brethren in the faith, we were asked, 'What course does Prussia pursue?' And we could have effected much more for our persecuted friends, had we been able to point with more decision to our own position."

The King was silent.

"I take the liberty," said brother Lehmann, "in this unworthy form, to present to your Majesty a pamphlet, containing authentic accounts of such persecutions."²

The King received the pamphlet with a friendly movement, and, turning over some pages, said, "As I have already remarked, religious persecution is much opposed to my principles, and it grieves me much to hear of its occurrence."

Brother Lehmann.—"A concession granted by your Majesty would doubtless bring about the termination of much persecution beyond Prussia."

The King: "You may depend upon it nothing shall be wanting to effect this. Your brethren in the faith stand high in my estimation."

The King then turned to brother Oncken, asking, "You are Mr. Oncken?" and receiving an answer in the affirmative, expressed great pleasure in seeing him. After some desultory conversation, the King, again referring to the memorial in his hand, said he would read it and communicate the result to us.

Before, however, we retired from the royal presence, brother Oncken asked permission to thank his Majesty for the cabinet order issued in his favour, July 20, 1852, which enabled him, after his expulsion, to return to Berlin to the aid of his friend Lehmann, who was ill.

The King: "And I must tell you this was not my first order of the kind. I issued a similar one in 1847, which must have perished in the commotions

of 1848. I confess the measures adopted against you grieved me deeply."

Brother Oncken: "I venture also to make known to your Majesty that the gracious assurances given to the Hon. Mr. Barnard have been an occasion of joy and gratitude to thousands of our Churches in America."

The King: "Yes, I repeat my regret at the course hitherto pursued. I was first informed of these things by my ambassador, Chevalier Bunsen, in London, and of the amazement and indignation they called forth in England. I am annoyed at proceedings so foreign to my conviction. I care not what judgment is passed upon my opinions, but I do not like to be considered responsible for that which is entirely opposed to my principles. Well, I have your statement, and shall attend to it. I am astonished nothing further has been done in this matter, and I shall now make it my own care."

With such and similar gracious expressions, we were then dismissed from the royal presence.

FILIAL FAITH IN GOD.

BY MRS. H. B. STOWE.

"I will cry unto God most high—unto God, that performeth all things for me."—Ps. 57: 2.

The Psalms of David are an anomaly in ancient literature. In no cotemporary writer, in none preceding is there any intercourse chronicled between the Divine and human spirit like that expressed in these. Other writings have often the soul's aspirations to Deity; but they have no record of communion in return. But the Psalms are as full of allusions which show intimate personal acquaintance, as are the letters of a child to a parent. Witness, in this place, how David, in trouble, speaks of God. As the merchant speaks of the banker who honors his drafts, as the ward speaks of the guardian who arranges his affairs, in a familiar matter-of-course way, so David in his trouble speaks of God who performeth all things for him!

This is not a God yet to be tried; but a God who has helped him so often that the thought of him comes naturally as his breathing; the soul turns to him as instinctively as the infant lifts his hands in every emergency to the mother who "performeth all things for him."

All religion is grounded on man's helplessness. Every man is pushed into existence much like a stranger stranded on a desolate island. He enters a great crushing system of unknown laws, moving with inflexible regularity, and with the most total disregard of the individual suffering caused by their inflexibility. The future is hid by an impenetrable veil, and there are coming upon him daily and hourly, from this quarter or that, sources of alarm, distress, anxiety, which force the most self-confident to stand in utter helplessness. The history of man has been the history of one long struggle for help. Generation after generation, in their darkness and ignorance, are landed on these mortal shores to find their way amid the conflicting powers of nature as they are best able; and no sooner do they acquire a little insight and little experience, than death hurries them out of sight.

Therefore the great underlying question of all religion is, does God care for us—will he help us?

It was claimed by the Hebrews, as the peculiarity of their religion, that it gave the most entire and satisfactory answer to this question. Moses says, "For what nation is there that hath God so nigh unto them, as the Lord our God is, in all things that we call upon him for."

† Properly speaking, in Schleswig-Holstein.

² Results of an investigation into cases of Protestant Persecution on the Continent, By Rev. T. B. Brooke, B. A., and Rev. Edward Steane, D. D.

The history of the earlier patriarchs is most touching and most consoling in the view which it presents of God tenderly guiding man, even as a nurse guides the tottering steps of an infant. How different are the recorded patriarchal prayers from things that often pass for prayers in modern churches! The patriarchal prayers were, in directness and simplicity of utterance, much like those which your little son addresses to you, as he sits on your knee by the flickering evening firelight. He turns to you as the one that "performeth all things for him," and just so did Abraham, Jacob, and David turn to God. To him you are unbounded in resources. It never enters his head to question either your ability or your willingness to help him to any thing he desires. It has never entered his head to sort out his requests, and to ask only such things as he thinks of a suitably dignified and important nature, to be mentioned to a man of your worth and wisdom; but he thinks aloud to you, urging with equal zeal for the bread that supports his life and the plaything that seems essential to his childish fancy.

Precisely like this was the Hebrew idea of prayer. I will not leave you orphans, said Jesus. I will come to you; and in all the old Hebrew revelations that same gracious utterance is heard. The most beautiful medium in which has been embodied this idea of the simple walk of the trustful spirit with God, is the life and writings of the poet David.

In him we trace the history of a sensitive, poetic nature, born in a rough age, in a family of rude warlike brothers, to whom the womanly tenderness of his nature was only an argument of mirth and derision. In such a soul the burden of feeling becomes too great to be borne alone. It has a thousand trembling wants, a thousand sensitive shrinkings, a thousand peculiar sorrows, and who can understand them?

But the poet's heart found refuge in another heart; a soul of infinite tenderness opened itself to him as a refuge, and from that hour he was alone no more. Sweet as an enchanted dream was his life, who saw, ever moving by his side, a form of eternal Love and Power. One to whom the throbbings of his heart could utter themselves without words. Thenceforward, amid the cares and contentions of a rude outerworld, was there evermore an inward sanctuary; he breaks forth sometimes in exclamations of joy on this sheltered security of the trusting soul: Oh! how great is thy goodness which thou hast laid up for them that fear thee, which thou hast wrought for them that trust in thee before the sons of men. Thou shalt hide them in the secret of thy presence from the pride of man; thou shalt keep them secretly as in a pavilion from the strife of tongues."

How different the experience of David from that of many well-meaning Christians! What experience have they that can be expressed by the simple phrase, "God that performeth all things for me?" Fenced about by philosophy, they see in life's history only the movement of a great machine, working by inevitable laws, with which God has no connection, except in distant perspective as first originator.

Why should I pray? Will God alter the laws of nature for me? And with this cold inquiry they smother the heart's yearning for help, and walk all their days orphans in their Father's house. There is bread enough, and to spare, but they perish with life-long hunger. All their days they go bowed with cares and anxieties which wear their hearts out, simply because they will not ask their Father to help them. If a man would for only one day imitate his little child, and pray to God as that little one does to him, he would make a discovery that might add

years to his life. For what frets the soul away? what silvers the hair, wrinkles the cheek, dims the eye? One word speaks it: CARE. The holy word says, "Casting all your care on Him, for he careth for you." Human reasoning says, "Casting your great cares on Him." God is not a God who performeth all things for us, but only great things at long intervals. Ah! could we but know it, to God every thing is great that is of importance enough to cost us a tear, a sigh, a wakeful hour, an anxious thought.

Does not a wise father watch over his son's kite, and skates, and top, as much as over his school bills and grammar? Does he not appreciate the influence on the forming character of all the anxieties they give him? and is God less wise?

How much purer and wiser the course of worldly affairs, were God the intimate Counsellor in them—the Friend to whom the soul continually turns! Then only is life fully consecrated, when in all our family arrangements, our business, our pleasures, our friendships, our amusements, we consult our Father. And say, in little cares as in great, *I will cry unto God most high: unto God that performeth all things for me.*—Independent.

THE TONGUE AND THE EYE.

Words and glances! how sharp and swift they fly, and how tremendous is their power for good or evil, for joy or sorrow!

There are words which carry healing to the sad heart, and there are those which crush and uproot the young and joyful hopes of the bravest spirit. There are those which cheer and inspire, which renew the courage of those ready to perish, and which send the thrill of life and hope even through the cold bosom of despair. There are words that make the soul of the weeper to sing for joy and thanksgiving; which can cause that poor, suffering thing, the sport of fashion and the fount of tears—the human heart—to reel beneath its overpowering load of rapture, or to shiver and shrink away into the chill darkness of a hopeless night.

Oh, words are mighty things! who can stand unmoved before them? They melt or burn, they warm or scorch, they bless or curse. Sharper than a two-edged sword do they fall from the lips of anger and scorn. Sweeter than honey from the honeycomb, dear as the joys of home, do they drop from the fond lips of love.

They can soothe and calm the troubled spirit, can comfort the afflicted and oppressed, or they can lash the waves of passion, hate and strife, to fearful fury.

Words can sting like serpents, they can gash and rend and tear, like ravaging wolves; they can cleave through nerve and marrow, and make wounds whose ragged scars will never pass away. They may indeed be hid from sight, covered over by the withered leaves and flowers which choke and moulder in every human heart.

Words, gentle, sincere and kind, from a warm heart, can make friends whom death hath not power to sever, and the harsh and angry word oft makes a life-long enemy.

Words! words! words! how they rush and ring. Along the highway, by the sheltered pathway, in the valley and the meadow, on the mountain, through the forest, in the village by the river side, along the shore and on the sea. The most remote and quiet hamlet hath its countless words, and through the town and city they roll and sweep with deep continuous roar. Who can tell the sum of them? Yet for

every single word that man shall speak "he shall give account in the day of judgment."

