

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Instituto 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.

- Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- 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
- 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.
- Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

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 pages/
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue
- Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index
- Title on header taken from:/
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:
- 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

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

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

THE CANADIAN DAY-STAR.

"I am the light of the world."
"Preach the Gospel to every creature."—JESUS.

MARCH, 1863.

DID THE LUTHERAN CHURCH AT THE REFORMATION RENOUNCE THE AUGUSTINIAN, OR CALVINIAN, DOGMA OF UNCONDITIONAL PREDESTINATION?

It is frequently very difficult, and sometimes impossible for us to determine what were the real views, on certain important doctrines of theology, entertained by the Reformers. There was, by no means, a uniformity of sentiment among them. They differed widely from one another; and the more we examine their writings the more satisfied do we become, that even the greatest and the best of them were but men,—imperfect, fallible, erring men. Their own opinions and practices required to be reformed, and the leading spirits among them, as might be expected, renounced some of those Augustinian dogmas which in the early stages of the Reformation they had themselves defended. Martin Luther is a striking example of this. In his later years he flatly contradicted what he had published in the early part of his life, on the freedom of the will, and other points in dispute. His warm heart expanded, and he died, we are credibly informed, a firm believer in the freedom of the human will, and the love of God to all mankind. There seems to be no way of accounting for the conflicting statements from his own pen, and the conflicting statements of historians respecting him, without bearing this in mind.

For example, Dr. Hade, in his history of the Christian Church, says of Luther, "The great champion of intellectual freedom, in consistency with the logical requirements of his system, did not hesitate in a passionate reply [in his controversy with Erasmus]

to contend for the innate bondage of the will, for he disposes of those scriptural passages which imply the freedom of the will, by asserting that God secretly intends the reverse of what he expresses in his revealed will, and that the apostles spoke of such a freedom only by way of irony.*

Bossuet, no friend of either Luther or Reformers, or reform, says, "The outrageous language of Luther did not constitute his greatest excesses in those books he wrote against Erasmus. The doctrine itself was horrible: for he not only concluded that free will was totally extinguished in mankind since their fall—a common error in the new reformation—but, moreover, that it is impossible any should be free but God; that his presence and divine providence, eternal and inevitable will of God, who thunderstrikes and breaks to pieces all free will: that the name of free will is a name which appertains to God alone, incompatible either with man, with angel, or any other creature."

"From these principles he was obliged to make God the author of crimes; nor did he conceal the thing, saying in express terms, that 'free will is a vain title; that God works the evil in us, as well as the good; that the great perfection of faith consists in believing God to be just, although, necessarily by his will, he renders us worthy of damnation, so as to seem to take pleasure in the torments of the wretched.'"†

We could easily give other statements from Luther, quoted by *Bossuet*, to show that the prince of Reformers was then in the dark on this important subject.

While *Dr. Mosheim* on the other hand says, and we believe with just as much truth, "The theological system that now prevails in the Lutheran academies, is not of the same tenor or spirit with that which was adopted in the infancy of the Reformation. As time and experience are necessary to bring all things to perfection, so the doctrine of the Lutheran Church changed, imperceptibly and by degrees, its original form, and was improved and perfected in many respects. This will appear both evident and striking to those who are acquainted with the history of the doctrines relating to the interpretation of Scripture, free will, predestination, and other points, and who compare the Lutheran

* Page 379.

† See *Bossuet's History of the Variations of the Protestant Church*, vol. I, book 2, sect. 17.

systems of divinity of the earlier date with those that have been composed in modern times."*

"The great Swiss Reformer, Zuingle," says Milner, "was the founder of those reformed churches, which had no communion with the Lutherans; and on a careful perusal of his voluminous writings, I am convinced, that certain peculiar sentiments, afterwards entertained by Calvin, concerning the absolute decrees of God, made no part of the theology of the Swiss Reformer." And on the same page he says, "Certainly the Lutheran Churches by degrees became more Arminian, and in general the rest of the Protestant Churches more Calvinistic afterwards." †

It is well known that many Calvinistic ministers at the present day, in their sermons from the pulpit, and in their publications, speak of the great leading Reformers as if they were all as Calvinistic in their theological sentiments, as John Calvin himself.

They seem to feel as if they would be giving countenance to dangerous error, were they to tell their hearers, or readers, that some of the greatest, the brightest, and the best of the Reformers, who under God were most honoured and successful in unfolding and propagating the grand principles of the Reformation, were Arminian in their sentiments. It is strange, but it is just as true as it is strange, that there are narrow-minded bigoted Calvinistic ministers in the Free Church of Scotland, and in other Presbyterian churches at the present day, building the tombs of old worthy Reformers, and garnishing their sepulchres, who, when they lived, believed and defended the very same doctrines, for the belief and defence of which we are treated, by these same ministers, as if we were in league with heresy. It is a fact which cannot be disputed, that some of the best of the Reformers repudiated Augustinianism before Calvin's Institutes were written, and others of them protested against their orthodoxy at the time they first appeared.

We were led to ask ourselves the question at the head of this article when reading the Augsburg Confession of Faith. And a careful examination of the Lutheran Manual on Scriptural Principles, by Dr. Schmucker, has, along with other sources of information, led us to the conclusion that the Lutheran Church at the Reformation did renounce the Augustinian, or Calvinian dogma of unconditional predestination. The Augsburg Confession,

* *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. II. p. 82.

† *History of the Church*, p. 946, Edinburgh, Ed. 1840.

which the Lutheran Church adopted, was drawn up by Melancthon and presented to Charles V. in 1530. Dr. Schmucker's Manual is based upon, and explanatory of that Confession, and it is quite evident, if we are to believe the Dr., who is a professor of theology in the Lutheran Church, that the Lutheran divines rejected as unscriptural the doctrines of *absolute predestination, limited atonement, and irresistible grace*. The work to which we have just referred, contains a great many valuable notes, historical facts, and numerous extracts from standard Lutheran theologians of Europe and America. As few of our readers are probably acquainted with it, we shall make one or two extracts bearing upon the predestination controversy, and, as the author occupies a professor's chair in the principal seminary on this continent, we may presume that he is somewhat acquainted with the history of doctrines in his own church.

