

Mary W. Rogers
MONTHLY MISCELLANY.

EDITED AND PUBLISHED

BY
J. CUNNINGHAM AND W. C. GRAVES.

VOL. I.] MONROE CO. TEN. AUGUST, 1843. [NO. 10.

Z. A. EDWARDS,—PRINTER.

TERMS:—THE MONTHLY MISCELLANY is published monthly at fifty cents per annum, invariably in advance.

All communications may be addressed, post-paid, either to W. C. Graves, Madisonville, Monroe co. E. T. or to Jesse Cunningham, Midway P. O. same county.

For special reasons we have concluded to copy from the South Western Christian Advocate the debate between the Rev. Israel Robards, of the Baptist church and the Rev. Timothy Sullens, of the Methodist E. church, as reported by "An Eye Witness." Several Baptist preachers in East Tennessee have, for the last two or three years, been making uncalled for and unprovoked attacks upon the Methodist Discipline. In the spring of 1841 a very large Baptist gun fired off at our Discipline in Knox county, which created quite a panic, but after two days were spent in adjusting the difficulties, in the way of a public debate, the excitement was quelled. The matter seemed to rest in that region until the visit of Mr. Robards to Knoxville, during which time we learned that a Baptist popgun was popping away at our Discipline about ten miles east of Knoxville; but, as is common in such cases, the tow wads scarcely raised blood blisters.

The Baptist champion of Hiwassee has been "laughing at the Methodist Discipline," (to use his own expression) and lugging certain detached portions of it into his sermons on close communion, and making ridicule of it in private company—particularly while trying to proselyte Methodist converts—for the last year or two in this region. If the Rev. gentleman will give the report of this debate a careful reading, perhaps he can suppress his risibles in future, while reading the productions of a mind which would compare with his as a giant would compare with a pigmy.

Nearly all the objections that we have heard urged against our Discipline on the score of close communion, are fully met in Mr. Sullens' reply. Please read, and understand.

From the South-western Christian Advocate

AN OTHER MODE OF ATTACK.

Mr. Editor:—I wish to lay before the ministers and members of the M. E. Church a faithful report of a debate which occurred on yesterday, in the Methodist Church in Knoxville, Ten. between the Rev. Israel Robards a Baptist clergyman, from New York, and the Rev. Timothy Sullens, pastor of the Methodist Church in this place.

Mr. Robards came to our town about four weeks ago, and professing great love and respect for all christian denominations, he was received most cordially by this community. Among the ministers of the different denominations, none were more marked in their attention to him than Mr. Sullens, who invited Mr. Robards to preach in his church the first Sabbath night which he spent in town. After Mr. Robards had preached he presided the protracted meeting which he began the following Saturday, and invited "the beloved Pastor of the Methodist Church and his members" to unite with him in the meeting. As our Baptist brethren had just organized a church in this place, under the care of Rev. Mr. Bullard, from New York, and as Mr. Robards seemed so friendly and catholic in his feelings, there was a general suspension of meetings by other churches, that our Baptist brethren might have a fair chance to build up a church in this place. Mr. Sullens accepted the invitation of Mr. Robards to assist in the meeting; attended every appointment with one or two exceptions, and did all in his power to advance the interest of the cause. Twice before the last day of the meeting our Baptist brethren repaired to the river to immerse some subjects, at which times we learned that our brother was not quite so liberal as he professed to be. At 2 o'clock on last Sabbath, the day the meeting closed how were we astonished to hear Mr. Robards, standing on the bank of the

river, assert "that he could prove to all Knoxville in fifteen minutes, that the Methodists were as much for close communion as the Baptists, if they would stick to the letter of their Discipline. As might have been expected a feeling of surprise spread through the whole congregation, and several Baptist brethren were themselves deeply mortified that an attack so unprovoked should have been made upon our Discipline. Mr. Sullens was not present at the river when the charge was made; but hearing of it, he called upon Mr. Robards early on Monday morning to hear from his own lips what he had stated, and to learn by what section or sections in our Discipline he attempted to prove his charge; and he told Mr. Robards that he felt it his duty both privately and publicly to contradict such a statement. Mr. Robards, who was exceedingly anxious to bring on a public controversy, without giving any definite answer as to the portion of our Discipline which he affirmed, proved close communion, answered Mr. Sullens, "Let it come before the public, I can easily prove what I affirm," and turned away. On Tuesday night, at a Temperance meeting, Mr. Robards took Mr. Sullens aside, and said, "You will doubtless bring this matter before the public," (did not Mr. Robards know it when he made the attack?) "I shall leave shortly, and I want an opportunity to redeem my pledge before I go." Mr. Sullens told him that he was opposed to such debates on the ground that they produced a foolish excitement; but he had a right to make any appointment he saw proper, and at any time. Well, but said Mr. Robards, I want you to attend and reply, if you wish. Mr. Sullens answered, "I shall attend if you make an appointment, and hear what you have to say; but as to replying, I shall not promise; for I do not know that I shall be ready. I never heard of such a charge before, and I have scarcely any idea what course you will pursue; and I now want you to give me at least the section in the Discipline which you intend to use." "No; but if I can have the use of your Church to-morrow, half past 10 o'clock, I will make my appointment." Mr. Sullens told

him that our Church was open to him; and he accordingly made his appointment.

On yesterday, half past 10 o'clock, Mr. Robards after a brief statement of the circumstances which had brought the congregation together, undertook to sustain his charge. He turned to chapt. iii: sec. 1, of our Discipline, and read, "Ye that do truly and earnestly repent of your sins, and are in love and charity with your neighbors, and intend to lead a new life, following the commandments of God, and walking from henceforth in his holy ways; draw near with faith and take this holy sacrament to your comfort: and make your humble confession to Almighty God, meekly kneeling upon your knees." From this invitation, said he, it seems that our Methodist brethren are for open communion, and I do not know but that this invitation given by them on every sacramental occasion goes a little too far. However we will let that pass. Turn to chapt. i: sec. 13, and see what that says, "Question. Are there any directions to be given concerning the Lord's supper?"

(Ans. 1. Let these, &c.)

I make no objections at all to this; let a man stand, sit or kneel, as he sees proper.

"Answer 2. Let no person who is not a member of our Church be admitted to the communion without examination, and so no token given by an Elder or Deacon." I asked a Methodist preacher in Hudson New York, what was meant by a token; but he could not tell. Soon afterwards I met with Dr. Bangs in the City of New York, to whom I proposed the same question. He told me that it meant a ticket.—Does it mean the same that is mentioned in the chap. i: sec. 6, which says "Give tickets to none that wear high heads, enormous bonnets, ruffles, or rings?" He answered, Yes. Will you, sir, give me a certificate to that effect? I will, said Dr. Bangs, who sat down and wrote one. (Here Mr. Robards repeated the language of the certificate, he said he had in his possession, given, if he did not mistake the date, in 1836.) Soon after this I met with presiding Elder Chase, a member of one of the Northern conferences, I do not recollect which, who concurred with