Oh, words are *fearful* things. And the silent glances of the eye—who has not felt their influence? Ah, who has followed all the depths of that orb of mystery, the human eye? Whence comes its amazing power? Whence but from that strange living creature, the invisible spirit that dwells within this prison house of clay? O undiscovered essence, it is through the wonderful eye thou lookest forth; and in the eyes of each other mortals may catch glimpses of the uncertain radiance, and the shadowy outlines of that subtle thing, the human soul. But let any try to behold less vaguely, let one seek to give those flitting, wavering gleams, that impalpable presence, a distinct form, and he is at once baffled, and made aware, to his ever-increasing perplexity, that man may not see himself, nor yet his brother whom he loves, but only the perishing and shattered tabernacle wherein he dwells. Strange, bewildering mystery. The eye, though a thing of dust, which must darken and close heavily, and moulder back to whence it came, is yet a *monarch*. Who disputes its sway? Who has not warmed and glowed beneath its glances? Who has not trembled and turned pale and cowered and shrunk away from its cold glance, or its chilling scorn? It can thrill with rapture unutterable every pulse and nerve, and it can freeze the springs of happiness, even in their wildest flow.

Since then the eye is so powerful for good or ill, let each one set a watch upon its glances, as well as upon "the words of the mouth and the thoughts of the heart."—*N. Y. Evangelist*.

From the *N. Y. Evangelist*.

THE RED-COAT PREACHER.

Captain Scott, the intimate friend and helper of Whitefield, having received a good education, embraced the profession of arms in his seventeenth year. He was in active service, and was soon promoted to the rank of captain. The danger to which he was exposed as a soldier, made a deep impression upon his mind, and led him to resolve to make preparation for death. He read the Scriptures, and offered a form of prayer daily, though his conduct in other respects remained unchanged. Happening to be quartered near Oathall, and being out on a shooting party, he was driven by a storm to take shelter in a farmhouse. A number of labourers were present, and the farmer being a religious man, the conversation turned on the subject of personal religion. Scott listened to their remarks with astonishment. He found they had ideas of religion which were perfectly new to him, and yet they were such as commended themselves to his conscience. He asked whence they had acquired their knowledge, and they told him at the hall of Lady Huntingdon, where a famous man was then preaching. They gave him an urgent invitation to come and hear for himself. He did so the following Sabbath, and heard Mr. Romaine preach from the following text, "*I am the way*." The discourse made known to him the way of salvation, and the result was, that he became a new man—a decided Christian. He soon began to hold meetings with his soldiers, among whom he became exceedingly useful, though this course exposed him to many annoyances. His first sermon was preached before his ordination, under the following circumstances:—A pious person to whom he was introduced, having heard of the meetings he had held among the soldiers, told him he must preach in his house that evening. He gave him a Bible and hymn book, and left him alone in

the parlour to prepare for his work. He complied with the request, or rather the injunction, and from that time forward was a zealous and effective public preacher. He soon after preached in the meeting-houses in Leicester, in his regimentals, and attracted great attention, and awakened great opposition. Whitefield gave him his hearty countenance, and invited him to London. "I have," said he, "invited Captain Scott to come to London, and bring his artillery to Tabernacle Rampart, and try what execution he can do there." Immense congregations crowded to hear him, and many were converted under his ministry.

The change in Captain Scott's mode of life caused many to say of him, as some did of his Master, "He is beside himself." One night, as he took the mail-coach for Shrewsbury, he found he had for a companion a major in the army. Though strangers, they engaged in conversation, and the captain asked him if he was acquainted with any families in Shrewsbury. The major answered in the affirmative, and enumerated, among other families of his particular acquaintance, the Scotts. In the course of his remarks respecting them, he said, "there was one mad fellow, who, many years ago, went into the army; and when he was there, turned Methodist, and went about preaching with his regiment." "Has he shown any other marks of derangement than those you have mentioned," said Captain Scott. "I really can't say, as I know very little about him." When they arrived at Oxford, they were shown into a room lighted by two candles. The captain, taking one in each hand, walked up to the major, and said, "Give me leave to introduce to you the mad Captain Scott." The major was overwhelmed with astonishment, and was greatly mortified at what he had said. The captain assured him that his remarks had not caused the slightest pain, but requested that when he saw his friends he would correct their misapprehensions with respect to the state of his mind. "It is no uncommon thing," said Scott, "for a man to be charged with derangement, when he begins to be truly wise, especially when he begins to reflect that he has an immortal and priceless soul, and makes it his great concern to secure its eternal happiness." He took the opportunity to explain to the major the change in his views since he entered the army, and in so doing, to set before him the way of salvation—with what effect, is not known.

One day the captain, being about to visit Berwick, took a letter from Mr. Romaine to a gentleman there named Poweys, with whom Mr. Venn was then staying. Poweys had known Scott well in former days, but was ignorant of the change that had taken place in his character. He was standing in the window, and saw the captain ride up in his uniform, and upon his military horse. "There is Captain Scott," said he: "what can he want here? I am determined I will not see him, if I can help it." He retired from the window; but as the captain inquired for him, he could not refuse to see him: he received him with an air of distant civility, regretting his presence, since it would be an interruption to the spiritual enjoyment of himself and friends. Scott handed him Romaine's letter. When he had read it, he ran and threw his arms around his guest, at the same time crying out, "Mr. Venn! Mr. Venn! Mrs. Poweys! Mrs. Poweys! Come here—come here quickly! Here is Captain Scott, a convert to Christ!" They came; and being informed of the contents of Romaine's letter, embraced the penitent, and like the angels in heaven, rejoiced over him who had been dead, and was alive again; who had been lost, but was found.

After awhile he sold out his commission, and renounced all his hopes of military advancement for

the nobler prospect of saving men by preaching Christ crucified. He was one of the supplies at the Tabernacle, for more than twenty years. How much more noble the employment of saving the souls, than that of destroying the bodies of men! What is the glory of Wellington, compared with that now enjoyed by him who gave up the pomp and the honour of arms for the reproach and service of the Lord Jesus Christ! Young men often burn with a desire for military glory. Let them know that there is a far higher ambition—let them take the testimony of God, that “they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars for ever and ever.”

From the Missionary Herald.

HOME PROCEEDINGS.

Most of our friends are aware that during the past six months the committee have had under their serious consideration the despatch of the directors of the East India Company on the subject of education. It is proposed in it, among other things, to give “grants in aid” to all schools, without regard to sect or party. The conditions on which such grants are to be given are two; first, that a good secular education be imparted, on the principles of European knowledge and science, and secondly, that the schools be open to the visits of a government inspector.

The question naturally arose, what course the society should take in this matter, and what course it should prescribe to the missionaries. These questions have not been decided hastily. They have had the attention of the committee at three of its quarterly meetings. We are happy to place the result before our readers, and we take the earliest opportunity of doing so, partly because frankness on such a subject will be appreciated by them, and partly to prevent any misconceptions getting abroad respecting the matter. The views of the Committee on the great question itself, and also of their duty in regard to the missionaries, or how far they consider they ought to legislate for their honoured brethren, will be understood from the document which is subjoined:—

CIRCULAR.

From various communications addressed to you during these few past years, you will have observed how deep and lively has been the interest of the Committee on all educational movements. They have regarded them as not only among the best means of promoting the social and intellectual improvement of the heathen, but also of facilitating the spread of the gospel throughout the mission field.

2. It has been, as you are aware, the uniform practice of the society to rely on the voluntary principle for the support of all its operations. But when a doubt was expressed some three years ago, whether this practice had not been departed from in some few instances, the Committee resolved that a circular should be sent to every missionary, inquiring whether any of the society's schools had been aided by grants from colonial governments. They found from the replies to this circular that in no instance but the Benevolent Institution, Calcutta, on other grounds an exceptional case, had any such grants been received during the previous ten years, the period to which the inquiry was limited.

3. On a further consideration of this important subject, the Committee deemed it desirable to place on record, in an explicit form, their views upon it, and for that purpose passed, in January, 1852, the following resolution:—

“That in the opinion of this Committee, it is inex-

pedient, and inconsistent with our principles to accept government or other state grants for religious purposes, the purposes of religious education included. It is therefore an instruction by this Committee to our brethren, that, in all their arrangements they act on this principle, as the only one which can commend their efforts in the department of education to the sympathy and support of our churches.”

4. The recent despatch from the directors of the East India Company to the government of India, on the subject of extending education in that country, has led the Committee to resume their deliberations on the whole question. The great importance of that despatch has led the Committee to give to it their most serious consideration; and they lose no time in communicating to you the result at which they have arrived.

5. The scheme put forth in the despatch is so far in advance of anything which has emanated from the Indian government, that it may fairly be regarded as a proof of their present enlightened policy, and their desire to promote the social and political advancement of the people.

6. But while the Committee are desirous to do justice to the merits of this measure of the Indian government, they do not forget that the education to be promoted by it is wholly *secular*. The education which the society aims to impart is *religious*. They have therefore carefully considered those clauses of the despatch which contemplate “grants in aid” to “institutions under the superintendence of different religious bodies and missionary societies,” and as the result of that consideration they feel bound to adhere to the resolution of January, 1852, and consequently, as the executive of the Baptist Missionary Society, they can neither accept nor administer such grants.