In reference to the lack of perfect consistency and uniformity of theological sentiment in the writings of *Luther*, Dr. Schmucker says, "The fact that his subsequent publications occasionally exhibit language inconsistent with this article of the confession, [Art. XII.] only proves that this great master-spirit of the Reformation had not leisure amid the overwhelming labours of his life, fully to systematise his views, and adjust his phraseology to the minute relations of the theological system."* In a note at the foot of the very same page, he adds, "On the question, whether Luther retained those doctrines, afterwards known as the peculiarities of Calvin, see Schlosseri *Lutherus Lutheranus*, in which the author demonstrates the opinion above expressed, by copious citations from Luther's works, on all the distinguishing points and especially unconditional election and reprobation." Dr. Schmucker then proceeds to make the following quotation from Luther, to which we would call the special attention of the reader, as it shows what were the great Reformer's views on *Election*. "For many be called, but few chosen.—Matt. xx. 16. Some put their own construction on these words and explain them thus:—many be called, that is, God *teuñers* his grace to many, but few are chosen, that is, he *bestows* his grace on few, because few are to be saved. But this is *indeed a wicked interpretation*, for how is it possible for one entertaining such ideas of the divine character, not to be an enemy of God, whose will alone, according to this

* See Lutheran Manual page 162.

view, is wanting in order to his salvation? Moreover, let this exposition be contrasted with that which a man will cherish after he shall have become experimentally acquainted with the Lord Jesus Christ, and it will be found to be nothing less than *downright diabolical blasphemy*.* The reader will see from this, that Luther considered the Calvinistic interpretation of Matt. xx. 16, "a wicked interpretation," and the advocacy of *unconditional election* "to be nothing less than *downright diabolical blasphemy*." Neither James Arminius, Episcopius, nor Wesley, nor Fletcher of Madley, nor any other Arminian, ever cast a heavier or a harder stone than this at Calvinism.

But this is not all.

Luther continues to say, "It is God's earnest will and desire, from all eternity, that all mankind may be saved and be made partakers of eternal glory, as Ezekiel, xviii ch. has plainly declared, "Have I any pleasure at all, that the wicked should die, saith the Lord God, and not that he should return from his ways and live?" If then he desires the salvation of every sinner that lives and moves everywhere under the high and wide heavens, why should you, influenced by foolish thoughts suggested by the enemy, exclude and separate yourselves from the grace of God?† This is the very truth which we delight to preach, and for the defence and propagation of which, we, as a denomination, have been subjected to opposition and obloquy at the hands of those who profess to follow the Reformers!!

Dr. Schmucker then proceeds to give us a very interesting historical account of predestination, or, rather we should say, the controversy respecting it. We extract the following, being assured that its great importance is quite a sufficient apology for its length. "But the only impartial and decisive course is to examine all his [Luther's] works, and also all his correspondence, according to their date, and trace the gradual change in his opinions. This, according to the unanimous testimony of all Germany, no man has ever done more than the celebrated Dr. Plank, professor of Theology, in Gottingen, in the preparation of his invaluable work, entitled, "*History of the Rise, Changes, and Formation of our Protestant System of Doctrines*, from the commencement of the Reformation till the introduction of the Form of Concord,"

* Page 163.

† Page 164.

(1580). The entire impartiality, and great ability of this work, which cost the author twenty years of labour and investigation, are conceded by all parties. The result of his examination may be seen in the following valuable quotation, which, whilst it fully sustains the position that Luther relinquished this doctrine, also renders it intelligible, how such a diversity of sentiment might naturally exist on this subject. "Nevertheless, the Lutheran divines did not for a long time see proper to take any notice of it, (viz., of the prominence and full development given to this doctrine (of unconditional or absolute predestination) by Calvin, and of its introduction into the Swiss churches;) and even the zealots of Lower Saxony, who had taken occasion from the Geneva "Consensus," to renew the contest concerning the Lord's Supper, observed a perfect silence on this incalculably more important doctrine, although Calvin appeared to urge them the more explicitly to its adoption. Melancthon alone declared to him, that although he would not quarrel with him about it, he would never consent to adopt his (Calvin's) views on predestination.* But the silence of the other Lutheran divines on this subject, although it might appear to have been the result of indifference, was owing to the very satisfactory reason, of which the greater part of them were well aware. It cannot be denied, that the Augustinian theory of predestination had already been forsaken by the Lutheran church. Yet her divines could not but feel, that they had *changed* their ground. The fact could not be concealed, that Luther had once embraced this doctrine in its full vigour, and even zealously defended it against Erasmus, and that his early adherents, including even Melancthon himself, had at first done the same. It is indeed true, they could prove that the doctrine was not long retained, and that *Luther himself had abandoned it!* But even this concession would give an advantage to an opponent in this dispute, which they were unwilling to concede to Calvin. They therefore determined, rather not to dispute with him on this subject at all. But there was another reason, which probably aided in causing them to keep silence on this subject. The greater part of Lutheran Divines, had, like Luther himself, receded from the Augustinian theory of predestination, very probably without themselves being fully aware how this result

* Melancthon did not even answer the first letter of Calvin, in which he requested his assent to the doctrine. See Calvin's epist. pp. 133, 135.

had been brought about. They found themselves removed from it, before they had wished to be; and it was Melancthon, and no one else, who had produced the change. In the first improved edition of his *Loci Theologici*, and doubtless still earlier in his oral Lectures, he had proposed a theory, which, both in its principles and consequences, was in direct contradiction to the Augustinian view. This contradiction, which Melancthon himself took no pains to bring to light, was however, at first, not generally perceived. Hence several of the principles of his new theory were adopted with the less apprehension, especially as each one of them, considered by itself, appeared to be incontestably true, both according to reason and scripture. Thus his cardinal ideas of the divine election of all men in Christ, of the universality of divine grace, of the extension of the atonement and merits of Christ to all men, had been embraced by nearly all the divines of their party, and *by Luther himself*, before they perceived that their views of an absolute decree of God, and the Augustinian doctrine of predestination, were utterly irreconcilable with them. But when at last they made the discovery, they found their position in several respects an embarrassing one, and were unable immediately to extricate themselves. They felt unwilling, not only so suddenly to abandon a doctrine which they had professed, but even to abandon it at all. They were conscious that Augustine's doctrine of predestination appeared to be inseparably connected with some other parts of his system, such as the total inability of men to do anything good, which they were firmly determined never to relinquish. On the other hand, they were just as anxious to retain the features of Melancthon's theory, which they had adopted; and were therefore brought into a dilemma, which they could not but feel. The greater part of their divines now adhered to the views of Melancthon, that God desires and strives to bestow salvation on all men in and through Christ; from which it necessarily follows, that his decree concerning the destiny of each individual could not be absolute. But they at the same time retained the opinion of Augustine, that depraved man can do nothing at all in the work of his salvation, cannot exert even the feeblest effort of his will: which seems just as necessarily to imply that the salvation or damnation of each individual, could be decided only by an absolute decree of God. Some of them probably had an impression, that there must be some method of avoiding the last mentioned inference; but their views were indis-

tinct. Hence it happened that during the synergistic controversy, some of them again embraced the Augustinian theory in full. The greater part of them, however, believed that all they wanted was a more systematic adjustment and connexion of the opinions they entertained; and this conviction was undoubtedly the principal reason for that caution; and in direct opposition to the polemic spirit of that age, they evaded a controversy on the subject. It was, therefore, not until 1561, that a formal dispute on this subject occurred, between the Lutheran and Calvinistic divines, the occasion of which was the celebrated Zanchius, at that time Professor of Theology, at Strasburg." This is a correct and impartial statement of the facts in the case, which never has been, and never can be successfully controverted,"*

If the Manual of the Lutheran Church, from which the above extract is taken, be worthy of our credit, then it follows that Melancthon had no sympathy whatever with the Calvinistic dogma of predestination, and Luther the Prince of The Reformers renounced it, *and stigmatized it*, toward the close of his useful and laborious life.