Dr. Bangs as to the meaning of token. (Here Mr. Robards stated that Mr. Chase admitted that the Methodist Discipline, as it now reads, is for close communion—that he Mr. Chase, introduced a resolution in the General conference to have it altered so as to be conformed to our practice; but that nothing was done in the case.) Now, said Mr. R. I am to prove my assertion; not from the usage of the Methodist Church; but from the letter of the Discipline. Mark that.—Well, this is communion day with the Methodist brethren—here is the altar—and before it my wife and self present ourselves to take the sacrament. The preacher asks my wife who she is? I am a member of the Baptist Church, sir. "Well sister, you cannot commune with us."—"Why not sir?" He reads his Discipline to her, "Give no tickets to any that wear high heads, enormous bonnets, ruffles or rings." "Your head, m'am is a little too high; that bonnet of yours is at least six inches wider than a Methodist bonnet ou't to be, and you have no less than half a dozen rings on your fingers. Therefore you cannot come." My wife goes home—lays off her big bonnet, and puts on a smaller one—pulls off her rings—bows her head a little, and comes back to the sacrament.—"Now sir," says she, are there any more objections to me?" "I don't know," says the preacher, "let us see." He turns to chapter i: sec. 23, of his Discipline, and reads, "No person shall be admitted to the Lord's supper among us, who is guilty of any practice for which we would expell a member of our Church." Well, never having read your Discipline, I cannot tell for how many things you do exclude members. I may be guilty. "I'll read you m'am another clause of our Discipline, and if you are not guilty there, I think you may commune." He turns to chapter ii: sec. 7, item 3, and reads, "If a member of our Church shall be clearly convicted of endeavoring to sow dissensions in any of our societies, by inveighing against either our doctrines or Discipline, such person so offending, shall be first reprov'd by the senior minister, or preacher of his circuit, and if he persist in such pernicious practices, he shall be expelled from the Church." "Do you en-

deavor, m'am to sow dissensions in our societies, by inveighing against our doctrines and Discipline?" "I do sir."
 "Well, but will you not promise to quit?" No, I will not: I have done so often, and I intend to keep at it." "Very well you cannot commune with us then."

Well, sir, you have set my wife aside: what objections have you to me?

Are you a Baptist preacher, sir?

I am.

Well, you look to be a plain man; but I do not know so well about it. He turns to chapter i: sec. 19, and reads, "What shall be done with those ministers, or preachers who hold and disseminate publicly or privately, doctrines which are contrary to our articles of religion?"

"Ans. Let the same process be observed as in the case of gross immorality."

"Do you, sir, hold and disseminate publicly and privately doctrines contrary to our articles of religion?"

"Yes, I do."

"Well, but will you not desist?"

"No; never. I mean to speak and preach against them while I live." Thus you see that I, as well as my wife am laid aside.

Again, suppose a member of the Methodist Church neglect to attend class meeting, or love feast, they will be cut off from the Church. Well, I never was in a class meeting nor a love feast, and I never expect to be if I live fifty years; for I see no authority for any such meetings in the Bible. Suppose a member of the M. Church should inveigh against Bishops he would be expelled. I speak and preach against them too. I don't believe that different grades in ministers is any where taught in the book of God; for all are on an equality. Suppose a member of the M. Church should speak against sprinkling, would he not be expelled? Well, I preach against it with all my soul. To talk about sprinkling being baptism is perfect stuff. What if I were to invite you all to commune with me; and instead of bread, should give you a potatoe; and instead of wine, milk.

Well, sprinkling looks to us for baptism, like potatoe and

milk would appear to you for bread and wine. And I will bind myself in a bond of one thousand dollars and give the best kind of security to pay it to any man, who will show me one word of sprinkling connected with this ordinance in the Bible. Suppose a Methodist sister should embrace Calvinistic sentiments? (Here Mr. Robards lugged in the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, from which he read several passages on decrees, election, effectual calling, &c., all of which should a Methodist sister profess to believe, would, he asserted, cause her to be expelled from the Church. If expelled for nothing else, of course she would be received by the Presbyterian Church. But if she come to the communion table again among the Methodists she would be rejected. To prove which, he read chapter ii: sec. 7, last clause, viz. "After such forms of trial and expulsion, such persons shall have no privileges of society or sacraments in our Church without contrition, confession or proper trial.") I do not, says Mr. Robards, condemn the Discipline on this subject; I think it right, and in perfect accordance with the Bible; but I am sorry that the practice of our Methodist brethren is contrary to the sacred rules of their Discipline. Every time they invite all christians of other denominations to commune with them they violate their Discipline; and if our Baptists are in the mire here, they are just as deep as we are:

The balance of Mr. Robard's speech was occupied in vindicating close communion, and the claim which the Baptists had of being the only true Church of Christ.

The following diagram will, I think, give your readers a better idea of Mr. Robard's views of the origin and succession of the Baptist Church than any thing which I could say:

River Jordan.	Papists, 606.	English Church.	Methodist, 1737.
		Calvin, 1536.	
		Luther, 1516.	
Baptists.	Arians, 325.	The only Church of Christ, established by John the Baptist.	

Mr. Robards asserted that there was but one Church for 325 years, which was the old Baptist Church. Then Arius broke off. In 606 the Papists. In 1516 Luther broke off from the Papal Church, and drew after him some from the true Church. In 1536, Calvin forsook the Papists, from which has sprung the Presbyterians. In—the English Church set off from the Catholics, and in 1737, the Methodists sprung from the English Church.

He then made a few quotations from Scripture, the principle of which was "one Lord, one faith, one baptism," and put great stress upon "*one faith*," as being a prominent characteristic of the Baptist Church.

AN EYE WITNESS.

Knoxville, Ten., June 16, 1843.

REV. T. SULLEN'S REPLY.

Mr. Editor.—I promised in my last communication to lay before your readers this week Mr. Sullen's reply to Mr. Robards.

After Mr. Robards closed his speech, Mr. Sullen arose and said:

"Brother Robards promised to prove his assertion in fif-

teen minutes. He has had an hour and forty minutes, with brother Bullard to help him, (Mr. Bullard read some texts of Scripture for Mr. Robards,) and how far he has succeeded I will leave the congregation to judge when I am done.

Mr. Robards began by reading that portion of our Discipline which is the invitation given on every sacramental occasion; and from this he thinks that we go too far, that the invitation is too broad, and by this admission virtually condemned all that he said afterwards. But here he is mistaken. The invitation is not too extensive; for we believe that 'all who do truly and earnestly repent of their sins, and are in love and charity with their neighbors, and intend to lead a new life following the commandments of God, and walking in his holy ways,' are worthy of a seat at the Lord's table, whether he be a Methodist, Presbyterian, or Baptist.

"Brother Robards next turned to our section on the Lord's supper, and made some comments on the passage which forbids those who are not of our church to commune with us, without examination and token given by a deacon or elder. I concur with Dr. Bangs as to the meaning of token; and here permit me to say that we, as well as our Presbyterian brethren, have dispensed with tokens altogether. In former times, when the number of communicants was much smaller than it is at present, and yet the danger of imposition was much greater, we all used tokens. But since the institution of camp-meetings and others of a similar character, when hundreds of members of different churches attend, we have not time for the distribution of tokens, and we merely read to the whole congregation the terms on which they are to be admitted, which is the method by which we now examine them, and we leave every one to determine before God whether he is qualified or not. And as we said before, we now repeat, that all who truly and earnestly repent of their sins, and are in love, &c., are qualified for an admission to the Lord's table, be he called by whatever name he may.