7. The Committee are, however, fully aware that a difference of opinion on this point exists, not only among themselves and their constituents, but also among their honoured missionary brethren. The decision of the Committee has not been, consequently, arrived at without anxiety. They regret that the funds of the society will not allow of any adequate support to education in India. They fear that not more than one in every twelve hundred of the population can be found in the mission schools existing there, and that not more than one in a hundred of the people can even read, though the desire for knowledge is intense and widely diffused. But they cannot depart from the principles here laid down.

8. At the same time, with a view to the guidance of those of our missionary brethren who do not concur in the views entertained by the Committee, I am directed by them to state, that while they would not feel justified in interfering with the exercise of their Christian liberty, by interdicting such missionaries from the acceptance of government grants for schools, it must be distinctly understood that, whenever, in the exercise of such discretion, the aid of government is sought, the schools so sustained cannot, in any instance, or under any circumstances, be considered the society's schools, or reported in its proceedings.

This letter having been read and approved by the Committee, will be regarded as their communication to you on the important question to which it relates. Trusting that in all your labors you may largely enjoy divine blessing.

I am, &c.

The Committee have not been unmindful of their pledge to use every effort to carry on the project to strengthen and enlarge the mission in India. They have recently appointed a sub-committee to consider and report on the best means of recalling the attention of the churches to the resolutions passed two

years ago, and more especially of those churches who have hitherto done little or nothing to aid them in this object. As soon as the Committee have finally decided on the course to be pursued, our friends will be sure to hear of it. Meanwhile, we hope that without any direct appeal being made to them, the churches who have not materially helped in this movement will do so without delay.

The meetings held during the past month have not been numerous, at least so far as we know. Mr. Trestrail and Mr. Makepeace have been the deputation to Oxford, Abingdon, Chipping, Norton, and Banbury, the latter going thence to Windsor, Staines, Wraysbury, and Datchet, in which latter places he was joined by Mr. Bowes; and Mr. Millard has visited Faringdon.

We regret to learn that the appearance of the outside of the *Juvenile Herald* does not satisfy our young friends. We confess that it does not satisfy us; but whether it shall have a coloured wrapper or not, is a question of *some shillings a thousand*; and as the wrapper is not a part of the book itself, but thrown away in the binding, we would kindly ask our young friends whether they care about the mere appearance of the *outside* month by month, when by using the present form so large a sum is saved to the society, and the cause which they themselves wish to promote. We shall feel particularly obliged if the teachers in our various schools will kindly explain this matter to the children, for we are sure if they will do so, the children have enough of good sense and good feeling to say, we don't care about the outside if the *inside* be good, especially as a large sum is saved every month to the mission.

ARE YOU A LADY?

From the New York Evangelist.

The term lady is an abbreviation of the Saxon word "Loefday," which means bread-giver. The "lady of the manor" was accustomed once a week to move among the poor as an alms-giver, enriching their tables, and bearing away the poor man's smile. She moved in queenly beauty, and to her queenly robe clung the children of the lowly, looking at her as if their little eyes could never be satisfied with seeing.

Their little hearts could never utter
How well they loved her bread and butter.

But they loved her smiling face more. They needed not that any tell them how priceless is a smile. It was May-day with them whenever she came among them with smiles and bread, and it was always May-day with her, for the smiling poor loved her, and crowned her queen of all the year.

Reader, are you a lady? Are you a queen among the poor? Do the children of the poor put a crown on your head? Do they make your hair gleam with gems, or is it burning with diamonds that the fingers of the poor never set there? Do the poor man's children cling to your gown, and find a protecting shadow in its folds?

Do you wear a robe that "dirty little fingers" have never touched? Or is it pure and snowy with the touch of unwashed poverty?

Oh! there are garments that in the eye of God are very white, because the soiled, tear-stained cheeks of crying, starving children have pressed them. There are pocket handkerchiefs that in the eye of God are of great price. The practised eye of the woman of the world says they cost neither ten nor a hundred dollars, and are not fit for a lady to carry, but God says they adorn the hands that carry them—they are a precious ornament, and fit for the hand of a

queen on her throne, because they have wiped away the tears of those who sigh and cry in the home of want.

Let me ask every lady, Do you carry such a pocket handkerchief?

Do you wear a dress that in the eye of God is a robe of light, because the weary, aching little heads of hungry children have leaned against it?

Are your jewels the grateful hearts of the poor? If they are, then they will never lose their lustre, but shine brighter and brighter the longer you wear them. I would rather have one grateful tear from a famished child I had fed, than all the jewels that glisten on a queen's brow. I would rather carry light and joy to one desolate home, than call the kingdoms of the world my own.

They are all God's poor—they are *my* poor.

Let me turn aside from the crowded paths of the world, where only the rich and the gay, and the pleasure-seekers walk, and let me take the dark and unalluring path that leads to the door of the poor man's home.

It's a cold winter. Warm fires, warm dinners, and warm hearts must protect us all from the snow and the cold. The poor are shivering over their last stick—weeping over their last crust—sighing for one warm heart to give them a blessing. Woman, sitting in a rich house—on a rich carpet—in a rich chair—by a rich coal grate—sitting there luxuriously dressed—clothed in the "purple, and fine linen" of life, let a thought of God's suffering poor start you.

The richest gifts of life warm your head and adorn your body. God has given you a bright cup to drink. 'Tis well—drink it—you may.

But let the poor man's children gather round—let them press their lips to the cup—let them share with you life's sweet draughts.

God is good to you and you must say,

As sweetly falls his love on me,
I'll let it fall on all.

You are sitting by your warm fire, and I see you looking with a taste-illuminated eye at a bouquet of house-plant flowers standing on your sideboard. It is a dollar bouquet. You paid that for it yesterday. It's all right enough. God made the flowers—He gave you money, and you may buy them, but oh! buy something for the poor. Whenever you spend a dollar for yourself spend one for the poor, and children shall gather round a bright fire, and laugh merrily over their warm clothes, and warm meal. If you have a woman's heart in you it will make it thrill with joy to know that the pangs of hunger are quelled—that wet eyes are dry again—that sad little faces smile again—that pale, thin cheeks are plump and rosy again with health.

But give something more than your money—give yourself, and God will love you, and his poor will love you.

You are sitting in a downy chair, close to your bright, warm fire—the air is full of snow, and the wind blows cold. It's a long way to that suffering house—if you go, you must walk. How can you? Your snug parlor is so pleasant—the pleasant heat of your fire steals upon you so deliciously, and then the sky is so cloudy, and the wind is so cold.

Oh! it's a keen winter—how can you go? You can. Let the love of the poor, and the poor man's God sustain you.

Draw away from your fire—get up—put on your overshoes—draw on the long over-stockings—wrap around you the ample and well-wadded cloak—pin snugly around you that warm hood—put on your furs—take off that gold brooch (it may be lost in the snow) and hang on your arm a basket of delicacies

for the sick, and palatable food for the hungry. With a woman's heart—a woman's energy—a woman's will, make your way through the snow. Your cheek shall have a ruddier tint—your eye shall have a brighter light—your heart shall have a brighter blessing.

From the N. Y. Journal of Commerce.

THOMAS PAINE.

In a recent article on the celebration of Tom Paine's Birth-day, we alluded to Grant Thorburn as a living witness of his dissolute and disgusting habits. A late *New York Observer* contains a letter from Mr. Thorburn, written on his 83rd birth-day, February 18th, and dated at Winsted, Conn., where he expects to pass his remaining days. The letter is devoted chiefly to reminiscences of Tom Paine. We make the following extracts, which we hope will be read at the next and every subsequent anniversary of the infidel debauchee.

As there is but a step between me and death, I owe it to generations yet to come, to tell what I saw and heard of THOMAS PAINE. Perhaps there lives not a man on earth, who traced him from his cradle to his grave, except myself. Carver and I were fellow-labourers in the same shop. Paine and Carver were born in the same town in England. Paine and I boarded with Carver. I often heard Carver, his wife, and Paine, as we four sat by the fire on a winter night, rehearse the items of his life. I think he was the worst member of the body politic I ever met in all my journey through life. He married a respectable lady, who died eleven months thereafter, in consequence of brutal treatment. He then married a daughter of the Collector of the Port of Lewis; after three years she obtained a divorce for like treatment.

In 1773, while he held an office in the Custom House, (given him by his father-in-law,) he was detected in taking bribes from the smugglers, and fled to America. He was made Secretary to the Private Committee of Congress, and took an oath of office to keep their secrets. He broke this oath by divulging the project of a secret mission to the Court of France by Silas Dean. He was dismissed with disgrace. (See the Journal of Congress in 1774 or 5.) This treachery was the cause of much trouble in Congress, and in the Court of Louis XVI.

We next find him in Paris, helping Robespierre in his labours of love to establish freedom of the press, and the right of speech, by means of the guillotine. He quarrelled with Robbie, and was chucked for guillotine. God, willing to make the wrath of Paine to praise Him, sent an angel who delivered him out of prison. (For particulars of this miracle, see the Life of Thorburn, 101st page.)

In 1801, when King Thomas the First ascended the throne of his kingdom, he instantly despatched a national frigate to convey to our shores the venerated Thomas Paine. He arrived early in the year 1802. I spoke with him at the City Hotel, Bowery, a few hours after his arrival. He found letters urging him on to Washington, then four days' journey. He started next morning. At Georgetown a messenger was sent forward to announce his approach; a feast was got ready, and all those of like thinking were invited. Paine entered late, his shirt unwashed, his beard unshorn, and reeling like a drunken man. A look of consternation shone forth from every face; mirth ceased; one by one they went out, leaving Paine alone on his chair fast asleep. Next day he received letters and instructions to return to New York.