We would like now to show from the Manual that the Lutheran Church believes that the *atonement was made for all the human race*;—and that *grace is resisibile*, but space forbids. We shall probably do so in our next number.—M.

DIVINE SOVEREIGNTY.

Having in last number entered upon this important and extensive subject, having defined what we understand by the term, and having also shown from scripture that God is a sovereign, we are now in some measure prepared to look at one or two of those manifestations of sovereignty, which the Divine Being has given us. We shall begin as near the beginning of our subject as we can well get, by observing that, **GOD ACTED AS A SOVEREIGN IN PURPOSING TO CREATE.**

That matter has not existed from the unbeginning ages of past duration, is one of the first principles of natural religion. There was, and in the very nature of things, there must have been, a period in past duration when our world had no existence. There must have been a period when no planet revolved around the sun,

when the centre of our system did not shine, when as yet it had no being. There must have been a period in past duration when those innumerable stars that stud the immensity of space, and twinkle in the firmament of heaven were not in being. There must have been a period in past duration when there was no milky-way, when no sun had as yet cast its beams upon its dependant planets; when the raw material out of which the splendid and stupendous universe arose, had no existence. There must have been a period in past duration when no being but the self-existent, independent and uncreated Jehovah existed;—yes, when He alone existed. Let us look at this idea, let us grasp the thought. This period in the nature of things, as well as in the order of nature, was prior to the beginning, spoken of in the first verse of the first chapter of Genesis, when God is said to have created the heavens and the earth.

By the greatest stretch of either our intellectual eye, or our imagination we cannot see farther back than this. What now do we behold? We behold the only Being that exists solitary and alone, enjoying infinite delight in the contemplation of his own absolutely infinite perfections. But we see him too, forming in his own infinite mind a stupendous plan, a plan, which at some future period will be by his unerring wisdom and omnipotent lower put in execution. In a word, we see him *purposing to create*. It is quite evident to every reflecting mind that this *purpose* to create, must, in the very nature of things, have been an act of pure sovereignty. He was under no conceivable obligation to purpose to create that chaos out of which in after ages countless worlds, and suns and systems, like so many dew drops sparkling in the fields of immensity, were to be formed. Now since the great I AM, who only hath immortality, who only inhabiteth eternity, and who only *then existed*, was under no obligation to purpose to create, it follows as a matter of course, that his purposing to create must have been an act of absolute and uncontrollable sovereignty.

But in order that we may enter a little more fully into this subject we would observe again, **THAT GOD ACTED AS A SOVEREIGN IN CREATING.**

Of course the self-existent and independent One was under no more obligation *to create* than he was under obligation *to purpose* to create. He who sits supreme upon the throne of the universe, and who doeth according to his will in the armies of heaven, and

among the inhabitants of the earth, put his purpose into execution. He has created; and O what a wonderful, what a mysterious, what an incomprehensible thing it is to create! To create an insect! To create an atom! The thought is overwhelming, for almighty power alone is competent for the task. Creation, we say, is a fact, however the mode of it, or the nature of it, may be hid from us; the fact of it is revealed, made known to us, and believed by us. Neither are we left in the dark with respect to the origin of creation: it had its origin in the deliberate choice, the sovereign will of the creator. He was not necessitated to bring the universe into being, but *he has created*; and O how great, how small, how simple, how complex, how vast, how varied are the works of his hand!!

That splendid and magnificent universe, an insignificant portion of which is only visible to us when we look up into the heavens in a clear winter evening, started into being at the bidding of Jehovah. "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth." "Thou, even thou, art Lord alone; thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth, and all things that are therein, the seas, and all that are therein, and thou preservest them all, and the host of heaven worshippeth thee."

"By his spirit he hath garnished the heavens." "Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands." The first act of creation was not an act of equity, or of justice, but of pure sovereignty; and all God's works of creation from the first onward, and downward through countless ages to the present moment, have been one unbroken manifestation of divine sovereignty.

He did not owe existence to any of the elements of nature, or any single atom of which the material universe is formed. He did not owe existence to the worm that crawls on the earth, or the fish that swims in the ocean. He did not owe existence to the flowers that beautify the fields, the beasts of the forest, or the cattle upon a thousand hills. He did not owe existence to the sun that rules by day or the moon that gives us light by night. The creation of the meanest and most insignificant insect that dances its short but happy life time away in the setting sunbeam, as well as the creation of the mightiest and most exalted archangel that burns before the eternal throne, are alike acts of pure sovereignty. The high and the lofty One who inhabiteth eternity, and who doeth according to his will in the armies of heaven, and

among the inhabitants of the earth, is at once absolutely independent, and absolutely sovereign.

No creature had the slightest claim upon him for existence, and consequently when he created chaos, or stones, or trees, or planets, or suns, or systems of worlds, to adorn and beautify the fields of immensity; or when he created intelligent beings such as men, and angels, when he endowed them with intelligence, sensibility and will, he did not perform any act of equity, or justice, but of absolute sovereignty. There is a great difference between an atom and an insect; and between an insect and an archangel. There is almost an infinite variety and diversity in the material, the vegetable, the animal and the intellectual kingdoms. And when the question is asked, Why does this differ from that? Why is this larger than that? Why is this more beautiful than that? Why is this inorganic, and that organized? Why is this an insect, and that an angel? Why is this a mere thing, having no life, no sensation, no will, no intelligence, no enjoyment, and that a man made in the image and likeness of God? When we are interrogated with these, and a thousand such questions, we have but one answer to them all, and that answer is "Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight." Or, "Our God is in the heaven, he hath done whatsoever he hath pleased."

We intended to have made a few remarks on Divine Sovereignty, as manifested in the creation of different classes of intelligent beings, and the institution of a moral system, but we must reserve the consideration of this important part of the subject till next number.—M.

HOLINESS.

By the late Rev. Robert Peden. Heb. xii. 14.

"Follow peace with all men, and holiness without which no man shall see the Lord".

Here are two golden links, peace and holiness.

I. The nature of holiness.

II. The necessity of holiness.

III. The means by which holiness is to be obtained.

I. The nature of holiness.—What is holiness?

1st. What it is not—2nd. What it is.

(a). It is not a property of matter: it is not something physi-

cal. It can only be the property of mind. It can only be the property of a moral being. We do not say of a stone, or a flower, or a plant, or a tree, or a mountain, or a lake—that it is holy. It is true we hear the expression, “the holy hill of Sion,” “a holy temple”—but the term is not predicated of the hill itself, or of the temple itself, but because they are scenes of holy associations.

(b). Neither is holiness an attribute of animal beings endowed only with instinct. We may speak of them as innocent, but holiness is not mere innocence. A being may be innocent without being holy. A lamb or a dove may be spoken of as innocent, but cannot be said to be holy. Innocence is freedom from guilt—but holiness is positive goodness. An infant may be innocent, in not having done any evil; and yet not having done positive good, it is not properly speaking holy.

(c). Holiness is not something compulsory—that is, men cannot be dragged, or driven into it. There must be an exercise of the will: it must be voluntary—the will moving in harmony.