"Brother Robards having ascertained that *token* means

7. Sullens

a ticket, and that it means the same precisely as is mentioned in our Discipline under the head of dress, where we are forbidden to give tickets to any who wear high heads, enormous bonnets, &c., endeavored to prove that we were for close communion on this ground. Now I affirm that if that proves close communion, so does the Bible; and I will go further, and say that our Discipline forbids no member of any denomination to come to our communion table, that is not forbidden by the word of God to go to any sacramental table. That part of our Discipline by which brother Robards made his first attempt to prove close communion, was intended to prevent all superfluous ornaments; and so does the Bible. Do you call on me for the proof? We have it at hand." [Here Mr. Sullens stated that the congregation would perceive that he had some idea of the course which Mr. Robards would pursue, "But how did I get it? Not from Mr. R., but from some of our members whom he has been trying to proselyte, and tear from the fold in which they had been long fed."] "Turn to Tim. ii: 6, and read what St. Paul, an inspired apostle, says on the subject: "In like manner also that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness, and sobriety; *not with broidered hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array.*" Hear what St. Peter says, on the same subject, "Whoso adorning, let it not be that outward adorning of *plaiting the hair and of wearing of gold, or of putting on apparel;* but let it be the hidden man of the heart." And if you will read the fearful judgments denounced against the daughters of Jerusalem, in the latter part of the third chapter of Isaiah, you will be convinced that God never did nor never will approve superfluous ornaments. They are as clearly forbidden as murder. "And if brother Robard's wife dresses as finely as he represented her before our communion table, I say she ought not to come. Does not the Bible say so too? Judge ye. But do all our Baptist and Presbyterian sisters wear superfluous ornaments? No; I am acquainted with many of them, and I know them to be as plain and as exemplary as any Methodist. Does this part of our Discipline cut such

off? No. Brother Robards was aware of that, and hence he abandoned this argument and raised another.

"He turned next to our Discipline and read, 'No person shall be admitted to the Lord's supper among us who is guilty of any practice for which we would exclude a member of our church.' Now to prove that members of other churches would be entirely cut off from our communion table, he turns over several passages to another part of our Discipline, and reads, 'If a member of our church shall be clearly convicted of endeavoring to sow *dissensions* in any of our societies, by *inveighing* against either our doctrines or Discipline,' he shall be expelled, unless he desist. And does this prove us close communionists? He thinks so; at least so far as his wife is concerned, for you recollect, that he introduced her before our altar as declaring that she did endeavor to sow dissensions in our church by inveighing against both our doctrines and Discipline. I was sorry to hear brother Robards make such an assertion; for I can prove to you easily, that whoever is guilty of such conduct, is unworthy of a place at any sacrament. What does dissension mean? Mr. Webster, a standard lexicographer, defines it thus: 'Disagreement in opinion, usually a disagreement which is violent, producing warm debates, or angry words; contention in words; strife; discord; quarrel; breach of friendship and union.' Now I ask, can a person be guilty of such conduct, and be a Christian. As well might you attempt to reconcile Belshazzar and Christ. How is such conduct reconcilable with the doctrines of Christ, who says, 'Blessed are the peacemakers; for they shall be called the children of God?'—the converse of which is, Cursed are the peace breakers; for they shall be called the children of the devil. How is such conduct reconcilable with St. Paul's doctrine, who says, 'Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which you have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.'

7. Selling.

"Let us next turn our attention to *inveigh*. What does it mean? (for when we argue we ought to define our terms.) Mr. Webster says, 'To inveigh' means 'to exclaim or rail against; to utter censorious and bitter language against any one; to reproach.' How does the same lexicographer define the verb *to rail*? 'To utter reproaches, to scoff, to use insolent and reproachful language; to censure in approbrious terms.' And what says the Bible on this subject? 'But now I have written unto you,' says St. Paul, 'not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolator, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one no not to eat.' 1. Cor. v. 11. Here the railer (one who inveighs) is classed with the most abandoned characters on earth. I blush for the man who calls himself a minister of Jesus Christ, and declares that he has *inveighed* against our doctrines and discipline, and that he intends to keep at it. Charity constrains me to believe that brother Robards did not know the meaning of these terms, or he would not have made such an assertion.

"I will make one or two more quotations from Scripture, and close this part of my subject. 'Whereas angels which are greater in power and might, bring not railing accusations against them before the Lord.' 2 Pet. ii: 11 'Michael the archangel; when contending with the devil, . . . durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, 'The Lord rebuke thee.' Jude 9. And if Michael durst not bring a railing accusation against the devil, what right has brother Robards to rail against us; for he is not better than Michael, nor we worse than the devil.' He has no right to do so, according to the word of God; If, I were to hear of a member of the Methodist Church, striving to sow dissensions among our Baptist brethren, I should vote for his expulsion from our church; for such conduct is as much condemned by the Bible as fornication and drunkenness.

"Brother Robards endeavored to prove that he himself would be cut off from our communion table by that part of our Discipline which directs that the same process shall be

observed as in the case of gross immorality against those ministers of *our church*, who hold and disseminate, both publicly and privately, doctrines which are contrary to our religion. The propriety of having such a rule in our Discipline must be obvious to every one. What if one of our preachers should embrace Universalism or Mormonism, how could we get clear of him without something of this character? But brother Robards is mistaken in supposing himself cut off from our sacraments, on the ground that he holds and preaches doctrines contrary to our articles of religion. All this he may do; and while he *reasons* on these subjects in the spirit of the Bible, and does *rail*, he is, according to the *letter* of our Discipline, entitled to a seat at our table. And here let me state that if a minister of our church disseminate doctrines contrary to our articles of religion he violates some of the most sacred vows ever made by man. Before he can be ordained among us, he acknowledges that he has read our form of Discipline, and affirms that he will keep it. And the man who will go and break the vows he has made under the most solemn circumstances, ought to be expelled from any church.

"Brother Robards said he was opposed to class meetings, love feasts, bishops, and sprinkling for baptism, and that for all this he is excluded from our sacraments. I think not. No man is expelled from our communion for differing with us in sentiment. Should a member of our own church embrace views and doctrines contrary to our Discipline, while they entertain them quietly and peaceably, they will not be interrupted; for I never heard of members being expelled from our church simply for embracing Calvinism, or any doctrine contrary to our Discipline. If they strove, however, to sow *dissensions* among us, by *inveighing* against our doctrines, of course they were cut off; and for so doing we are justified by the word of God. Brother Robards after having laid aside our Discipline, attempted to prove that the Baptists were the only true church of Christ, founded by John the Baptist. And if bold, daring assertions can do for proof, I admit that he has succeeded. But does he think he can gull this community by

such stuff? What! the Baptists trace an unbroken succession back to John the Baptist? I affirm, that I am as near akin to John the Baptist, both by church and blood, as brother Robards, and I can trace my genealogy back to him as easily as he or any other Baptist preacher. Yes, I go still further, and assert, that we are more like the primitive church, both in our doctrines and government than the Baptists, and I defy them to gainsay it. And here I must call the attention of the congregation to one of brother Robard's Scriptural quotations, upon which he laid so much stress. *'One Lord, one faith, one baptism.'* That is, there is but one faith, and that is the Baptist faith; but one baptism which is immersion; but one church the Baptist Church; and the world will never get right till all become Baptists. 'O yes, join the Baptists, and all will be one.' Does he suppose that we can be so easily deluded? What! join the Baptists, that we all may be one? How many kinds of Baptists are there? We hear of the six principle Baptists, the Seventh day Baptists, the Missionary and Anti-missionary Baptists, the Arminian and Calvinistic Baptists, the Campbellite and Mormon Baptists—and heaven knows how many more; and among these there is as much bitter controversy—yes, more than you can find among Pedo-Baptists; and yet our brother here says, 'O come and join the old Baptist Church, and let us all be one.' Go sir, and settle the disputes raging among yourselves, before you sound the union trumpet any more in our ears.

"But all this is said from the question at issue. And here, I ask, why did brother Robards make this unprovoked attack upon our Discipline? Have we not treated him with Christian courtesy? Were we not at peace in this place with our Baptist brethren? Why then has he thrown this fire-brand among us? I will tell you why. There is a want of consistency in the conduct of our Baptist brethren, relative to communion, which they cannot force upon the community. They will admit us into their pulpits to preach with them, and to pray with them; They admit that there are as good christians among Pedo-baptists, as among themselves—and yet exclude us from their table.