When Aaron Burr returned from Europe, whither

he had fled after his duel with Hamilton, he kept his office in Nassau Street, near my seed store. From him I received the account above stated.

Paine, on his return, was unable to find lodgings; Carver took him in for old acquaintance sake. He died at Greenwich, of delirium tremens, in 1809.

THE POWER OF PRAYER.

The efficacy of prayer, to bring light and wisdom into the mind, peace into the conscience, submission into the will, and purity into the affections; to keep our garments clean, our armour bright, and our hearts joyful; to make us strong for the conflict, for service, or for suffering; to obtain sufficiency for our place and work, and a blessing on our endeavours; to secure peace with our enemies, or protection against them; to carry every point that is truly good for us; to bring down blessings on our families, friends, and country; to procure peace and prosperity to the Church, the conversion of sinners, and the spread of the gospel; and for all things which we can desire or conceive;—must be allowed by every man who reverences the Scriptures, or knows what it is "to talk with God." Did men speculate and dispute less, and pray more, their souls would be "like a watered garden," fruitful, joyful, beautiful and fragrant. Prayer is the first breath of divine life; it is the pulse of the believing soul, the best criterion of health or sickness, vigour or debility. By prayer we "draw water with joy from the wells of salvation; by prayer faith puts forth its energy in apprehending the promised blessings, and receiving from the Redeemer's fulness; in leaning on his Almighty arm, and making "his name our strong tower;" and in overcoming the world, the flesh and the devil. All other means of grace are made effectual by prayer; every doctrine and instruction produces its effect in proportion as this is attended to; every grace revives or languishes according to the same rule. Our grand conflict with Satan and our own hearts is about prayer; the sinner feels less reluctance, and meets with less resistance, in all other means of grace, than in retiring to "pour out his heart" secretly before God; and the believer will find his chief difficulty to consist in continuing instant and fervent in this spiritual exercise. If he succeed here all else will eventually give place before him, and turn out to his benefit and comfort.—*Rev. T. Scott.*

From Evangelical Christendom.

PROTESTANT INNER MISSION IN GARD.

I shall now return to religious news which ought to obtain a place in our correspondence. An Inner Mission, similar to what you call *Home Mission*, has just been established in the department of Gard. It is a work which may become of much importance, if it is conducted in a pious and faithful spirit.

The department of Gard is that part of France which contains the largest number of Protestants.—The city of *Nismes*, the capital of this province, is in some sort the metropolis of French Protestantism. There, also, are the *Cevennes*, Alpine cantons, celebrated for the heroic resistance of the Huguenots against the persecutions of Louis XIV. There, also, the *Desert* assemblies were never given up, not even in the darkest days, and the children of Calvin sealed their faith with their blood, until they conquered and obtained religious liberty. But a great laxity has crept in among them since the revolution of 1789, and all the efforts of the pastors have not succeeded in awakening in recent generations the ardent piety

of their fathers. This state of things excited the solicitude of several friends of the Gospel, and they resolved to employ *itinerant* preachers, chosen from among the pastors of the National Church, who are to go at certain intervals and visit the flocks successively; preaching to them the Word of Life and promoting works conformable to the will of God.

The following are the chief regulations which are to govern this institution: "The *Inner Mission* has for its aim the awakening and development of piety and Christian life. It acts with the approbation of the pastors and the ecclesiastical authorities. It solicits and accepts the concurrence of all the pastors and ministers of the Reformed Church of France, and that of all Protestant laymen, who, animated by a spirit of faith and love, desire to labour for the spiritual advancement of their brethren. The Pastoral Conference (of Gard) which has established the *Inner Mission*, directs it by a Central Committee.— This committee, composed of six pastors and three laymen, is chosen by the ballot of the Conference itself. A public meeting of the *Inner Mission* will be held every year. The labors of the Mission are of a twofold nature, *direct* and *indirect*. . . . In the first category are placed special preachings, conferences, Sabbath schools, ordinary instructions to the catechumens, religious associations of young people, domiciliary visits to the members of the Church, popular libraries, and religious publications. In the second category are reformatory asylums, the superintendence exercised over young apprentices and workmen, mutual aid societies, orphan refuges, hospitals, aged pilgrim asylums, and other benevolent institutions, approved of by the Conference."

The *Inner Mission*, as you know, embraces a great number of objects; it aims at producing a regeneration, at once religious and moral, among the Churches. The Central Committee has been nominated, and immediately afterwards this Committee designated *twenty pastors*, who are to visit the most important Protestant parishes of Gard, informing them of the establishment of the *Inner Mission*. It remains to be seen what will be the results of this great enterprise. Its intentions are undoubtedly good. But it is easier to write good projects on paper than to accomplish them.

From News of the Churches.

OLD CALABAR.

The Committee on Foreign Missions of the United Presbyterian Church have decided the question proposed by their missionaries in Old Calabar as to the admission of slave-owners to church-fellowship. In Calabar there is no free labouring population; all are either masters or slaves, and the latter are manifold more numerous than the former. There is no manumission; a freeman may become a slave, but not *vice versa*; once a slave always a slave. He may change his master, but not his state. The law gives the master absolute power over his slave; he may use him, abuse him, kill him, or dispose of him in any way. The law, at the same time, holds the master responsible for any crime which his slave may commit against other members of the community. The master, it is true, does not often push his cruelties to the utmost verge of his power. He supports his slaves if resident in his house, or wholly occupied in his service; when not so occupied, they provide for themselves, and pay their masters a portion of their gains. The theory is in practice so much modified, that a slave may himself be a slave-owner, and may become richer than his master. With all

this modification, however, the real relation of the two classes of the community is that of master and slave. In these circumstances, the missionaries hesitated what course to adopt with reference to slave-owners respecting baptism. The owner might give to other masters, but could not free his slaves; so long as they remained with him they were held to be his slaves, and he was held responsible for their crimes; he must either have slaves or no servants at all. The deliverance of the Committee runs thus:—

"As by the law and custom of Calabar, it appears that legal manumission is at present impracticable, and as the missionaries would not be justified in excluding from the fellowship of the church any that give satisfactory evidence of conversion, and that are willing to obey the laws of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Committee agree to state that, in accordance with the views above expressed, and guided by the resolutions of the Synod, they are of opinion that, in the present condition of society at Calabar, persons holding slaves may be admitted into church-fellowship on their signing such a declaration as the following:—

"DECLARATION.

"Believing that all men are equal in the sight of God, and that under the gospel there is in Christ Jesus neither bond nor free, I hereby, as a servant of Christ, bound to obey the commands of God's Word, promise in the sight of the great God, my divine Master, that I shall regard those persons placed under my care, as *servants*, not as *property*; that I shall give them what is just and equal for their work; that I shall encourage them to obtain education for themselves and their children, and to attend on such means of religious instruction as the church may be able to afford them; that I shall endeavor, as far as I can, to secure the making of the laws to promote personal freedom; that, as soon as it can be done, I shall legally set free all those under my care; and that, in the meantime, I shall treat them with kindness and equity, it being my constant aim to act upon the command of the Lord Jesus Christ, to do unto others as I should wish them to do unto me.

"The Committee regard this arrangement as only temporary in its nature, and as applicable solely to a slave-holding country into which the gospel has been newly introduced, and where circumstances stand in the way of legal manumission; for when, in the providence and by the blessing of God, the majority of freemen shall have been brought under the influence of Christian truth, the country having reached the second of the two states pointed out in the preceding paper, the legal abolition of slavery should, as a matter of duty, take place. It results from the principles laid down, that if Christians being the majority, and having thus the power of legislation, shall decline to abolish slavery, or if they shall, when manumission becomes legally practicable, deny this boon to their slaves, it will then clearly be the duty of the office-bearers of the church to exclude from the fellowship those who refuse to put an end to this evil and unchristian thing."

THE CHRISTIAN'S LIGHT.

The Christian is called a "light," not lightning. In order to act with effect on others, he must walk in the Spirit, and thus become the image of goodness; he must be so akin to God and so filled with his dispositions, that he shall seem to surround himself with hallowed atmosphere. It is folly to endeavour to make ourselves shine before we are luminous. If

the sun without its beams should talk to the planets and urge with them till the final day, it would not make them shine; there must be light in the sun itself, and then they will shine of course. And this, my brethren, is what God intends for you all. It is the great idea of his gospel, and the work of his Spirit, to make you "lights in the world." His greatest joy is to give you a character, to beautify your example, to exalt your principles, and make you each the depository of his own almighty grace. But in order to this, something is necessary on your part—a full surrender of your mind to duty and to God and a perpetual desire of this spiritual intimacy. Having this, having a participation thus of the goodness of God, you will as naturally communicate good as the sun communicates his beams.—*Dr. Bushnell.*

RECEPTION OF BURNS IN BOSTON.

SPEECH OF DR. KIRK.

Rev. Dr. Kirk was then introduced who spoke briefly in his usually effective style, showing how deeply his feelings were enlisted in the event which had caused the meeting of this evening. He said we have to-night a combined view; the Southern side and the Northern side. We have the fact that we recognize under that black skin a man; and that they in the South recognise only a chattel; and that makes a vast difference between the South and the North.

The question may be asked, for what do you come here to-night? Is it to fan a feeling of opposition to the South, and to stir up fanaticism? No, but we come to assert that a black man is a man. (Cries of good, and cheers.)