Suppose you say to your son, go and shut the door—and your child refuses: he will not do it: you take him and carry him to the door, and you take his arm, and make him push the door—has he obeyed you? It is true his hand pushed the door, but the act was compulsory. It was not obedience: it was not voluntary.

(d). Holiness is not acting from a slavish fear or dread. If you tell your child to do a thing, and if he is compelled to do it, not from a regard to his father, or his father’s command, but simply from the force of fear of being punished, that child does not obey in the proper sense—it is not willing, hearty, loving obedience.

(e). Holiness is not morality. A man may be moral, honest, honourable, upright in all his relations to his fellow beings, and yet may be destitute of true holiness: How strikingly is this illustrated in the case of the young ruler who came to Jesus: he had been strictly moral, but Christ showed him that he lacked real true holiness.

(f). Holiness is not a mere observance of external duties, rites or ceremonies. How striking is the case of Saul,—A Hebrew of Hebrews—a Pharisee: He considered himself a moral man, a religious man—and he carried his religion to a high state of zeal: yet when he got a proper view of himself, he confessed he was a blasphemer and a persecutor, and injurious.

(g). Holiness is not mere sectarian zeal. A man may be very zealous for his sect—for his church—defend its creed, its government, and oppose other denominations—and he may be fond of his own minister, of his own church, regular in his attendance, contribute to its support, and after all be destitute of holiness.

2nd. What is it? It is conformity to the great principles of God's government. What are these? Two, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength : and the second is like unto it, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." With reference to man's will, it is that will in harmony with God's will—as to his affections, it is his affections moving supremely to God, and loving his neighbour as himself. Holiness is not, something external but internal—it must have root in the heart. The requirement is, thou shalt *love* the Lord thy God with all thy *heart*.

It is love to God in the heart manifesting itself in the life.

II. Necessity of holiness. Not as a *ground* of acceptance. Christ's righteousness is the *only ground* of acceptance. Yet "without holiness no man shall see God." By seeing God is not meant just getting a sight or a glimpse of God as a mere spectator, but seeing God in the way of intimate and holy communion—the enjoyment of the beatific vision.

(a). God is a being infinitely holy—glorious *in holiness*. The seraphim veil their faces with their wings, and cry '*holy, holy, holy*' is the Lord of hosts," and Isaiah says "Woe is me ! for I am undone ; for I am a man of unclean lips : and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips : for mine eyes have seen the king, the Lord of hosts. "Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, for thou art *holy* !" "Who is able to stand before thee *holy Lord God*." How could we have fellowship with such a being without holiness ?

(b) The inhabitants of heaven are all holy. Over the archway of heaven is the inscription : "Nothing shall enter in that defileth, neither whatsoever whatsoever worketh abomination or maketh a lie." Angels are holy: the Seraphim—the Cherubim—all the angelic orders—and all the ransomed of the Lord are holy. No sin can enter there.

(c). Without holiness an individual would not fitted for the employments of heaven. Heaven has its employments—its service. It is not only where God manifests his glory, but

where He is glorified. There all is allegiance—loyalty to him in his service—submission to his authority—reverence for his majesty—love to his infinite moral excellences—obedience to his requirements. Heaven is a *rest*, but not of inactivity, of indifference, of insensibility; but a service where love to God prompts to duty and service and where there is no wearisomeness no irksomeness.

(d). Without holiness there would be no relish for the enjoyments of heaven. Suppose God were to admit an unholy and unsanctified soul—a soul grovelling in sin, in the love and practice of sin, it would not be fit neither for the enjoyments nor the employments of heaven. Let us look even to society on earth. There are some saints met together for social prayer, praise, and converse on spiritual things: now their hearts are warmed, elevated, and comforted by such communion: but here is another society—it is a saloon—it is a gambling room: there is ribaldry, revelry, riot, the profane oath, the rude jest, the obscene remark,—“their mouth is an open sepulchre,” shewing corruptness, and wickedness, and deadly moral putrefaction. Let one of these bar-room or groggery frequenters be put into the meeting first spoken of: he has been drinking—the fumes of the bar-room impregnate his clothes, and pollute his breath. Could he enjoy fellowship with these godly persons? Could he engage in their service? Could he relish their spiritual enjoyments?—surely not. He could not be happy—he would be like a fish out of the water. Were he obliged to sit there, it would be a weariness to him. Nor would it be pleasant companionship for the saints; they could not enjoy his kind of fellowship, unless they had lost their relish for spiritual things. If so on earth, how much more in heaven?

(e). Holiness is necessary, for you will see that the whole word of God points to it as the great necessary result to be attained. All the machinery of grace is to be but a means to this great end. What is the object of Christ's mission? It is to save—but save from what? From sin. “He shall be called Jesus for he shall save his people from their sin.” “This is the will of God even your sanctification.” “Believers are said to be, ‘*Chosen in Christ to be holy.*’” “Elect—*unto obedience*”—“*Called—to be holy,*” also to “*Purify* their hearts by faith.” Suppose a way to pardon, but none to sanctification, the scheme would be of no use.

III. The means whereby holiness is to be attained.

I have stated that holiness springs from love—it is supreme love to God in its manifestation.

First, the first thing necessary is, what is to be done with past sin—how is it to be dealt with. If there is no way for exemption from the condition arising therefrom, then what would future holiness avail? Blessed be God there is pardon, there is forgiveness for the past, consistent with justice, holiness and all the attributes of God.

And how are we to get this love which is the element of holiness? The same scheme that reveals the way of pardon, reveals the means of sanctification.

“The love of Christ constraineth us : because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead. And that he died for all, that they which live, should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again.” “We love him because he first loved us.”

ON SOCIETY AND TRADE.

That man was originally and specifically constituted for society, is the clear teaching of the Scriptures. He who created man, and knows whereof we are made, solemnly declared “It is not good that man should be alone.” An examination into the faculties, appetencies, and emotional powers of the human mind, will illustrate and confirm this supreme definition, and show that, constituted as he is, man cannot attain to that full development of his mental being, cannot be perfected as a rational and moral creature, except in society. Inspiration, reason and experience, then, combine to testify, that man was made, not for solitude and intellectual abstraction, but for intimate and constant living association with his fellows, and for taking part in all the various relations, duties, &c., to which it gives rise. It is also an equally plain teaching of the Scriptures that fallen man was appointed to labour—to labour hard—and to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow. Man in paradise, and blessed with a mate with whom he could take sweet counsel and enjoy exquisite satisfaction, was not meant to be inactive. Even then the garden was his field, and it is reasonable to suppose he found there sufficient employment for part of every day ; and that, although fatigue and pain were not known, he was so far wearied each evening, as to be in a condition joyfully to welcome the night and that repose for which it was given. It is true the human frame was not mortal, and that disease had not made an inroad on our world ; but that frame doubtless, even in