The community knows that an unbaptized person has no more right to preach the gospel than he has to commune. A spirit of honest inquiry has gone abroad on this subject. Our Baptist brethren know this, and hence their great effort to prove that if they are wrong, so are we—if they are in "the mire," we are hard by their side; and if they are in an error, we are not the people to reprove. Well, I intend, before I close to submit this subject to the congregation. I think it highly important, in order to prevent any misrepresentations that the people decide by vote, before they leave this house, whether or not brother Robards has redeemed his pledge, which was to prove that the Methodist Church, according to the letter of its Discipline, is as much for close communion as the Baptist Church. Has he done so?"

Here Mr. Sullens offered Mr. Robards the privilege of making any further remarks he saw proper; but he declined. Mr. Sullens then asked him if he (Mr. Robards) would not put the vote. This he declined, and stated that he thought the vote had better not be taken; but Mr. Sullens said he had been forced into the debate by Mr. Robards, and he was determined to have an expression of the sentiments of the congregation before he left. The question was then stated *clearly* by Mr. Sullens, and he called upon all who thought that Mr. Robards had sustained his position to rise up. Thirty-two arose. The other side of the question was then submitted, whereupon two hundred and nineteen arose nearly seven to one. And thus ended the debate.

AN EYE-WITNESS

(Continued from page 144.)

REV. JOHN WESLEY. We still continue Mr. Wesley's account of himself.—"I omitted no occasion of doing good: I for that reason suffered evil. And all this I knew to be nothing, unless as it was directed toward inward holiness. Accordingly this, the image of God, was what I aimed at in all, by doing his will, not my own. Yet when, after continuing some years in this course, I apprehended myself

to be near death. I could not find that all this gave me any comfort, or any assurance of acceptance with God. At this I then was not a little surprised; not imagining that I had been all this time building on the sand, nor considering that 'other foundations can no man lay, than that which is laid by God, even Christ Jesus.'

7. Soon after, a contemplative man convinced me still more than I was convinced before, that outward works are nothing, being alone; and in several conversations instructed me, how to pursue inward holiness, or a union of the soul with God. But even of his instructions (though I then received them as the word of God) I cannot but now observe, 1. That he spoke so incautiously against trusting in outward works, that he discouraged me from doing them at all. 2. That he recommended (as it were, to supply what was wanting in them) mental prayers, and the like exercises, as the most effectual means of purifying the soul, and uniting it with God. Now these were, in truth, as much my own works as visiting the sick or clothing the naked; and the union with God thus pursued, was as really my own righteousness, as any I had before pursued under another name.

8. In this refined way of trusting to my own works and my own righteousness, (so zealously inculcated by the mystic writers,) I dragged on heavily, finding no comfort or help therein, till the time of my leaving England. On ship-board, however, I was again active in outward works: where it pleased God of his free mercy to give me twenty-six of the Moravian brethren for companions, who endeavored to show me a more excellent way. But I understod it not at first. I was too learned and too wise. So that it seemed foolishness unto me. And I continued practicing, and following after, and trusting in, that righteousness whereby no flesh can be saved.

(To be Continued.)

work of an angel, or one who was formed to fill a more exalted station in the scale of being. It is, therefore, needless to talk of his escaping from the hand of God, and acting independently of him; my notions of moral agency implies no such powers. Your doctrine, which supposes the efficient energy of God upon the will, is necessary to its motions, is attended with many absurdities and inconsistencies. It is absurd to say, that man cannot move his *will* with as much ease as he can move his *judgment*, or his *hand*, without the application of physical power to produce such exercise or motion. It is inconsistent, also, inasmuch as it makes God the efficient cause of all sinful volitions, among men and devils. It is inconsistent, likewise, in that it represents the *Almighty* as not being able to impart to his own offspring, a power to *will* and *act*, but by his agency constantly exercised upon them. Suppose it to be true, that God, in all cases, influences and guides the wills of man, in perfect accordance with his own most holy will; so that they both run in a parallel line; where is the *sinfulness* of such volitions? Can it be sinful to follow the sacred impulses of Divine influence? Can a man sin by *willing* what God irresistibly disposes him to will? Is not HOLINESS itself, a *conformity* to the Divine will? Is it *wrong* to will as God influences us to will? God's will cannot be *wrong*; of course, if the moral agent's will is always in perfect accordance with the Divine will, he is always willing what is *right*. If, therefore, the volitions of moral agents are produced by Divine agency, and are in perfect accordance with the Divine will, they are always *just as God wills them to be*—they could be no better; for there is no higher standard of holiness, nor more perfect rule of right than the *will of God*. And do you think that God will send any man to endless torments for doing *right*?—for doing as God *wills* he should do? “Will not the Judge of all the earth do right?”

H. We must not exalt our reason and speculations above “what is written.” We “know but in part,” ignorant as we are of God, and the ways of God, which are “higher than the heavens.” We must remember, that he has a sovereign right to do what he wills with his own, and none should say, “why doest thou thus?”

M. I know that God, as sovereign Lord of all, has a right to dispose of his creatures as he pleases; but I am authorised, by his holy word, to believe that he will never exercise his *sovereign right* to do what is *wrong* in the very nature and fitness of things. If the Holy Scriptures any where taught the doctrine, that God so operates upon the heart of man, as to produce all his desires

and volitions, I would feel that I was sinning in his holy sight when I make such statements as the above; but no such doctrine is there taught. No part of the Bible teaches the Hopkinsian doctrine of God's eternal decrees, and all-efficient influence upon the will; and I feel under no more obligation to reverence such doctrines than I do those of Mahomet. I know that many parts of the Bible are mysterious, and incomprehensible; but this does not prove that every thing is Bible truth which is mysterious; not to say, grossly absurd, and wretchedly inconsistent.

H. Does not St. Paul say that God "*worketh all things* after the counsel of his own will?" You know he does; and *sinful volitions* being *something*, God must *work* them as well as others.

M. You know that many texts must be explained according to the analogy of faith, or they cannot be properly understood. Take, for instance, the following, and similar expressions; "It repented the Lord that he had made man; and it grieved him in his heart," &c.; Genesis. "And the Lord repented of the evil which he said he would do unto them, and he did it not;" Josiah; also, Jon. 18. You believe, as well as I, that God does not literally *repent*; and yet the Scripture says he did. These passages show the necessity of *qualifying* and *explaining* some portions of Scripture, in order to a proper understanding of them. Take one more text: "The manifestation of the Spirit is given to *every man* to profit withal;" 1 Cor. 7, &c. I heard a Hopkinsian preacher explain this text once, and he said, that "every man" meant every character spoken of in that chapter; that is, every believer. Now, why not allow of the same latitude in explaining the passage before us? When Paul says, "God *worketh all things* after the counsel of his own will," why not understand him thus: "God's works are all done after the counsel of his own will;" that is, he does nothing at random, like poor, ignorant man; or thus, "God *worketh all things*;" (that is, *these things*; the things spoken of in that place,) "after the counsel of his own will." Does not this appear to be an easy, and natural interpretation?

H. By *all things*, I understand every thing in the universe, without exception.

M. Then you suppose that the "works of the Devil," the "works of darkness," murder, drunkenness, debauchery, and all such crimes, are the *works of the Lord*! Is not this shocking doctrine? Does it not charge all our crimes upon our Maker?