Some one in the audience said, that was said long ago. Yes, said Mr. Kirk, it was, and I wish it had been acted upon. The effect of Southern laws was then commented on. The time has come he said, when the South should know what we think of them. He did not think blustering, spluttering or bravado would do any good. He had prayed to God that we might have nothing but calm, clear vision and a little of the fire that filled the heart of Otis in Faneuil Hall. (Applause.) The Northern view of slavery is that a man is a man for a' that. He thought the negro a man, every inch of him. Under the skin, it is all human. If that doctrine is believed there will be many changes, and there will have to be, in the Senate of the U. States, the passage of an obliteration law. Yes, Burns is a man, and more of a man than I thought he was. Burns has talked to my heart to-night, like a man. To be sure, he did use bad grammar; but whose fault was that! I think he has the true oratorical ring in him, like that of some of the Indian orators. If he had been in the North all his life, he would not have used so bad grammar. For one, he bowed to the Constitution of the United States; but the fact is, Anthony Burns is a man for all that; the fact is, it is wrong to incarcerate him except for crime. There is a wrong somewhere. It is entirely proper that the citizens of Boston, who witnessed the scenes of last summer, should come here to say that they recognized him who has been vilified, as a man. We have not come to make a lion of him. We have only met to congratulate him. We expect that he will retire to his place in the church, and like a modest man that he is, occupy the station for which he may be fitted.

This meeting is but one of a series, in a course of action. Whom is this meeting to affect? The good men of the South. It may help them to see that there is not mere infidelity at work; there is Christianity at work too. They will see that the Christianity of

the North is in positive direct antagonism to the slavery of the South. (Applause.)

'The times of this ignorance God winked at.' It will not do for our Southern brethren to apologize for Slavery and justify it unless they will justify polygamy too. And God is putting that along side of them to try them.

This meeting will have some effect on the bad men of the South too. Men who will put upon the auction block and then laugh at and jeer a man because he loves freedom, are bad men. They can be made to feel, and we shall try in our way to make them feel. (Applause.) There is a tone of indignation which can affect them; and when they come to the North, they must not be flattered and caressed, but men must go round them. (Applause.)

When the Nebraska bill was passed, he said that for one, he was going to act. He was now ashamed of his country, and he would endeavor to purify it from its guilt in connection with Slavery.

The meeting was closed by the whole audience uniting in singing the doxology, 'Praise God, &c.'

From News of the Churches.

EXPERIMENTS IN BOOK-HAWKING.

Among many details, to which attention has lately been directed, in connection with the condition of the masses, especially in rural districts, that of the books, and papers usually read by them has had a place. All persons conversant with the subject have come to the conclusion that the materials for reading furnished to our rural labourers have commonly been of the coarsest and worst description, and that it would be a source of infinite blessing, under God, were effectual measures taken to supply them with a wholesome, interesting, and edifying literature.

For this purpose the plan of book-hawking has been devised. It has been in operation in some districts in England,—*e. g.*, Warwickshire and Hampshire,—in the former, under the auspices of Lord Lyttleton and others, in the latter, of a society of which the Rev. G. H. Sumner is secretary. It so happens, that the paper which has bestowed most attention on the subject is the Tractarian *Guardian*, a proof that the Puseyites, like their cousins the Papists, are wise in their generation in devising means for spreading their views, but not to be taken, we trust, as any evidence that activity in this department is confined to the Tractarian party. Indeed, we have good cause to know that this is far from being the case. In Scotland the subject is under the careful and earnest consideration of some of the best friends of the evangelical cause, who are in the midst of very effective measures to work the scheme.

It may be useful to parties interested in the work to extract a few passages giving information of the plans and experience of those who have been some time in the field. Mr. Sumner, secretary of the Winchester scheme, has written an account of it to the *Guardian*.

The following are the rules of the society:—

"1. That a general committee be formed of all donors of £1, and annual subscribers of 5s., to meet when called together by a requisition of five members.

"2. That the sub-committee, appointed Feb. 1853, have power to make additions to their body, and to fill up vacancies, subject to the approval of the archdeacon of Winchester.

"3. That Bibles, prayer and other books, and tracts from various sources, together with a stock of appropriate ornaments for cottage walls, shall be

supplied by the sub-committee to the book-hawker for sale.

"4. That directions be given to the book-hawker not to sell any book in a parish if disapproved of by the clergyman of the parish."

"We employ one hawker whose time is devoted exclusively to going from house to house with his pack, and offering for sale Bibles, prayer-books, church-services books, both of a religious and secular character, and prints. His wages are one guinea a week. He finds his own board and lodging, but we pay his travelling expenses. No percentage is allowed on his sales, as it has been found practically that such a plan is an inducement to him to neglect the poorer districts and lone cottages, and confine his attention principally to selling books of a more expensive kind. A general supervision over the selection of books is exercised by the sub-committee. The hawker keeps a diary, in which his day's work is entered. As he is not under his master's eye some such check is necessary.

"The hawker carries with him a licence. The price of this is four pounds. It is made out from August to August, and is not issued for a less time than a year. A hawker, therefore, commencing in July, would pay four pounds for a licence which would only last him a month. The licence is made out in my own name, and the hawker considered to be my servant. This is done to obviate the necessity of purchasing a fresh licence in case of a change of hawker.

"During the first ten months our hawker sold books and prints to the amount of very nearly £150. The profit on this, and on about twenty pounds' worth sold by myself, amounted to upwards of £40. Our expenses during the same time being about £78, it follows that the agency was carried on by drawing upon subscribers and donations to the amount of about £38. There were, however, many expenses incidental to the commencement of the undertaking, and I should say that with a rigid economy the necessary expenses would amount to about £70 or £75 yearly. I should not venture to commence the scheme with a less sum than this in hand.

"It is found that about two visits yearly to the same place are sufficient, and our experience has shown us that the labours of the most zealous clergyman do not make the hawker's visits useless. For it is not only Bibles and prayer-books that he sells, but he brings to the cottager's own door a variety of books from many publishers. No clergyman, however desirous he might be to supply his parishioners with suitable books, could offer them so large a choice as the hawker is able to do. One of the most important duties of the secretary is to be constantly adding new books to his stock. For this purpose it is absolutely essential that he should have *carte-blanche*. The purchasers from the hawker are most critical, and complaints are sure to be heard if the list of books is stereotyped."

THE BIBLE.

How comes it that this little volume, composed by humble men in a rude age, when art and science were but in their childhood, has exerted more influence on the human mind and on the social system, than all other books put together? Whence comes it that this book has achieved such marvellous changes in the opinions of mankind, has banished idol-worship—has abolished infanticide—has put down polygamy and divorce—exalted the condition of woman—raised the standard of public morality—created for families that blessed thing, a Christian home—and

caused its other triumph by causing benevolent institutions (open and expansive), to spring up as with the wand of enchantment? What sort of a book is this, that even the wind and waves of human passions obey it? What other engine of social improvement has operated so long, and yet lost none of its virtue? Since it appeared, many boasted plans of amelioration have been tried and failed; many codes of jurisprudence have arisen, and run their course and expired. Empire after empire has been launched on the tide of time, and gone down, leaving no trace on the waters. But this book is still going about doing good—leavening society with its holy principles—cheering the sorrowful with its consolation—strengthening the tempted—encouraging the penitent—calming the troubled spirit—and smoothing the pillow of death. Can such a book be the offspring of human genius? Does not the vastness of its effects demonstrate the excellency of the power to be of God?—*Dr. M' Cullough.*

From Mr Williams.

CHANGES IN CHINA.

Instead of the half dozen whom Dr. Morrison assembled in his study that he might discourse to them of the things of the kingdom of heaven, there are now daily religious services at Hongkong and all the open cities, and a score or more in all, upon the Sabbath, where thousands hear something of Jesus Christ. The aids in learning the language have been enlarged, until something is possessed in every dialect to guide and assist the learner; and the books for teaching geographical, astronomical, physiological, and historical truth, as well as religious, have increased many fold. Churches have been erected where nothing but heathenish temples once attracted worshippers. Converts are not so numerous as we wish; but the signs of interest daily increase. In the region around Amoy these are so striking, indeed, that we now look for great triumphs of redeeming love. A million of Testaments are in progress of printing and circulation; and other parts of the Scriptures will likewise be multiplied. Finally, the whole mass of Chinese mind is stirred up by a body of insurgents, of whom one prominent characteristic is their rejection of idolatrous worship for the worship of the true God. Whether their purpose of overthrowing the Manchu sway, and substituting therefor a native dynasty, be successful or not, their tenets and books have attracted the serious regard of all that is learned and influential in the empire, and will prepare the way for a purer statement of the doctrines of the cross, and identify change with Christianity.

CHRISTIAN DEVOTION.—When the Huguenots first settled at New Rochelle, twenty miles from New York, the only place of worship they could attend was in that city. After working hard all the week till Saturday night, they spent the night in trudging on foot to the city, where they attended worship twice on the sabbath, and then walked home to be ready for work in the morning; and yet in spite of these hardships, they wrote to France expressing gratitude for the great privileges they enjoyed.

CATHOLICISM.—According to the Catholic Directory for 1855, there are in the United States 7 archbishops, 33 bishops, 1,704 priests, and 1,814 churches, with an estimated Catholic population of 1,838,500. There was an increase during 1854 of two bishops, 129 priests, and 112 churches.

Views and Doings of Individuals.

For the Gospel Tribune.

PRAYER.

BY THE FOREST BARD.

'Tis sweet the knee in prayer to bend,
'Tis sweet an hour with God to spend,
The voice of prayer and praise to blend,
And bow before the throne.

The soul will find this converse sweet,
When from life's scenes it would retreat,
And prostrate fall before the feet,
Of the I Am unknown.

Oh what so high the soul can raise,
As prayer's calm voice combined with praise,
When up to heaven the soul may gaze,
And converse hold above.