its primitive beauty and efficiency, required both food and exercise, and both were essential to the realization of that endless life to which man was created. But when man fell, and his mental powers became dislocated,—perverted,—depraved—a strange and overpowering necessity originated man's employment. In his sinless state, mental and physical health required exertion: but in his fallen state employment was requisite, in order to preserve the human species—to prevent society from self annihilation, to set up a barrier against the overflowing deluge of sin. It was, therefore, the very greatest blessing that God appointed man to work; and the sentence which dooms our race to earn our bread, is, so far from being a curse, one of our greatest blessings: in our present circumstances no enactment of the Supreme Ruler could be more appropriate; more beneficent and wise; more worthy of our Father; more conducive to the welfare of our world. Were men able to eat without working; had men nothing to do; were labour optional; the state of things would be frightful, sin would gain a maturity, a prolificness, a dominion, which would soon turn earth into hell. The necessity of labour—the ordinance of God, “If any will not work neither shall they eat,”—is, therefore, a law of love,—a law of life,—a law which bespeaks the wisdom, providence, and philanthropy of our common Father. Those, then, who speak against society and against business, and who tell us that the perfection of the saint requires his abstraction from all human pursuits and human society, blunder egregiously—they mistake the design of God, the character of man, and the nature and office of true religion. “I pray not that thou shouldst take them out of the world,” was our Lord's language: and it is full of the truest philosophy, while it also throbs with infinite compassion and love. Man needs society; and physical and mental exertion contribute to the health, symmetry, power, and happiness of both body and soul. Hence we see that heathenism and popery equally have outraged the divine constitution of things, by their inculcation of celibacy and solitude, and by representing trade—the earning of one's bread by labour,—as unsuitable to the saint, and obstructive to the perfection of his renewed character. But when men pretend to be wiser than God, they invariably stultify themselves; and so it has been proved, in both those systems of delusion. Their votaries, affecting to be too holy to mingle with men and to work for their living, have become so vile that it might seem they had fiends for their companions, and were the passive tools of the evil one. Our

place, then, as men and as Christians, is in society, not as drones—but labourers—contributing to the welfare of the whole, as members of the same body. It cannot be denied, that this is a very difficult task. Sin has so degraded society, and so tainted everything that man touches, that it is hardly possible to converse with men without catching their spirit, or to deal with them in trade without availing ourselves of arts which cannot be justified to the conscience, but to which custom has given currency and a sort of legitimaey. I believe many Christians have been, and are, sorely puzzled how to live with a good conscience; and under the painful pressure have been tempted to betake themselves into solitude. In this way monasticism originated. Such are to be sympathised with, not condemned: and if the matter is fairly looked into, most Christians will find that it has been owing to a thoughtless walk,—a passive floating on the tide—a credulous acceptance of whatever has been offered, that they themselves have not been similarly tempted. Let us see how society operates to blight and destroy religion, and how many trades there are which cannot be honestly followed by those who walk with God. The language of society is so garnished with what is complimentary and approximating to falsehood, so fashioned by heathenish principles and notions,—so favourable to insincerity and deceit, that those who fear a lie and all semblance to a lie, who wish to speak in their heart the truth, and who know not to flatter any man, can hardly adopt the phraseology now current without wounding their conscience. He who would speak with grace in his heart and on his lips,—who would honour God in his body (a part of which is his tongue) who would sanctify the Lord God in his heart,—must construct a style of his own, and become a man of strange speech. The Friends are an instance of this. They simply attempt to be true, and to omit all pagan imitations and reference—to treat others as fellow-servants of the great King, and without flattering or deceiving them,—and in this attempt they have fallen into the ridicule of the world and have gained no imitators. This shews how inveterate is the corruption of speech amongst us, how incurably we are prone to violate the truth in describing events—in promising—in reproving. Hence oaths, or solemn appeals to God prevail; every thing is exaggerated and painted off for effect; and faults are reproved in a tone and dialect, which liken those, who ought to be Christ's resemblances, to the children of the evil one. The habits of society, too, are indefensible. We clothe ourselves and feed without fear; we pamper the

body, and thereby not merely debilitate and destroy it, but yield to it an undue importance, which subordinates and degrades the soul. Every house is decorated to the utmost of its owner's ability; and those less successful in money making than ourselves, and therefore less elegantly clad and housed, are not deemed fit visitants or associates. Money parcels mankind out into castes—castes as real as those of Hindooism, and equally inexcusable before God. We feast our equals, and in various ways pay court to our superiors; while the poor, and the criminal, and the sick, and the orphan are forgotten, and left to perish. Many a christian expends more on a christmas dinner—a tea party—a jaunt, than would support a poor family a week, and then goes and prays—"our Father, give us this day our daily bread;" forgetting that his brother in the next house, would have been glad to have relieved his own or his childrens' craving hunger with a tithe of that which he has squandered in the richest viands.

Selected by R. T. St. Catharines.

THE CHILDREN'S PORTION.

STRETCH IT A LITTLE.—A little girl and her brother were on their way to the grocer's one winter morning. The ground was white with frost, and the wind was very sharp. They were both poorly dressed, but the little girl had a sort of a coat over her, which she seemed to have outgrown. As they walked briskly along she drew her little companion close up to her, saying, 'Come under my coat, Johnny.' 'It isn't big enough for both,' he replied; 'I think I can stretch it a little,' she said; and they were soon as close together and as warm as two birds in the same nest. How many shivering bodies, and heavy hearts and weeping eyes, there are in the world, just because people do not stretch their comforts a little beyond themselves!

THOU GOD SEEST ME.

God does see me every day,—
 When I work and when I play;
 When I read and when I talk,
 When I run and when I walk;
 When I eat and when I drink,
 When I sit and only think;
 When I laugh and when I cry,
 God is ever watching nigh.

When I'm quiet, when I'm rude,
 When I'm naughty, when I'm good ;
 When I'm happy, when I'm sad,
 When I'm sorry, when I'm glad ;
 When I pluck the scented rose,
 That in my neat garden grows ;
 When I crush the tiny fly,
 God is watching from the sky.

When the sun gives heat and light,
 When the stars are twinkling bright ;
 When the moon shines on my bed,
 God still watches o'er my head ;
 Night or day, at church or fair,
 God is ever, ever near,
 Marking all I do or say,
 Pointing to the happy way.—*Anon.*

OUR FRAGMENT BASKET.

GRACE AND GLORY are not so different as some imagine. They differ only in degree; the state is the same—the nature is the same. Grace is glory in the bud, and glory is grace in the flower; the one is the child, the other is the man; the one is the dawn, the other the day. For what is Heaven? It is a condition in which all worldly distinctions will be done away and only those remain that result from character. The Christian is rising towards it now. "In his eyes a vile person is contemned, but he honoureth them that fear the Lord."

BENEVOLENCE.—No disposition is considered as more important in the realization of genuine Christianity than true benevolence; and amid all the glories of religion this is the most resplendent. Repentance wears a countenance smiling in grief, and placid in tears, "looking unto him who was pierced." Faith stands on the rock of eternal ages, and keeps her eye fixed on the cross of Christ. Hope reclines upon her anchor, while storms and billows howl around; but benevolence, surrounded with the atmosphere of heaven, smiles with ineffable beneficence, stretches out her hand to relieve the wants of mankind, and, mingling her praises with those of the celestial world, attunes her song to the melody which encircles the throne of God.