H. It may appear so to one whose views are limited, and bounded by the *appearance* of things; but to one who can grasp the "great whole,"—who views the grand objects which the all-

wise God had in view, when he decreed and produced sin. That is, the glory of God, and the greatest possible happiness of his intelligent universe. God works wickedness in the hearts of men and devils, not for the *sake of wickedness in, and of itself*; for he *abhors sin, as sin*; but, for the *sake of the greater good for which he will make it the occasion*. Had it not been for the sin and fall of man, there could have been no redemption—no sacrifice for sin—no exhibition of pardoning mercy;—in short, no display of the divine nature and character, as made known by the grand scheme of redemption. Once more; the sufferings of the damned in hell, for ever, will enhance the happiness of God's elect children in heaven. They will have occasion, forever, to sing, "Why me! why me!"

M. This plausible argument, which professes to soar, in the greatness of its grandeur and glory, far above the minds of the "uninstructed few," will be found, upon close examination, to be a mere flourish, calculated to mislead and bewilder the simple, and render palatable, the horrid system of *eternal reprobation*.

What real acquisitions can be made, to the *infinite glories and ineffable happiness* of the GREAT GOD, by the partial display which he has made of himself, in the redemption of fallen man? Poor, short-sighted mortals, that we are; we seem to think of God as some do of great earthly monarchs; that their *glory* and *greatness* depends upon a *display* of their splendor, fine equipage, &c. &c. But, suppose I allow all the force that can be given to the argument in favor of such a display of the Divine perfections; it will not militate against my doctrine; for the All-knowing Jehovah foresaw that man would sin as he did. And, of course, there was no necessity to decree that he *should* do it. Suppose, for example, you had a neighbour, who, after receiving many special favors at your hand, determined in his mind, to injure you as much as he could; and you had foresight to know that, on a certain day, he would come to your house, in order to accomplish his wicked design; you prepare for his approach, and so arrange your concerns that his efforts to *injure*, shall ultimately *benefit* you. I suppose you to be able not only to *foreknow* the whole scene, from first to last; but, also, to possess power to *control his will, dispositions and actions*. He is under obligations to favor you; and you hold him responsible for his conduct, before your neighbours and fellow creatures. You promise great rewards if he will fulfill his obligations, and threaten him with death in case he should undertake to injure you; as you clearly see he certainly will. You see him coming *freely* and of his

own accord, and so arrange your matters as to make his wicked designs and actions an occasion of displaying your amiable character before your family and subjects, (for I suppose you to be a ruler.) You know he will *certainly come*, and that you will make it an occasion of exalting your own character and the happiness of your dependents. Under such circumstances as these, would it be wisdom in you to go to the man, tie him fast with cords of necessity, and constantly *move* his will and affections to insult you? If you know he *will come*, why use any influence to bring him? Would it set forth your character to any better advantage, to *necessitate* him to do, what you see he will *certainly* do, *without* such *necessitating* influence?

Did not the All-wise Jehovah see, from the beginning, how all his accountable creatures would freely act? He certainly did; and so disposed the great concerns of his kingdom as to anticipate all the sins of fallen angels and men; and, in his adorable wisdom, overrules them, in a way that displays his amiable perfections. But if he had sufficient knowledge to foreknow, with infinite certainty, how all beings would act, and to make his arrangements accordingly, where is the necessity for his *determining* that they should thus act, and for his influencing them thus to act, by his irresistible energy? I believe that the "full orb'd Jehovah" can, by one intuitive glance of his infinite mind, behold all actions and events that ever did, or ever will, take place; and that, too, with more ease than the eye of man can behold the plainest object. He saw proper to leave free agents at perfect liberty to act in ten thousand other ways than those in which they ever did or will act; at the same time, he knew the only ways in which they would ever use their liberty of action, with as much certainty as if he had secured their actions by laws of fatality. The whole system of decrees, by which God is supposed to have bound himself, and all his creatures, is entirely superfluous, and may be considered as the relics of heathen fatality, introduced into the church in the fourth century by St. Austin, and soon received as the gospel of Christ.

As to God's decreeing that some men and angels should sin and suffer in hell eternally, for the happiness of others, I believe no such thing. What happiness could it afford A and B, for C and D to suffer in the flames of hell? Is it the native feeling of piety or benevolence, to see others suffer? Certainly not. And if your doctrine of eternal decrees be true, the sufferings of one could be of no service, as a warning beacon to another; for, the eternal destiny of all being fixed by unchangeable decrees, is be-

yond the reach of influence from *motives; means* and *ends* being all made certain by eternal predestination.

Again; it seems to me, that if the system of Hopkinsian Calvinism be true; that God decreed all the sins of men and angels, and caused them to take place, by disposing their wills to sin, he would appear in a very unfavorable point of light, before an intelligent universe, as being so angry with these creatures, for doing what he caused them to do, as to send his Son to die on the cross to make an atonement for actions with which he was well pleased, having "*worked*" them himself. The inconsistency increases, when he is represented as obeying unto death for an *elect* few, only, and sending the other part of mankind to endless torment, *for doing his will*. Away, then, with your "sublime scheme" of the "great system of decrees." Instead of "displaying" to advantage, the character and perfections of God, they cast reflections upon his holiness, goodness, justice, and truth; and, therefore, cannot be of the Bible.

H. It is much easier to *declaim* than to *reason*; to create seeming difficulties, than to point out and refute error. To me it appears one of the brightest displays of the divine nature, the redemption of man, and the great system of eternal decrees. But let us return to the condition of Adam in Paradise.

M. I have no objection; but would rather postpone it until we meet again.

H. Very well. I am willing to rest awhile.
(*To be continued.*)

REVIVALS.

At a Methodist Camp-meeting, near Winchester, Ky. about two weeks since, one hundred and twenty persons profess to have obtained an interest in Christ, and the pardon of their sins; and at a Camp-meeting in Bourbon county, a few days after, between 30 and 40. Within the last three weeks 33 white persons, and a considerable number of blacks, have been added to the Methodist church in Lexington. Nearly one hundred have been added to the Methodist church in this town, in the course of the last year. These facts have been communicated to us by the Rev. Mr. Stevenson.
Edit. Lum.

Eighty-one persons of color received baptism by immersion in Augusta, Geo. on the first Sabbath in July.

In East Guilford, Con. the number of conversions since the present revival commenced, is estimated at about one hundred

In New Milford, a revival has commenced since the meeting of the conference of churches in that place. *Rel. Int.*

We learn from the Columbian Star, that 23 persons have been lately baptized at South Quay, 21 in Black Creek Church, 6 in Suffolk, and 55 at Mill Swamp, all in Virginia.

A letter dated London, August 6, says, "Our Conference is now sitting. Above eight thousand members have been received the last year, exclusive of those on trial."

Christian Advocate & Journal.

Extract of a letter dated Steubenville, Ohio, August 30.

"Our Conference closed its session yesterday morning, and Bishop George left this in good health and spirits, considering the labours of the past week. We had a tolerably pleasant and agreeable conference, and the labours of the preachers were not in vain in this place. Several souls were awakened and brought into a state of gospel liberty."

Id.

"THE SABBATH A DELIGHT."

I have often thought that Christians were remiss in reminding each other of certain points of duty. They do not obey the precept of exhorting one another daily. Their hours of social communion are too often passed without reference to their spiritual state. They tell of all their temporal fortunes or misfortunes; but rarely give a statement of their spiritual condition.