To make our wants and wishes known,
To supplicate th' Eternal's throne,
Till faith will make our wants his own,
For he's a God of love.

Naught can the soul so sweetly calm,
As talking with the great I Am,
It more than Gilead's precious balm,
The sinking soul sustains.

When up to Christ our sighs have sped,
Like Mary's ointment on His head,
Or tears to wash his feet she shed,
His benediction gains.

When'er the soul's in sorrow sunk,
Or by the wine of woe made drunk,
Or scathed by misery's touch hath shrunk,
Oh let it flee to prayer!

'Twill quickly quell tumultuous thought,
A cure it gives untried, unbought,
With heavenly influences 'tis fraught
To banish our despair.

Or doth ecstatic pleasure roll,
Or joy that knows of no control,
Or pleasure penetrate the soul,
To prayer resort again.
It moderates our passions' tide,
Subdues our joy, o'ercomes our pride,
Bids wrath and vanity subside,
And all our thoughts restrains.

Do evil thoughts within us rise,
Pale envy with her griffin eyes,
Or vice in masquerade disguise,
To tempt us to the wrong?
Again to prayer let us resort,
Our feeble faith it will support,
It renders fruitless each effort,
Of sin—and makes us strong.

Doth grief or woe assume their part,
To open the floodgates of the heart,
Despite of consolation's art,
And through the bosom roll?
In secret prayer then let us seek,
Through his still voice to God we'll speak,
Then like true friendship kind and meek,
'Twill sooth the woe-sick soul.

No reverend knee did ever bend,
Nor earnest, sacred prayer ascend,
To which he had no ear to lend,
To listen to our sigh.

Religion speaks through this sweet voice,
The system is our Maker's choice,
To hear its plaint he doth rejoice,
And to our wants draws nigh.

'Twill shield us from temptation's lure,
Our souls of sin's deep wounds 'twill cure.

And room for us in heav'n make sure,

If faithfully we pray.

Through death's lone valley, dark and dim,
Our little vessel's sails 'twill trim,
And safely guides our souls to him,
Who'll be our Master there.

Then let us ever bear in mind,
That thus a daysman we can find,
A mediator still inclined,

Assistance still to spare.
'To Him, oh let us oft draw nigh,
To him for succour let us fly,
His intercession ask on high,
And sacrifice in prayer.

Aurora, April, 1855.

For the Gospel Tribune.

THE DEBATE ON COMMUNION BETWEEN REV. MESSRS. DUNCAN AND BALL.

Not having been present at the debate, I have to take it as reported in the *Christian Messenger*, where we are told, "the Rev. Mr. Duncan opened the debate, and his statements went to show that immersed believers (or Baptists) only could fulfil the duties of the commission." The first and most important duty enjoined in the commission is to preach the Gospel. Cannot the unimmersed discharge this important duty? The article in the *Messenger*, following the Report, is a notice of the late Dr. Beaumont, (Methodist,) in which the Doctor is eulogized as "an eminent minister," (of the Gospel of Christ, I presume;) and amongst many other fine things spoken of Dr. B.; we are assured that he *well deserved* to have worn the title of D. D. He was, we are informed, too, the son of a *faithful* Methodist Minister. In the same article, other two celebrated names are quoted, viz.: Drs. Morrison and Milne, of whom it is said, "two men to whom India and the Christian world stand more indebted, than perhaps to any other men who have ever lived." Perhaps Mr. Duncan would not endorse what is here said of these illustrious men, for neither of them was immersed. To invite such men to sit down at the table of the Lord, would, in his estimation, be to subvert the commission, because they "rejected and despised the teachings and example of the Son of God and his apostles." Strong language this! Beaumont, the *eminent minister*, and his father, the *faithful minister*, and the celebrated Morrison and Milne, to whom India and the Christian world stand so deeply indebted, must be viewed after all as *subverters* of the commission—*rejectors* and *despisers* of the teaching and example of the Son of God! Who on reading this can help thinking of the awful passage, "He that *despised* Moses' law died without mercy; of how much sorer punishment shall they be thought worthy," &c. But the Beaumonts, Morrison, and Milne, are not the only "eminent," "the faithful," but unimmersed ministers to whom the Christian world is deeply indebted; and Mr. Duncan knows it: he ought therefore to have been more sparing of his gall-dipt epithets, because they are certainly only partially applicable to the unimmersed. There are thousands of them concerning whom

stringent Close Baptist says, "It were to be wished that many of our own people (Baptists) were like them."

Mr. Duncan anticipates the question, "Do you unchurch all the Pedobaptist Ministers?" and he ventures unhesitatingly to answer in the affirmative. The fact, he says, that Pedobaptists have subverted the commission, proves that they actually are unchurched!! I pretend not to quote him verbatim; but sure I am I do not misrepresent him. I think I see Mr. Duncan complacently surveying his terms, set in the syllogistical form, and admiring the cogency of his conclusion, thus,—

None who reverse the order and change the subjects and mode of baptism can have a place in the Church of Christ; but all Pedobaptists reverse the order and change the subjects and mode of baptism.

Therefore no Pedobaptists can be in the Church of Christ!

But is it possible that Mr. Duncan can have arrived at the conclusion to which this syllogism inevitably leads?

While we have in view certain Pedobaptists of a cold, suspicious character, whose pretensions to genuine piety are rather unprominent, and are told these are the men who have reversed the order, &c., and have therefore no place in the Church of Christ, we may feel strongly inclined to question the propriety of communing with them. But when we have in our eye, men, whose ardent piety and devotedness place them far above suspicion—and many such there have been, and are—and should any Baptist point to these and say,—Behold the men who, having reversed the order and changed the subjects and mode of baptism, have therefore no place in the Church of Christ; we should not hesitate to spurn the assumption, and could only view it as betraying the grossest ignorance of the nature of the religion of Christ. Did Mr. Duncan never, in all his travels through the world, nor in his intercourse with Christian men, meet with a Pedobaptist of whom he would have hardly dared to say, he has no place in the Church of Christ? Could he not at least call to his recollection the remains of some who were known as Pedobaptists—subverters of the authority (according to him) of a portion of the word of God, to whom it would look rather unseemly to say, thou hast no place in the Church of Christ? Could Mr. Duncan address himself even to Watts, one of the sweetest singers of the Christian Israel, and say, Isaac, thou art a subverter, a rejector, a despiser &c.; thou canst therefore have neither part nor lot in our Zion; thou enterest not in by the door; thou art therefore a thief and a robber? Watts was only one of thousands that could be named who lived the life of faith, and "who being dead yet speak."

But am I right in supposing that Mr. D. really means to deny that any Pedobaptists can have a place in the Church of Christ? Certainly his reporter makes him speak so. If this be his opinion, it may

be granted, Mr. D. is at least a consistent close-communicationist; and we solemnly assure him that he has only to prove his position to make us as close as he would wish us to be; but, in the meantime, we tell him that what he views as proof, falls far short in our estimation.

The strong conviction we have, that many Pedobaptists are in the Church of Christ, and in equally close and endearing intimacy with him as even *Regular* Baptists, makes us feel very confident in our position. Though there were no other argument that could be brought to bear, the very supposition that God would forbid us to commune with those with whom he evidently communes himself, appears too abhorrent both to reason and revelation for us to entertain it a moment.

We will not pretend to defend everything that Mr. Ball may have advanced. His reference to the 500, whether they were baptized or not, might have well been spared, for he had no need of such assistance.

Mr. Duncan calls it an inference from a mere *supposition*, and says it is a *specimen of open-communication logic*.

We beg leave, however, to tell him, that we have something else than *mere suppositions* to draw our inferences from. And first we ask him, if it be not a positive and glaring fact that the Saviour enjoined on his disciples the duties of love and forbearance? and also, that he prayed earnestly that they might *all be one*, that the world might be constrained to believe? He knows that these are not *mere suppositions*. The inferences which we draw from these are, 1st, that the union prayed for, and the love enjoined, must be *exhibited* to the view of the world, otherwise it could not be seen, and unseen it could not produce the desired effect. 2nd. We infer that the world will never be constrained to believe by the *exhibition* of repulsive principles and practice among the disciples of Christ. But here the question arises, are Pedobaptists disciples? If we ask Mr. Duncan, does he *undisciple* all Pedobaptists? He will of course answer, "the affirmative is proved by the fact, &c." If they are not in his church they are not his disciples; if not disciples they have, of course, no right to the privileges of disciples, and we repeat it, let him prove his position and the controversy is settled.

But secondly it is a glaring fact, and not a "*mere supposition*," that the duty of forbearance is often insisted on in the apostolic writings; from which we infer that differences of opinion among the disciples existed even then, but there is not one word in all these epistles to countenance divisions among the disciples, but the reverse. As to the nature of *their* differences it may suffice to know that it was such as not to affect their acceptance with God; and precisely such is the nature of the difference between us and Pedobaptists, as we firmly believe, but of course this will be questioned by Mr. Duncan: well, we say again, let him prove his position,—let him show that the error of Pedobaptists affects their acceptance with God, and his point is gained; persuaded as we are

that it does not, we naturally *infer* that as in primitive times Christians were enjoined to exercise charity and forbearance, and to maintain union notwithstanding differences of opinion about matters not affecting their acceptance with God; we infer, I say, that it is our duty to exercise charity and forbearance, and maintain union with pious Pedobaptists, convinced as we are that their error affects not their acceptance with God.