CHRISTIAN PRUDENCE.—Contract not much carnal acquaintance.
 Learn to be abused without being angry.
 Argue coolly, and from conscience, not for victory.
 Affect not a show of sanctity before men.
 Be not ashamed of piety in any company.

Whatever else thou readest, read a double portion of the Scriptures of truth.

Shun familiarity with the men of the world, else celestial truths, as uttered by thee, will be contemned.

Care not much about thy own reputation, so truth and gospel suffer not.

BACKSLIDING IN OLD AGE.

Did it ever occur to you that Christians were more apt to backslide and fall into open sin in the *latter part* of their religious course, than in its earlier stages? It is a startling announcement, but I think you will find it *true*. Look at all the cases of backsliding recorded in the Bible. Did they not, *every one of them*, occur late in life? There was David. In the days of his youth and early manhood, a pattern of faith and devotion. In advanced life guilty of *murder and adultery*, and still later of *pride and self-conceit*, in numbering the people. Look at Moses. The great sin of his life committed when just about to enter the promised land. Look at Hezekiah,—the “good king Hezekiah.” In his *early days*, zealous and devout. The last fifteen years of his life (a special gift from his God, and therefore one would think to be *specialy* consecrated to him) bringing “wrath upon himself and Jerusalem.” So too with Josiah. So too with Jehoshaphat. And look around at the cases of grievous backsliding within your own observation. Have they not, almost *every one of them* occurred *late in life*? I mean, after many years of Christian profession. This fact (is it not a *fact*?) seems to me to teach several lessons of deep and solemn importance.

1. It accounts for another fact which has of late forced itself upon my attention, viz., That in the case of very many of God's people, their heaviest and most numerous *trials come late in life*. God, in his tender mercy, sends the trials to save them from falling away from their steadfastness, and bringing reproach upon his cause.

2. These cases, recorded in the Bible and confirmed by observation, ought to make Christians as they advance in life, more and more watchful and distrustful of themselves.—*Parish Visitor*.

CORRESPONDENCE.

(For the Canadian Day Star.)

GANANOQUE, January 1, 1863.

From a slight personal acquaintance with yourselves, and from the perusal of your paper since its commencement, I believe that you are

liberal minded, and that your object in publishing the "Star" is to get at the truth. With this impression I have taken the liberty to send you the following thoughts, and if you do not think them out of place, be so good as give them a corner in your paper, and make any remarks on them as you may see fit.

It has often occurred to my mind—How is it if the Gospel story or scheme of salvation is so all important to the human race that their eternal weal or woe depends upon their knowing and believing it—how is it, I say, that the knowledge of the scheme has been revealed to comparatively so few of mankind? We are instructed to believe that the soul is of infinitely more importance than the body; and yet do we not find that God has taken more care that the bodies he has made shall be sustained and not die for lack of food, than he has done to save immortal souls from eternal loss and ruin? You may look abroad over all the world from

"Greenland's icy mountains
To India's coral stand,"

and we find that God in his goodness has made ample provision for the temporal welfare of his creatures, and this is just what we would expect from our all wise and infinitely good Father, but how different—according to common ideas—has he acted with regard to our eternal interests! We find that only a very small part of mankind have ever heard of the Gospel plan of salvation, and of those who have heard, how few have believed! They may and generally do *wish to believe*—but the story has been presented to their minds in so many different ways—one crying—believe it *this way*, and another, believe it *that way*—that the mind is confused and bewildered, and a great many will not and cannot believe at all. They say to themselves—"How can we tell which is the right way? How can we tell where the truth is among so many conflicting systems?" I cannot help thinking that if belief in the Gospel was as essential to our salvation as we are taught it is, our Father would not have been so partial to his children. It would have been just as easy for him to have revealed his will to the *whole* human race as to a *part*. And we find in the natural world no evidence of such partiality—God does not make his sun to shine on part of his family and leave the other part in darkness. No! The great orb shines for *all*, and the *whole* world is cheered by his life-giving influence.

Suppose for a moment that you were from home—a great distance away from your family—and that you were to hear that all your children were taken sick with a dangerous malady—and suppose that you knew of an infallible cure for this disease, would you not take the most sure and speedy means at your disposal to send a knowledge of this remedy to your family? What would men think of you, if, instead of sending this information over the wires like a *flash of lightning*, you were to select a cripple and employ him as your messenger to carry this cure to your perishing family? But suppose for a moment that you adopted this insane course:—You despatch the messenger with the cure that is to save your children—but in the meantime some of them have died, and others are in extreme jeopardy. The messenger at

last arrives however, and he meets the friends carrying the corpse of one child to the grave. The messenger cries out "Good news! I have been sent by the father of these children with an infallible remedy for their disease." The people crowd around, eager and anxious to know what this wonderful cure is, but alas! they are doomed to be disappointed. They find that the prescription is written in a language they do not understand—but still they do not despair—they call in the learned men of the town to translate and interpret the precious document. Again they are disappointed—for the learned men differ in their reading of the paper. One says that the cure is to be applied outwardly—another is just as sure that it should be taken internally—some say that it will save all the family, and others positively affirm that it is only intended for a part of them—and thus they differ and quarrel about the words and the way of applying the cure, while all the time the fell disease is carrying off the unfortunate children! If any man were to act in this way would he not be considered either a madman or a monster? Most certainly—for he allowed his children to perish when he had it in his power, by acting with common judgment, to have saved them. But thanks be to God, who has implanted in our nature the love of our children, such a man never existed. And shall God be less just and less wise than men? No! God has unbounded resources, as well as unbounded love, and I cannot believe that he would leave so many to perish, and not make known to them fully, clearly and plainly the way of salvation. I cannot dwell on this subject at present—but just think for one moment of millions on millions of immortal beings going down to hell—down to everlasting torments—and no friendly voice to warn—nor hand stretched out to save them! The thought is horrible, and is sufficient, if dwelt on, to drive reason from its throne, and turn men into raving maniacs.

But perhaps, Messrs Editors, my ideas on this subject are all wrong. If so, I will be glad and grateful if you will set me right. *Truth* is what I want, and earnestly desire to obtain. Any remarks that you may make on the subject, will be highly appreciated by myself and by others who have doubts and difficulties like my own.

I am,

Your Obedient Servant,

ROBERT BROUGH.

REMARKS.

1. We are glad that our correspondent admits that his ideas on the subject treated of in his letter *may* be all wrong. This is candid. We are thankful that he seeks and desires to obtain the truth. We trust he will be successful in his search and that his desire may be gratified

2. We are thankful too that he admits that God is "our infinitely wise and good Father." We agree with him in believing in the Fatherhood of God, and that he is infinite in wisdom and in goodness. There is thus some common ground on which we can base our reasonings. We believe indeed that Fatherhood does not exhaust the relations which

God sustains to men. We regard him, as the "Governor among the nations," as well: still we believe in his Fatherhood.

3. We are glad too that he believes in God's care over his creatures—that God makes ample provision for the supply of those wants of his creatures that relate to this terrene and temporary condition.