Now, if they were more frequently to inquire after the health or prosperity of the little world within, they might quicken each other's zeal in a profitable manner. Indeed I confess with shame my own culpable negligence in this respect, and acknowledge that I have felt keen self reproach for not making closer inquiries of Christian friends. You and I passed three days together, during which time I learnt the most minute particulars of your joys and sorrows, and yet asked no details of the progress you were making in christianity. What inexcusable inconsistency we Christians daily commit! We profess to make religion a paramount object of consideration, and yet think and speak of all other things before it.—Let us at least take shame to ourselves for such a violation of our most sacred obligations.

I remember a little circumstance that occurred when I was in a state of spiritual darkness. I was sitting in a pew at church next to some ladies, who were, I was told, zealous professors of

religion. I had remarked in a whisper to my companions, that these ladies joined with great solemnity in the different parts of worship. When the blessing was pronounced, we determined to sit still until the outer part of a crowded congregation should have quitted the church. As the service had really been impressive, I was awed into a degree of seriousness, which did not soon give way to the natural gaiety of my disposition. I sunk into a reverie, and would have enjoyed meditation, had I not been interrupted by the audible whisperings of the two pious ladies in the next pew. They began by earnest inquiries after each other's health. Then followed details of their families and connexions and acquaintances; in the course of which desultory conversation I heard insinuations and inuendoes of no very charitable description, till at length, the subject having become confidential, their voices sunk into an inaudible murmur.

Christians are apt to fall off too suddenly from their devout frames during divine worship. How much light discourse commences while the congregation is dispersing; and how little suitable seriousness is preserved through the day which we are commanded to keep holy. I am convinced that a neglect of the Sabbath is one great cause of spiritual declension. Few persons understand the obligations implied in the 4th commandment; and fewer still are scrupulous in practising them strictly. My own experience convinces me of the danger of a half-way observance of the injunctions with regard to our day of rest. It is so manifestly the intention of our heavenly Father, that we should occupy our thoughts with holy themes on his own day, that we ought to honor him in a particular manner, for having vouchsafed us so precious a privilege. We should consider ourselves as invited guests of our beneficent Parent on that day. We are permitted to draw near him in his ordinances, and to maintain communion with him during the day. He not only gives us leave, but enjoins us, to lay by the burden of our temporal cares, and participate in spiritual pleasures. What ingratitude, then, are we guilty of, when we complain of the irksomeness of refraining from unhallowed occupations on the day which the Lord has hallowed for his own use.

There is one Christian duty eminently in unison with the Sabbath feelings of the heart. This is the important privilege of praying for our enemies. Few people are without evil wishes in this world, and we should never forget to pray for them.—There is not so powerful a softener of animosity as fervent prayer.—When we have received ill offices from our fellow beings we are apt, in spite of Christian restrictions, to feel resentment towards

them. This is, as we well know, a sinful frame of mind, against which we must unceasingly struggle. If we pray to the Lord to bless our enemies, we cannot feel resentment towards them, and it is a good habit, whenever resentment is awakened, by any untoward circumstance, to go immediately to the throne of grace with our intercessory petitions.

Richmond Visitor.

"WICKEDNESS OVERTHROWETH THE SINNER."

1. It exhausts his *property*, whether much or little. Sin is a very expensive thing; a person cannot commit it to any extent, but at considerable loss, not only of time, but also of substance. The passions are clamorous, exorbitant, and restless, till gratified; and this must be repeated successively, even while habit is forming, as well as when it is confirmed by a maturity in wickedness. The case of the prodigal son is in point; who proceeded in a course of licentiousness and extravagance till he had wasted all his patrimony in riotous living, and was reduced to the necessity of desiring the husks on which the swine did feed; Luke xv, 16.

2. It blasts his *reputation*. Sin can never be deemed honorable, on correct principles; yet while practical sinners possess pecuniary means of supporting themselves in their vices, they still keep up their name and rank in the world; not in the church of God, nor in the estimation of Heaven. But when the means of supplying fuel necessary to feed the fires of foul desire and towering ambition fails, then their outward splendours go out in darkness, and they sink into contemptuous neglect and total forgetfulness. "The name of the wicked shall rot," Prov. x, 7; so that persons shall turn away from it with disgust. "The candle of the wicked shall be put out;" Prov. xxiv, 20.

3. It destroys his *health*. Intemperance has a natural tendency to undermine the best constitution: it is a violence done to the physical order of things in the system: it renders a man old in constitution while he is young in years: it expends the natural vigor prematurely, and renders the body a weak, enervated, shadowy substance. The languors, flatulencies, hypochondriacal affections, and a long train of feelings and apprehensions, show the fatal attacks made by sin, and that the tide of life is ebbing apace.

4. It hastens the approach of *death*. Wicked men frequently do "not live out half their days;" Psal. lv, 23; "for when they shall say, peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh as a thief in the night;" Thess. v, 3. Sometimes their passions hurry them forward to the commission of crimes, which terminate in

the most disgraceful exit; they die examples of public justice. Wisdom has "length of days in her right hand;" Prov. iii, 16; but to the wicked she says, "All they that hate me love death;" Prov. viii, 36.

5. It effects the damnation of the *soul*. A sinner "wrongeth his own soul;" Prov. viii, 36. Obeying the dictates of sin, he quengeth the Spirit of grace, neglects the salvation of the gospel, disregards the threatenings of the law, and proceeds in acts of aggression, till having sinned beyond remedy, he goes to his own place. "The wicked shall be turned into hell;" Psal. ix, 17; from which place there is no redemption, for the torments are literally everlasting, the smoke of them ascending up for ever and ever.

THETA.

From Zion's Herald.

INCOMPETENT MINISTERS

This subject has been so often agitated and so much exaggerated that our minds have become quite sensitive to it, and when those and like hackneyed expressions are used without proper qualification, we are warranted by the established usage of the terms to take the same application that their inventors have taken the liberty to make of them. In an address of the Charitable Society in the state of Connecticut, for the education of indigent pious young men for the ministry, it is stated, that "in our land are only 3000 educated ministers, and that there are 5,000,000 of souls destitute of proper religious instruction;" that, "in our whole population are only 1200 organized congregations; the remainder is in the hands of illiterate men, or like primeval chaos, without form, and void, and darkness resting upon it." Again: "These illiterate men are not possessed of an English education, and in many instances, are unable to read and write. By them, as a body, learning is despised, and with few exceptions they are utterly unacquainted with theology." "One half of the district of Maine is destitute of stated instruction, and 40,000 of the inhabitants not only deprived of the blessings of a regular ministry, but exposed, to the errors of enthusiastic and false teachers." "In the whole western part of the state of Rhode Island, including one half of the population of the state, is but one regularly educated minister." "New-York state, containing a population of 1,000,000, has in it 500,000 destitute of the stated means of grace.—Thus on the right and left, Connecticut is bounded by a moral wilderness, and her sympathies are demanded by a famine of the word of life." "The district including Ohio, the western counties of Pennsylvania, and the states of Kentucky, Tennes-

see, Louisiana, and all the territories, are a population of 2,000,000, 1,974,000 of which are unsupplied. In Louisiana, containing 76,000 souls, is only one Protestant minister." In the state of Virginia, containing 974,000 inhabitants, are 915,000 of her population in the hands of unlettered men, or totally destitute of the means of grace. The state of Maryland is no better than Va. In the state of Georgia are 452,000 souls: 442,400 of the population destitute, and only ten qualified ministers in the whole state."