3rdly. It is not a *mere supposition*, but a fact proclaimed by a voice from the excellent glory, "that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation," (and in every *denomination* too,) he that feareth him and worketh righteousness, is accepted of him; from this we *infer* that for us to respect persons on grounds not sanctioned by him either by precept or example would, in the language of his apostle, be to withstand and tempt him: and what are we that we should do so?

4thly. It is not a "*mere supposition*" but an eternal verity that we are forbid to judge our brother whom God hath received, and are commanded to receive him on the very ground that God hath done so. Our very rational nature is appealed to as to the unseemliness of it in the question, "What hast thou to do to judge thy brother?"

5thly. It is not a *mere supposition* but an undeniable and pleasing fact that thousands of our Pedobaptist brethren are just as good Christians as ourselves, and equally high in the favour of their Lord; and we *infer* that it would therefore very ill become us to refuse to join with them to celebrate his dying love.

6thly. It is a fact, and not a "*mere supposition*" that even Close Baptists themselves set us the example of communing with pious Pedobaptists in every religious exercise except the supper; and if it be right and duty for them to do so, seeing neither the commission nor any other passage of Scripture that we know of makes the least distinction between communing with them in the Lord's Supper, and doing so in other religious exercises, we *infer* that we have no better warrant to refuse fellowship with them in the Lord's Supper, than we have to refuse it in other religious exercises. Indeed we feel inclined to the conclusion that the warrant to commune with pious Pedobaptists in celebrating the Supper is clearer, if there be a difference, than the warrant to commune with them in any other religious exercise.

Mr. D. asks, why this patronage to baptismal error? It is denied that exercising charity and forbearance towards erring brethren, amounts to patronising their errors: forbearance is not in all cases, nor necessarily in any case, patronising the errors or faults which are forborne. It is certain that errors did exist in the church in the days of the apostles, and some of them apparently of no very trivial importance, yet it is certain that in those very churches where the errors existed, charity and

forbearance are plainly and positively enjoined, and divisions prohibited: this is as obvious as it is that baptism should precede the supper.

Mr. D. takes credit to Close Communions for following the strict instruction of Christ? but where are the instructions which warrant them to exclude, or refuse, a single individual who loves him in sincerity? They cannot be found in the New Testament. The only instructions referred to by Mr. D. is the Commission, but in vain do we look to it for a warrant to exclude or reject a single genuine disciple from his church, still less a warrant to unchurch the great majority of his chosen people. It is true, if Pedobaptists were necessarily, as such, *despisers* of the instructions of Christ in regard to baptism, a warrant for their rejection would be easily found.

It is truly amazing to find such manifest ignorance of the principle of Open Communion as that displayed by Mr. D. in the following sentence, "Their mighty Pedobaptists—in, their preaching &c.—as a general rule treat the Baptists as an ignorant, fanatical and contracted sect; and their people with few exceptions, regard them in the same light." Now does Mr. D. really suppose that we are contending for a right to admit to our fellowship, a set of men such as he describes? If he does, he is sadly mistaken: for we are just as *close* against the admission of such characters as he could wish us to be; he may depend upon it we do not like to be held in contempt more than he, especially by those seeking our fellowship. To such characters seeking our fellowship we should reply, "friends, you know you hold us in contempt, you mind that sermon,—writing, exhortation, in which you so contemned, maltreated us; we cannot view you as true men, else you would not seek fellowship with us, without at least some acknowledgement." In short we defy Mr. D. to beat us in strictness in reference to such characters. We must however remind him that though Pedobaptists may be, "*as a general rule,*" yet they are not all of this stamp; there are "*exceptions,*" even Mr. D. admits there are "*a few!*" Well be it known to him, or any one else that happens to be as ill informed as he, that we Open Communions contend for a right to commune only with those Pedobaptists who form the "*few exceptions,*" no matter how *few*, (so far as our argument is concerned, I mean;) if there be *only one*, be assured, Mr. D., we contend for communion *ONLY with that one!* Moreover we do not anticipate that as "*a general rule*" we shall be troubled with applicants for admission to our fellowship from among the class that hold us in contempt; but from *the few* that have some respect for us, and if they have a little respect for us, and more for God and his Christ, they are welcome, until at least we be furnished with a better warrant for their rejection than we have.

The following is another display which we should not have expected from Mr. Duncan.

He says, "We are told (by Mr. Ball) that Christian character is the test of admission to the Lord's Supper.

Let us again consult the Divine word. In Acts xvi. 27, we have the character of a suicide; in the 27th verse he is under deep convictions; and in the 33rd verse he is baptized—that done, he is fit to become a member of the church of Christ, and entitled to sit down at the Lord's table."

Now does Mr. D. want us to receive this as proof that Christian character is not necessary as a test of admission to the Lord's supper? Verily he does, otherwise the quotation has no meaning: then we are stricter than he is, in a very important sense. We would rather have one unimmersed person in a Church *with* Christian character, than ten immersed persons *without* it. It is a matter of deep regret to find a REGULAR Baptist minister appealing to the new Testament for proof of such a dogma, a dogma which we had hoped was exploded throughout evangelical Christendom a century ago.

But admitting that Christian character is unnecessary as a test of admission to the Lord's Supper. This passage is surely badly selected as a proof of it. Does Mr. D. really believe that the jailor, when he was baptized and admitted to the Church, was destitute of Christian character? Then I repeat, it is surely matter of regret that a REGULAR BAPTIST minister should be found so much in the dark as to what constitutes Christian character. We are expressly told that the jailor believed, and it is impossible to read attentively the New Testament without being convinced that *faith* is there held to be the main ingredient in Christian character.

There is only one other matter to which I shall direct attention in the mean time: it is the question which he asks his opponent, did God ever reveal a *non-essential* command?

Whether Mr. Ball attempted a direct answer to the important question does not appear in the report; it is therefore uncertain whether he would have answered in the negative or the affirmative. It is, however, pretty certain from its connection with the context that in Mr. D's opinion the question could be answered *only in the negative*. It sounds somewhat as if he had said, I dare you, Mr. B. to say that ever God revealed a non-essential command. It would be useless to enter into the question whether God ever gave any command that was not essential; let it suffice to come at once to the very question at issue, viz: whether God's command "be baptized," as understood by Baptists, be essential or not; and however much Mr. D. may be surprised at it, I unhesitatingly answer the question in the negative: it is *not essential*; and I could quote not a few good regular baptists corroborating my view. In the meantime I merely refer to the article in the *Ch. Mess.* immediately following the Report, headed "Sheer Misrepresentation." The truth is, all the Baptists with whom I have ever been acquainted, regular or irregular, would have taken it as the most grievous slander, or affront, to have it even insinuated that they believed baptism to be essential to salvation. Such

insinuations they are not at the pains to answer: they repel them with contempt.

From the article alluded to, we learn that a Dr. Elliott had dared to say "according to Baptist teaching, one can't be a Christian till immersed by a Baptist; and he can't get into heaven without first being a Christian."

This is certainly no worse than to say that baptism is *essential* either to Christian character, or to divine acceptance; yet the editor of the *Watchman and Reflector* is evidently at a loss how to express his detestation of the calumny. Almost any Baptist would repel the statement of Dr. Elliott with disgust; perhaps the very pastor of the Vittoria Church would; yet here is Mr. D., an intelligent regular Baptist minister, asking a question from which, standing where it does, the following inferences are fairly deducible.

1. That Mr D. believes God never did reveal a *non-essential* command.

2. That as the command "be baptized" is God's, he (Mr. D.) believes that it is *essential*, and that too, in all possible circumstances. And by examining the context it will be easily perceived that he understands its observance, *by immersion*, to be essential to the existence of Christian character, and consequently to salvation.

In closing, I remark, there is in the discussions of the advocates of close-communication, whether written or verbal, a striking peculiarity observable. In general, they in the outset profess great respect and veneration for many Pedo-baptists, express high admiration of their Christian character and devotedness; but alas! before they get through, their confidence dwindles into suspicion, their admiration of excellence into uncharitable questioning of sincerity; it is even broadly insinuated that they may be viewed as contumacious schismatics, as persons in fundamental error. So much is this the case that I have long been convinced that the close-communication theory cannot be maintained without questioning the Christian character of Pedo-baptists. And considering the bright evidence of genuine Christian character afforded by thousands of them, that system which requires its being questioned, may fairly be viewed as carrying along with it its own refutation. Surely there must be something radically wrong about the system that requires to question the sincerity of such men as those in the short list already quoted in this article.

Z. F.

For the Gospel Tribune.

ARGUMENTS FOR OPEN COMMUNION.

BY THE LATE REV. MR. KINGHORN, NORWICH, ENGLAND.

It is pretty generally known by Baptists at least, that Mr. K. was the great opponent of Hall on terms of Communion, and wrote no less than three voluminous replies to Mr. H.; perhaps the most plausible of any that has appeared.

It is one striking peculiarity in all defences of close-communion, that Pedobaptists are held to be precisely in the same predicament as persons refusing to be baptized in apostolic times; hence the free use of such designations as *subverters, rejectors, despisers, &c.*, of the teaching and example of the Son of God. (See Report of Bloomsburg debate, Ch. Mess.) If indeed the assumption referred to were well grounded; if Pedobaptists were as inexcusable as persons refusing to be immersed in apostolic times, the epithets might be very applicable, and consequently the argument for close-communion would be irrefragible; but let good Mr. Kinghorn be heard on this important point, whose testimony must be allowed to be free of bias in favour of open communion. It may be remarked that probably the good man did not see that his admissions were so much in favour of open communion, for in his general reasoning he tries hard to make it out that to be unimmersed now is precisely the same as it was to be so in apostolic times.