4. But our respected correspondent will please to notice that God does not make provision for the supply of the bodily wants of men in such a way as to supersede all necessity for exertion on their part. Where God gives powers and capabilities, he intends them for use, and bestows no premium on idleness. The farmer must turn up the soil and cast in the seed, in order that, by God's rain and dew and sunshine it may spring up, grow, and come to perfection. If he neglect to do this, he will find that the soil will produce nothing to feed the bodies of his household, but will be overgrown with weeds, thistles or brushwood. Man also needs to use with carefulness that which God gives him to supply his temporal wants as a blessing on his labours and industry. How often do we see, under the government of "the infinitely wise and good" God, persons of slothful or improvident habits, coming to poverty and want.' We wish our correspondent to make a special note of this.

5. While "our infinitely wise and good" God makes provision for the wants of men when their agency concurs with his, under his government many calamities and woes befall men. There is such a thing as pain, as sickness, as sorrow. When we look into the world we see a vast amount of misery endured by men. When we, along with our correspondent, 'look abroad all over the world,

"From Greenland's icy mountains
To India's coral strand,"

we wish him to observe accurately what is in the field of vision. We see much of the goodness of God, we rejoice to admit. But do we not also behold a great amount of wretchedness? God is infinitely wise and good we both believe. Now how are we to explain this anomaly—misery endured under the superintendence of an infinitely wise and good being? We cannot regard it as a display of malevolence; for we both assume that God is infinite in wisdom and in goodness. We are rather to infer that there is something wrong with man—that he is in an abnormal condition—that God is dealing with him as if he was displeased with him. When we look into the conscience of man we learn that man is a sinner—that he has transgressed the laws of the infinitely wise and good being who made him. Thus moral evil or sin is the only satisfactory interpretation of natural evil or misery.

6. But if it be the case that man is a transgressor of God's law—a rebel against his righteous authority; and if the misery that exists in the world is to be regarded, in some degree, as *punitive*—as a display of righteousness—the blessings which men enjoy from God are unmerited by them. Men do not deserve the amount of happiness which they do experience.

7. Our correspondent assumes that "the knowledge of the scheme in salvation is revealed to comparatively few of mankind.' Now here w/

must discriminate. As "our infinitely wise and good Father" and Ruler is dealing with men not as they deserve, he is, in his Providence revealing himself as a propitious God. Thus the *fact* of the divine propitiousness has all along been revealed to men. The *way* of propitiation has not been made known to all men—only to those into whose hands the written revelation, in whole, or in part, has come. To the Jews who lived before the coming of Christ, the way of propitiation was obscurely made known through their typical shadows. Still the fact of God's propitiousness has all long been made known to all men in the blessings, which God has bestowed on men in his providential dealings with them. Thus all men have all along had the means of knowing the divine propitiousness, and they are answerable only for the amount of light which is vouchsafed to them.

8. From some portions of the written revelation it would appear that one end which God has in view in revealing himself to men as propitious in his providential dealings, is, that they might seek the Lord and find him. Acts, xvii. 23—28. In Rom ii. 14, Paul assumes that Gentiles, who, having not the law or the written revelation, do by nature the things contained in the written revelation, shall be justified in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ.

9. As God's temporal blessings for the sustenance of our bodies are not so bestowed on us as that no exercise of our activity is required, the analogy leads us to believe that man's agency is required in order to the salvation of his soul, not indeed in the way of meriting salvation, but in the way of admitting, and welcoming the light, respecting it which it pleases God to vouchsafe. Bibleless peoples are under obligation to receive the light which God gives them, respecting his propitiousness, in his dealings with them. Bible blessed peoples are under obligation to receive the light, which God has given them in that Book, respecting, not only the fact of God's propitiousness, but the way of propitiation. God does not deal partially in vouchsafing more light to some than to others, because all are responsible only according to the amount of light which is among them.

10. As to knowledge respecting the way of propitiation, be it observed that the way of salvation, as far as it could be made known at the periods was twice universal i. the earth—immediately after the fall and immediately after the flood. Men wandered away voluntarily from the lamp of light which God hung out for their guidance. God took measures to separate the nation of the Jews from other nations, for a variety of purposes; and among others, not to prevent the outflowing of religious truth to the Gentiles, but to prevent the inflowing of heathen superstitions and impurities among them. That the Bible and the knowledge of the way of salvation are not being more extensively diffused is owing partly to the backwardness of the church of God to obey the Redeemer's behest; and, we must add, partly to the unwillingness of men to come under the power of the truth, and the obstacles they put in the way of its diffusion. But no one will be blamed for not using light which was never given him. To whomsoever much is given of them also much shall be required.

11. As to the fact that men, to whom God's written revelation has come, interpret the way of salvation differently, to whatever extent this is true, it is just what might be expected among a race of free agents, and it admonishes us, not to reject the Christian scheme altogether, but to search and examine for ourselves,—to depend not on the explanations of fallible men, but to examine honestly for ourselves, God's testimony which is as open to our inspection as to theirs.

We might extend these remarks : but in the meantime we deem it unnecessary to do so. We shall be happy if they be of any service to our correspondent, or to those who have doubts and difficulties like his own. We shall be glad to hear from him again. A.

VIRTUE IS ITS OWN REWARD.

Virtue is the practice of moral duties. Does any one doubt that happiness is the attendant of virtue?

Let such an one in imagination glance through the lapse of nearly six thousand years, to the blissful abode of paradise, and behold two intelligent beings, a little lower than the angels, their fair open countenances beaming with ineffable delight at the approach of their sovereign and see how they strive to excel each other in acts of adoration. Then let him mark the serpent attempting to persuade Eve to take the forbidden fruit. *His words are smoother than butter, but war is in his heart.* Will he succeed? Impossible, she knows it is prohibited. "Ye shall not surely die, for God doth know that in the day that ye eat thereof your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." Ah! she believes him, forgets her God, eats, and dies. Alas poor Eve! where is now thy virtue, thy happiness? Gone! But her guilt does not stop here; she takes the place of the tempter, and Adam becomes her partner in guilt.

Job feared God and eschewed evil; but while prosperity was his lot his virtue was ascribed to that. "Doth Job fear God for naught put forth thy hand now, and touch all that he hath, and he will curse thee to thy face." These were the words of Satan, but when Job was delivered into his hand, when he had reduced him to poverty, not leaving a solitary child to comfort him in his old age, the result was sufficient to prove that his virtue proceeded from integrity.

Yet Satan not being convinced, had permission to lay his hand upon Job's person, and when all but life had left him, when his companion tempted him to sin, he rebuked her; and in all that he said he sinned not with his lips. His friends who came to comfort him, told him that he was a very great sinner, and that he was now suffering the

just punishment of his iniquity, yet he did not despair; he retained his integrity, when he knew he would get no credit for it. He appealed to the Searcher of hearts, and God at length approved him, blessed him with great riches and honor, children and long life, and "made his righteousness to shine as the noonday." He came forth from the furnace of affliction, as does gold from the refiner's fire, purer and brighter, with no essential loss.

His virtue was its own reward.

S. C. C.

It was probably the exceeding proneness of the Israelites to idolatry which led God not to allow any one of them to see Moses after he was dead, or to be present at his funeral when he was buried.