Only a few days since, in a sermon preached in Boston before the society for promoting Christian knowledge, it was stated, "that in the state of New Hampshire are 100 parishes destitute of regularly educated ministers; Rhode Island worse, and the farther we proceed south, worse and worse." In a late account given of the state of religion in the Canadas, it is said, "The prevailing denomination of these provinces is the Methodist, conducted by itinerating preachers: these preachers are illiterate, rude in their manners, and many of them very exceptionable in their lives." At a late prayer meeting held in this city for the colleges, to which we were invited, were some broad intimations given on this subject in the old terms of "competent and incompetent ministers." Newspapers and missionary journals are constantly teeming with such like expressions.

In short, we can scarcely ever attend any of those associations which have for their professed objects the union and promotion of Christianity, without having our feelings more or less affected by the cruel torture of a topic which has been wounded till, like an open sore, it bleeds the moment it is touched.

These are the apologies we have to offer—for not uniting with our Congregational brethren in their various religious confederations. If these are not deemed satisfactory, we have others still in reserve which we will with pleasure offer whenever demanded.

We feel it insulting to our common sense to be invited to the field of religious association in conjunction with men who, like the sons of Jacob, have already dug a cave, and are resolved to profit by the degradation of their younger brethren.

Missionary Anniversary in the Society Islands.

One of the native speakers said: "The Gospel cannot be conveyed to distant lands without means. This is the way: pray with the mouth and give with the hands. To pray without giving, is a lying prayer." Another said: "It is because God de-

sires that we bring forth fruit to him, that he requires us to give a portion of our property. Let the word of God spread widely. Let not the husband be angry if the wife give to this good cause."—A third remarked: "We are all collected together this day to promote the work of God. Let us be diligent—beware lest any of us become like Ananias and Sapphira, keeping back that which belongs to God."—A fourth added: "The great tree has grown—the shade has stretched to numerous lands; it has not grown by the sword, but by the prayers of those in Great Britain who sent us this word." And a fifth—"Let us not begin at the top of the tree,—let us begin at the root,—let our hearts be found in this work."—And a sixth—"Let not our subscription be like powder put into a gun without shot—make a great noise and do no execution."

Rec. & Tel.

ASSURANCE. Presumption on the subject of religion it is to be feared, is frequently practised. Men claim God for their God and friend, and profess to confide in his mercy and goodness, without any scriptural authority for so doing. This, in some instances, may have originated in a religious *descent*,—"We have Abraham for our father," Matt. iii, 9, without having experienced a gracious change of heart. "He is not a Jew who is one outwardly: but he is a Jew who is one inwardly and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God," Rom. ii, 28, 29. A religious *education* may have produced this effect in some persons. If not correct, with regard to sound evangelical principles and views, by such an education moral habits may have been induced unconnected with gospel doctrines; the result must be a Pharisaical religion, a 'clean cup and platter,' a garnished outside, while the heart, as to its real state, is likened to an "open sepulchre" full of rottenness and dead men's bones." Wealthy persons, moved to sympathy and acts of beneficence, by the privation and sufferings of their fellow men; or prompted by the examples of others, to enrol their names in the lists of generous benefactors, who advocate the cause of suffering humanity, at home, or in distant lands; may presume to think

as these actions are formerly good in themselves, and beneficial to others, that they who come forward in this way, solely on this account, pleasing to God. But the apostle says, "Though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not *love*, it profiteth me nothing," 1 Cor. xiii, 3. Here let us observe, that scriptural assurance of the divine favour, can be obtained only by *penitents*, who mourn before God the folly and crimes of their past lives, confess and forsake their sins, are anxious to obtain salvation, are found in a diligent use of the appointed means of grace for that purpose,—and by such persons, only *through faith* in our Lord Jesus Christ, resting wholly on his atoning sacrifice for remission of sins; and acceptance with God. Believers are "accepted in the Beloved." They "receive the promise of the Spirit through faith;" and, by his direct testimony in the heart, are enabled to say, "O God, thou art my God." Having "received the spirit of adoption," they cry, "Abba, Father." This is a *divine* assurance.

INFIDELITY AND DEATH.

From Dr. Dwight's Travels.

The well-known Col. Allen was an avowed infidel. One day he was visited by Dr. Elliott, and after dinner introduced to the Colonel's library, where some works on Deism were particularly brought to the notice of the visitor. While looking over one of those volumes, a servant tapped at the library door, and announced to the Dr. that his daughter was lying at the point of death. Dr. Elliott was requested to accompany him to the chamber of death. On going to the bed-side of his beloved and dying child, she addressed her father thus—"Father, I am dying! shall I believe those things which you have taught me, or must I believe what my mother has taught me?" The colonel's wife was a woman of distinguished piety. Col. A. was an avowed professor of Deism and Infidelity; he looked on his dying daughter, his countenance changed, his features altered, his lips quivered, when he said,—"*Believe what your mother has taught you!*" The test was too much for him; there was a conflict between his pride of intellect, his principles as a champion of infidelity,

and the natural, the genuine feelings of a parent whose daughter was just entering an eternal world. *Religious Messenger.*

Mr. Fletcher, preaching on Noah as a type of Christ, was in the midst of a most animated description of the terrible day of the Lord, when he suddenly paused, every feature of his expressive countenance was marked with painful feelings, and striking his forehead with the palm of his hand, he exclaimed, Wretched man that I am! Beloved brethren, it often cuts me to the soul, as it does at this moment, to reflect that while I have been endeavouring by the force of truth, by the beauty of holiness, and even by the terrors of the Lord, to beg of you to walk in the peaceable paths of righteousness, I am, in respect to many of you who reject the Gospel, only tying millstones round your necks to sink you deeper in perdition. The whole church was electrified, and it was some time before he could resume his subject.

Idleness is the hot bed of temptation, the cradle of disease, and the canker worm of felicity. In a little time, to the man who has no employment, life will have no novelty, and when novelty is laid in the grave, the funeral of comfort will enter the church yard. From that moment it is the shade, and not the man, who creeps along the path of mortality. On the contrary, what solid satisfaction does the man of diligence possess? What health in his countenance? What strength in his limbs? What vigour in his understanding? With what a zest does he relish the refreshments of the day? With what pleasure does he seek the bed of repose at night? It is not the accidental hardness of a pillow that can make him unhappy, and rob him of sleep. He earns his maintenance, and he enjoys it. He has faithfully laboured in the day, and the slumbers of the night are a sweet retribution to him. To the diligent man every day is a little life, and every night is a little heaven. The toil has been honest and her reward is sure.

Babylon.—The Hon. Capt. Keppel, in the narrative of his visit to this ancient spot, says, that the Tower of Babel, the brickwork of which, in many parts, is completely molten, resembles what the Scriptures prophesied it should become, "a burnt mountain." From the summit of the tower, Capt. Keppel had a distinct view of the vast heaps which constitute all that now remains of ancient Babylon; a more complete picture of desolation could not well be imagined. The eye wandered over a

barren desert, in which the ruins were nearly the only indication that it had ever been inhabited. "It was impossible," adds the enterprising traveller, "to behold this scene, and not be reminded how exactly the predictions of Isaiah and Jeremiah have been fulfilled, even in the appearance Babylon was doomed to present: that she should never be inhabited; that the Arabian should not pitch his tent there; that she should become heaps; that she should be a desolation, a dry land, and a wilderness."

POETRY.

The Fall.—Gen. iii. 6.—BY C. WESLEY.

She saw; she took; she ate;
Death entered by the eye;
And parlying in a tempted state
They lust, consent, and die.

But all mankind, restored,
Their Eden may retrieve:
And lo, by faith we see our Lord,
We touch, and taste, and live!

Jesus, thou art a tree
That makes the foolish wise;
And safely We may feed on thee,
And feast both heart and eyes.