Mr. Hall had remarked, that "to be unbaptised now, is, in a moral view, a very distinct thing, and involves very different consequences from being in that predicament in the times of the Apostles." In reference to this Mr. K. says, "Mr. Hall presents this to our notice, and offers it as an alternative, that we may either deny or affirm it, and, doubtless, thinks it a dilemma from which we cannot escape." Mr. Kinghorn does make his escape, and it deserves special notice how he does so. He proceeds as follows:—

"He who admits the permanency of baptism, who believes that he has been a subject of that rite in a valid form from his infancy, is *not in the situation of those who refused to obey the dictates of inspired men.* We differ from him, we acknowledge; but the nature of the difference is very distinct from what it would be if he denied the authority of the Apostles. For this reason, we (Close Communionists) treat him, not as a person who designedly opposes the dictates of the Apostles, but as a mistaken good man." Good! We (Open Communionists) want nothing better as far as relates to this point. But if Mr. H., or any one, should have asked the good man, why then do you not admit him to the supper? he would have replied, because the Apostles did not admit the unbaptised to the supper! forgetting that neither did the Apostle view them as *good men.*

Again, Mr. K., in defending himself from the charge of inconsistency in communing with the unbaptized in other Christian duties, while he refuses to do so at the Lord's table, pleads the cause of Open Communion to perfection. He says "The conduct of the Apostle in attending the temple-worship furnishes another case in our favour," (that is, in favour of partial fellowship.) Observe how good Mr. K. conducts the argument. He proceeds thus: "Peter and John went up to the temple at the hour of prayer" (Acts vii. 1.) They did not forsake the house of

prayer, whither they had been habituated to go, so long as they had the opportunity. The Apostle Paul many years afterwards went up to Jerusalem to worship (Acts xxiv. 11.) This is his defence for being found in the temple: and he contended that though, in the very way which the Jews called heresy, yet said he, so worship I the God of my fathers, the same God whom they worshipped: thus declaring that, *though he differed from them, yet since there was one great point of union, he acceded to their worship AS FAR AS HE COULD:* and his taking the vow of the Nazarite upon him, and being found in the temple for the purpose of fulfilling the commanded rites, part of which consisted in an offering made by the Jewish priests according to the law, was a proof that, *as far as he thought them right, he gave them such complete countenance, that he made use of their ministrations; and yet we know that his sentiments as a christian would necessarily prevent him from holding complete communion with that people."* Just as our principles as Baptists, prevent us from holding communion with Pedo-baptists, in their baptism of infants.

Now, what was the principle (according to Mr. K.) on which Paul joined in the devotional exercises of the Jews? "There was" (he says) "*one great point of union between him and them, and he acceded to their worship as far as he could.* But between us and many Pedo-baptists there is union on every point but one; why then should we not unite with them AS FAR AS WE CAN? Had it not been the fetters of his system, Mr. Kinghorn was as open as Mr. Hall. No doubt Mr. Hall and he are perfectly at one on the subject long ago, and we are strongly inclined to think it may safely be presumed that Mr. K. is as well convinced as Mr. H. that it is not the will of the King of heaven that a mere external rite should separate his disciples even though it be his own institution. Sacrifice was his institution, yet he says, I will have mercy and not sacrifice. So when the two come into competition, we believe he says I will have love and not baptism.

Z. F.

CONVOCAION OF THE BAPTISTS OF CANADA.

Two of the answers returned to the circular, proposing the convention which is now called to meet in Toronto on the 13th of June next, prove that it is possible to understand from the circular, that the convocation is intended to be exclusive in its character, a thought so far removed from the minds of the movers in this matter, that it was deemed quite unnecessary to make any direct reference to the subject. And it is still thought, that a comprehensive view of the circular must satisfy all that it aims simply at gathering together the scattered fragments of the Baptist denomination, such as may wish to proceed on the old basis, of leaving each minister and each church, and each member of every church, at perfect liberty to act, not only on the communion question, but on every other question precisely as to them may seem in the most perfect harmony with the holy standards of Divine Truth—nothing to be demanded of any one, save this necessary thing, that

none be found guilty of taking a liberty of any kind, that shall render questionable the genuineness of his personal religion. This Christian liberty the "Regular Baptists" will not allow, as they are now enforcing the rule, that none shall be identified with them, who practice the unrestricted Communion of Saints at the Lord's Table. But, as nothing could better set forth the nature of the *old basis* of the Baptist Denomination in Canada, and the reasons why it is desired to preserve it intact, than the answer to the circular, received from the Rev. John Gilmour, of Peterboro'—it is considered advisable to give an extract from the document. He says, "The organization should be simply *Baptist*, and that the churches might be open or close, as they themselves may see fit, yet unite together for any given object carefully avoiding this, that union should interfere with the independency of the separate churches—for all organizations that interfere with the independency of the church, appear to me anti-scriptural. That each Church should manage its own affairs, appears to me clearly taught, and therefore any church which allows the usages or customs of a denomination to interfere, is yielding a great principle. I may have no objection to the usages &c., but when they are urged authoritatively, then I object to them, on that account, however innocent in themselves; because by such action they are placing human authority on the same level with Divine; that seems to me to be what Paul resents in the matter of circumcision, Acts 15: 1., Rom. 14th and 15th chapters. But then if we urge open communion upon a church, we may just as much offend against this law, as in close.

"In *christian* fellowship, I violate no law of the Lord, in sectarian fellowship it seems to me there is a violation of law; because Christ has enjoined on his followers, the reception of such as in the judgment of charity we think he has received (Rom. 14:) and then a new law must be framed to meet the case, viz., that though all believers were received under Apostolic authority, yet we frame a law that all believers shall not be received." A little further on, Mr. G. says, "But then it may be said if you admit christians deficient of some things, of which primitive christians were not—are you not going contrary to Apostolic example—by no means. because I follow the direction of a law which they enjoined to govern in all cases, where brethren differ, viz., THE LAW OF FORBEARANCE.

As the scope of the convocation has now been stated with abundant precision all will recognize in the proposed lines of action, the old landmarks of the Baptist Denomination, the existence and usages of which many of its old members are determined to perpetuate, and now, once more, invite all who are similarly minded to meet them in the City of Toronto, on Wednesday, the 13th of June next, as explained in the call published last month.

In addition to the extract from answers to the circulars, which have been already published,—the following just received will further indicate the current of this movement:—

"I received your circular a few days ago, the contents of it are in my view very important; and I am decidedly with you in the matter. Certainly the Regular Baptists are a secession from the Baptist Denomination, and though the latter are no doubt in the minority, in the meantime, they ought nevertheless to maintain their position. I am persuaded no good can come of giving place to Regular Baptist arrogance. Though we should be disposed to give way, and fall in with them, we could not heal their

"internal dissensions, and until these be healed, it is vain to anticipate that much can be accomplished. You calculate on twenty; well, twenty of the right stamp to raise and keep unfurled the standard of christian liberty, might be able by the blessing of God to accomplish much good. I may be mistaken, but I cannot avoid thinking that there are not a few who are now nominally with the Regular Baptists, who remain with them only till a more liberal standard be raised with a fair prospect of success."

The "Twenty," referred to in the last quotation, represents the number of ministers, who are expected to maintain their old position as Baptists simply; but as the call is addressed to "The ministers and other representatives of the views of the circular, it is expected that many who are not ministers will take part in the deliberations of the convention.

For the Gospel Tribune.

SABBATH DESECRATION BY MINISTERS.

DEAR BROTHER,—Should you have nothing ready from an abler pen on the subject of Sabbath Desecration by ministers, referred to in the *Tribune* of No. 11, perhaps the following hints may deserve notice:

1. It seems like an insult to common sense to imagine, that at this period of time, and in civilized and Protestant lands, any should need to be cautioned against the demoralizing dogmas of Popery and Mormonism on this subject, involving as it does the highest and dearest interests of man, and associating itself with all that tends to invest his character with a lovely and moral dignity, so that shame may well cover the face of him who cannot with all his heart adopt the sentiments expressed by our immortal bard:

"Hail wedded love, mysterious law, true source
Of human offspring, sole propriety,
In Paradise of all things common else!
By thee adulterous lust was driven from men
Among the bestial herds to range; by thee
Founded in reason, loyal, just, and pure,
Relations dear, and all the charities
Of father, son, and brother, first were known."

2. But though marriage occupies such an important position amongst the arrangements of infinite wisdom and goodness, and so admirably tends to alleviate the sorrows and augment the happiness of the human family; and though it is guarded by the most sacred sanctions in the Scriptures, and is often adverted to by the Holy Spirit to illustrate truths of the highest spiritual import; and though in all ages and in all countries, especially the Eastern, it has been celebrated with attractive rites and usages, yet neither in the Old Testament nor the New is it ever elevated to the rank of a religious service; although certainly on entering into such a relation, nothing can be more essentially necessary than that every step should be taken in the fear of the Lord; and also at the marriage feast the presiding spirit should be that of pure religion.

3. Should the propositions embodied in the foregoing remarks prove to be correct, it must be conceded, that, from the nature of its relationship, its connection with the drawing together of relations and friends for social enjoyment, such as, though not forbidden in Scripture, are certainly incompatible with all its injunctions relative to that holy day, and finally its being on the part of the bride and bridegroom a civil contract, adapted only for the present life, and, on the part of the minister, in some respects, a piece of secular business; to which, if we add the excitement of preparations, dressing, conversation, introducing, and taking leave of friends, &c., it must surely be ascribed to a most culpable want of thought on the part of such brethren as persist in this very objectionable practice. Q. Q., PICKERING.