INTELLIGENCE.

DUNSHALT—OPENING SERVICES.—On Sunday January 4, the Independent Evangelical Union Chapel here was opened by the Rev. T. G. Salmon from Glasgow, who preached in the forenoon from Isaiah liii. 11: "He shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied;" in the afternoon, from Luke 19. 41. "And when he was come near, he beheld the city, and wept over it; and in the evening from Mathew xv. 6—"Thus have you made the commandment of God of none effect by your traditions." The different subjects were most interesting and instructive, and were very ably expounded by the Rev. gentleman. The attendance during the day was large and in the evening the chapel was densely thronged by a very attentive audience. The collections throughout the day were very handsome, and betokened a very liberal and independent spirit on the part of the congregation. We have also to mention the presentation of a very handsome pulpit Bible and Psalm Book to the congregation by a Christian friend.

On Monday evening a soiree was held, Mr. John Kay, Freuchie, presided. The Divine blessing being asked by the Rev. N. Galloway, Dunfermline, the large assembly was served with an excellent cup of tea with the usual requisites. Tea being over, the chairman in a few humorous remarks introduced the Rev. T. G. Salmon, who addressed the meeting on an objection raised by some of the people, viz.:—"If Christ died for all, why are all not saved." The Rev. N. Galloway then followed—his subject being, "The heart of Christ in relation to the unconverted;" and the Rev. W. Adamson, Perth, who chose as his subject—"Man's Ability and Inability in reference to his salvation." In characterising the different subjects, we may say, unimpartially, that we seldom or never listened to such a talented and clear exposition of the plan of salvation, and what we cannot omit to mention was, the absence of any sectarian spirit during the proceedings of the evening.—*Dunfermline Press.*

CONVERSION OF AN INFIDEL:—In the *Revival* is an account of the conversion of another infidel or secularist. He had returned from the United States, to Leeds, England, and was in search of employment. He felt very unhappy. He was about to commit suicide. But he says, "A vague mistrust about the future still hovered in my delirious mind." The day after this when seeking work, he came into the vicinity of Ebenezer Chapel, in which special services were being held. He noticed a small bill on the door, and went up to read it. It commenced with the word 'Friend.' That word struck a sympathetic cord in his soul. He went into the chapel and attended a prayer meeting being held in it. He went again in the evening. But we give his own narrative of the result:—

"Whilst the Rev. J. C. Milbourn was preaching I was awakened to a full sense of my perilous position. His text was Matthew xi. 25, 26, 'Lord save us; we perish,' &c. I will not detail the points of the sermon, which was not an elaborate argument addressed to reason, but was a powerful, and awakening appeal to conscience, accompanied by an influence evidently Divine. My conscience was awakened! It arose in majesty and asserted its imperial prerogative. Reason was humbled and reduced to its legitimate function and sphere. The moral revolution, however, was not effected without a terrific struggle within. It was indeed a mighty struggle! My whole nature was convulsed! Tongue cannot describe my sensation at that critical juncture. It was during prayer that the victory was won. The Saviour prevailed; my doubts and fears fled away. I believed in the Lord Jesus Christ as my Saviour. I did indeed believe on him with all my heart; and at that moment the talismanic words 'Peace, be still,' were spoken to my inmost soul. The tempest subsided, and the Comforter whispered—

'Thy light is come,
Glory divine is risen on thee,
Thy warfare's past; thy mourning's o'er;
Look up, for thou shalt weep no more.'

"The great moral incubus,—scepticism, was effectually removed, and I awoke to newness of life. Faith had found her lamp, and hope her anchor, and a genial ray of love was shed abroad in my heart.

"For myself, I am perfectly satisfied with the choice I have made. My conscience and reason approve it. I can now say what I could never say before—"I am happy!" I have at last attained the great object of my being—the knowledge of salvation through faith. Here I rest with safety, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God."

PROTESTANT COLLEGE IN SYRIA.—A Protestant College, to be called the Syrian Protestant Collegiate Institute, is about to be established in Beirut, Syria.

DR. ANDERSON—One of the Secretaries of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, has gone on a visit to the Sandwich Islands. There are about twenty thousand church members in these islands. Yet the civilization of the mass of the people, and even of a large part of the church members is partial. The object of the visit is

to ascertain the actual state of religion among the people, so that it may be seen whether it would be safe for the interests of Christianity for the Board to retire from Missionary effort there, and leave the carrying on of the work to a native pastor.

OPENING OF EVANGELICAL UNION CHAPEL PERTH.—On Sabbath, Jan. 11, the chapel of the Evangelical Union Church, High Street, was opened for the public worship of God. In the morning, the Rev. G. T. M. Inglis, of Edinburgh, preached an appropriate and earnest discourse, from the words, 'Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.' In the afternoon, the pastor of the Church, the Rev. W. Adamson, preached from the text, 'Of Zion it shall be said that this and that man shall be born in her, and the Highest himself shall establish her.' In the evening, Mr. Inglis discoursed from the question of the Saviour, 'What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?' During the day the chapel was completely filled, and in the evening it was crowded in every part, and many had to go away without gaining admission. The collections for the day were most liberal, having amounted in all to no less a sum than £91 0s. 1½d. All the services of Sabbath were of a character to cheer and gladden the hearts of the brethren, and to glorify the name of the Three-One Jehovah.—*Christian News.*

OPENING OF EVANGELICAL UNION CHAPEL, SALTCOATS.—This place of worship was opened for divine service on Jan. 11. Professor Kirk preached in the morning and evening, and Rev. J. McDowal, pastor of the church, in the afternoon.—*Christian News.*

ORDINATION.—The Rev. Wm Halliday, having received a cordial and unanimous call to the pastorate of the Evangelical Union Church, Montrose, which was vacant by the removal of Rev. D. Hislop to Leith, was set apart to the sacred office on the evening of Jan. 7. Sermon by Rev. John Miller, Dundee. Rev. F. Ferguson, Aberdeen, presided, and put the questions to the pastorelect; Rev. R. Wallace, Cupar-Angus, addressed the pastor; and Rev. W. Adamson, Perth, addressed the Church. On the Sabbath following, Rev. H. Stewart of Anstruther introduced Mr. Halliday to his Charge. The settlement is every way harmonious.—*Christian News.*

THE WESTMINSTER CONFSSION OF FAITH.—At the usual monthly meeting of the United Presbyterian Presbytery of Glasgow, Scotland held on Jan. 20, a memorial was read from Mr. Walker (elder), Airdrie, praying that the Confession of Faith be no longer recognized or taught. The Presbytery agreed by a majority to transmit the memorial to the Synod. We shall see what treatment it will receive at the hands of that body.

OPENING OF THE E. U. CHAPEL, EYEMOUTH.—This chapel was publicly opened for divine service on Sabbath, the 15th January, by the Rev. Robert Mitchell, of Hawick, who preached three times to large and attentive audiences. The chapel is a neat and comfortable edifice situated upon and fronting the main street of the town, containing about 100 sittings, with a neat platform, and well lighted up with gas.