Wisdom divine Thou art,
Received through faith alone,
And when thou didst thyself impart,
We know as we are known.

DEATH OF MOSES.—DR. WATTS.

Sweet was the journey to the sky,
The holy prophet tried:
"Climb up the mount," said God, "and die,"
The prophet climbed, and died.

Softly his fainting head he lay
Upon his maker's breast,
His maker soothed his soul away,
And laid his flesh to rest.

In God's own arms he left the breath,
That God's own spirit gave;
His was the noblest road to death,
And his the sweetest grave.

Albany, N. Y.—A correspondent informs us, that the ministry of the word in the city of Albany, is, at present, attended by immense crowds of people, and that a number of remarkable cases of conversion have taken place. The most perfect harmony and fellowship prevails among the ministers of the gospel there.—*Philadelphia.*

From an esteemed correspondent at Newburgh, N. Y. we are happy to learn that the work of the Lord is prospering—20 or 30 have joined society—and the revival still continues. To God be all the praise.

Revival in Potsdam, St. Lawrence Co. N. Y.—Extract of a letter from the Vev. B. G. Paddock, dated Dec. 18, 1826. "We have such a revival of religion as I never witnessed before, although I was in the great reformation at Utica and Rome last winter. We hold prayer meetings in our village nearly every evening. Our chapel, which is a good sized one, is literally filled, and the meetings are more and more interesting. At nearly every meeting some soul or souls are brought to rejoice in the God of their salvation. Some of them are the first characters in our village. Some of all ranks, ages and conditions in society, are brought to praise God. Several who have been zealous Universalists have come forth publicly and acknowledged their errors and their sins, and asked the prayers of the saints, and soon have been made to rejoice in a better hope, even 'Christ formed in them the hope of glory.' Such glorious times I never saw before; perhaps fifty in one meeting, who have lately been converted, will arise and speak of the goodness of God to their souls. The work is general, but no where so powerful as in this town and village."

FROM THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER.

MISS LIVERMORE.

Our readers may have observed in our columns, recently, notices of Miss Livermore's intention to preach at the Capitol and elsewhere. Our engagements have not allowed us to attend her preaching, had we wished to do so. Those, who have heard her, speak highly of her natural gifts, and some are even enraptured by her eloquence. Among the latter is the esteemed Lady who is the author of the following Letter, of which we have been allowed to take a copy for publication. It is ad-

dressed to the daughter of the writer, who resides in a distant part of the country.

"Washington, 9th Jan. 1827.

MY BELOVED CHILD : I witnessed a scene yesterday, so novel and impressive, that I cannot forbear attempting a description of it. I say attempting, for the sensibilities were more strongly affected than the senses, consequently a just delineation is very difficult. It had been rumored for some weeks, that a woman of considerable pretensions had solicited in vain for permission to preach at the Representatives Hall at the Capitol. So you see, after all the professions of veneration for our sex, made by mankind, when tested by their acts, they say "What good thing can come out of Nazareth?"

Thanks to the Christian Pastors of Georgetown ; they invited her to their Churches, from whence the fame of her eloquence spread through the City—curiosity prevailed over illiberal prejudice, and she was invited to preach at the Capitol. We attended at an early hour, and found the hall, lobby, and gallery, so completely filled that it was almost impossible to get admission : And I am told the Avenue itself was full of persons excluded.

When I looked round and saw the numerous audience, greater than I had ever seen on any former occasion, I trembled for the yet unseen female who was to address them. At length she appeared, attended by a friend.—Her figure is good, her height some what above mediocrity, her face pale, perhaps some would say plain, but pleasing, and indicative of great serenity and goodness. They were both dressed in a style so simple and neat, you would have taken them for Quakers. She ascended the Speaker's Chair, and her friend seated herself by her. She commenced, in the usual manner, by prayer and singing. She then read the 112th psalm in a voice somewhat hurried and tremulous, and selected her text from 2d Samuel, 23d chap. part of the 3d and all of the 4th verses—"He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God. And he shall be as the light of

the morning, when the sun riseth, even a morning without clouds, as the tender grass springing out of the earth clear shining after rain."

The President, and many members of Congress, were present. From her text, you will readily perceive her address was intended principally for the rulers of the nation. But she embraced the whole multitude—the rulers of schools—the rulers of families : and, as individuals, the rulers of our passions.

Her language was correct, persuasive, and judging by my own feelings, the profound attention and sympathy of the audience, extremely eloquent. Many wept even to sobbing. C. first yielded to the general impression, and even I, although unused to the melting mood, I, who thought my heart was seared by affliction, and my eyes dried by weeping, found that heart relenting, and those eyes dissolving in a trickling thaw.

Judging, as I said, by my own feelings, and I have no other test, I should say she is the most eloquent preacher I have listened to since the days of Mr. WADDELL.

But no language can do justice to the pathos of her singing. For when she closed by singing a hymn, that might with propriety be termed a prayer, in which she asks the divine perfections of each sacred character recorded in Scripture, her voice was so melodious, and her face beamed with such heavenly goodness, as to resemble a transfiguration, and you were compelled to accord them all to her. I could have listened from morn till noon, and from noon till dewy eve of a Summer's day. It savoured more of inspiration than any thing I ever witnessed; and to enjoy the frame of mind which I think she does, I would relinquish the world. Call this rhapsody if you will: but would to God you had heard her! I think you would have felt as I did, and I may add, as I now do."

"What knowest thou, O wife! whether thou shalt save thy husband? or what knowest thou, O man! whether thou shalt save thy wife?"

It is, no doubt, a dangerous experiment, for any Christian to

marry an unbeliever.—We knew, however, an instance of a lovely saint, who we believe is now in heaven; who, after much trial on this subject, gave her hand to the man on whom she had already placed her tenderest affection. He possessed almost every grace; but was destitute of the grace of God. By spending the early part of his life in a foreign land and associating with those who had the reputation of gentlemen, he had imbibed the fashionable habit in that place, of using God's name in vain in common conversation. His new and much loved wife sought to reclaim him; she knew the only way to his heart; she took advantage of his love for her, to win him to Christ, and she effectually succeeded.

One day, as she was standing before him, in company with a few friends, who were listening to his conversation, in order to give additional interest, as he supposed, to what he was relating, he added the name of Christ. He looked at his wife and saw her in tears.—He was confused. With ineffable sweetness she raised her hand, and gently pressed his chin: "Oh!" said she, "if you knew how much I love that *dear name*, you would never again pain my heart by trifling with it."—His heart was touched.—He was unable to proceed. He asked her forgiveness, and soon left the room. In this way he was saved from ruin, and is now an eminent example of piety. *Augusta Herald.*

Female temper.—"It is particularly necessary for girls to acquire command of temper; because much of the effects of their powers of reasoning and of their wit, when they grow up, depend upon the gentleness and good humor with which they conduct themselves. A woman who should attempt to thunder with her tongue, would not find her eloquence increase her domestic happiness. We do not wish that women should implicitly yield their better judgement to their fathers or husbands; but let them support the cause of reason with all the *grace of female gentleness*.

A man, in a furious passion, is terrible to his enemies; but a woman in a passion is disgusting to her friends; she loses all the respect due to her sex, and she has not masculine strength and courage to enforce any other kind of respect. These circumstances should be considered by those, who advise that no difference should be made in the education of the two sexes.

The happiness and influence of women both as wives and mothers, and indeed, in every relation, so much depend on their temper, that it ought to be most carefully cultivated. We should not suffer girls to imagine that they balance ill humour by some good quality or accomplishment; because, in fact, *there are none which can supply the want of temper in the female sex.*" *Th.*