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Jewish Schools at Cochin.

These Schools, which began to be established about two years ago, in Cochin and its vicinity, are under the Superintendence of Mr. and Mrs. E. Laseron, Missionaries of the Church of Scotland. They are designed for the Christian instruction of Jewish, and other children, of both sexes. The Girls, who are in separate schools, are also taught needlework, and other useful domestic arts, by Mrs. L. The following brief statistics will show the present state of the Mission, as regards the department of education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of Schools</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consisting of Schools for Boys</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do. for Girls</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these schools, five are exclusively for Jewish children. The number of scholars in 1846, was upwards of 500, of which about 160 are Jews; the remainder being Heathens, Romanists, Syrians and Mussulmans.

Considering the comparatively short time the schools have been in full operation, these results indicate considerable success, and it is hoped also, the evidence of the Divine blessing.

Although the salaries of the Missionaries are defrayed by the Church at home, all the other expenses of the schools must be met by subscriptions raised in this country.

The estimated expenses for the present year will not be less than Rs. 950 0 0

Estimated amount of subscriptions, &c. on Western Coast, — 700 0 0

Leaving to be supplied, a deficiency of — 250 0 0

Besides what is thus necessary for the annual expenditure, funds are also required to build a proper school-house in Cochin, and some others also at out-stations. For these purposes it is calculated that about Rupees 600 will be required; so that about Nine Hundred Rupees in all, are needed in order to the proper and efficient carrying on of the Mission. It is trusted that the liberality of the Christian Community of Southern India will not long leave the Mission unfurnished with this comparatively small amount of funds; and it is in the hope of contributing in part, at least, to its realization, that the present statement is now made public to the friends of Christian Education in Madras, and in other parts of the Presidency. We cannot but believe, that many will be willing and thankful to aid in gathering into the fold of the Good Shepherd these lambs of the lost and scattered flock of Israel.

Contributions and subscriptions will be received by Mr. Laseron, at Cochin; and in Madras, by the Chaplains of St. Andrew's Church.

Subscriptions already received:

- Rev. M. Bowie, — — — — Rs. 10 0 0
- Rev. E. K. Hamilton, — — — — 20 0 0

Bibles for Soldiers and Sailors.

Officers commanding Her Majesty's, and the Honorable Company's European Regiments, and Commanders of Ships in the Naval and Merchant Service, may be supplied (for the use of their men) with the Bibles of the Naval and Military Bible Society (of England,) neatly bound and double-clasped, and expressly designed for the use of the Army and Navy, at the following low rates—viz.:

- Nonpareil, 18mo. (Hospital size) English cost price, 2s. 9d. — Rs. 1 0 0
- Ruby, 16mo. (Knapsack size) do. do. 2s. 7d. — 1 12 0

To Sailors and Soldiers themselves, or for the use of their families, the prices will be reduced one-half.

Application to be made to the Reverend R. K. Hamilton, Junior Scottish Chaplain.

Madras, February, 1847.
THE EVILS OF WAR.

Quis fuit horrendos primum qui protulit ensos?
Quis furor est utram bellis accresce mortem?—TIBULLUS.

Oh, for a lodge in some vast wilderness,
Some boundless continuity of shade—
Where rumour of oppression and deceit,
Of unsuccessful or successful War,
Might never reach me more.—Cowper.

There are many social evils in existence—many habits and practices of society, in themselves, obviously reprehensible—which, however, from long established usage, and various other causes, have, in the general judgment of mankind, not only almost ceased to be regarded as criminal, but have come, in many cases, to be looked upon as expedient, and even defended as justifiable. Of none of these evils, probably, is this more true, than it is of that fatal and injurious practice which forms the subject of our present consideration. Armed with the weight of an ancient origin, and long continued existence; universally tolerated and practised in all ages and nations; closely, and apparently inextricably interwoven with the framework of existing society; capable, moreover, of so much plausible vindication and defence; and associated with so much that is imposing, dazzling, and attractive in the eyes of men—with the memorable achievements of conquest, with the heroic struggles of liberty and patriotism, with the proudest recollections of national triumph and glory—War—irrational, inexpedient, and criminal as it is, and as calm and dispassionate reflection must pronounce it to be—is either scarcely recognised as an evil at all, or else, if admitted abstractedly to be so, is looked upon as one so necessary and inevitable, that the bare idea
of attempting, or even of hoping for, its suppression, if not actually denounced as impolitic, is at least regarded as, in the highest degree, impracticable and visionary.

Yet war, it cannot be doubted, is the most gigantic and calamitous of social evils: injurious to man, abhorrent to God, repugnant to every dictate of humanity and religion; and so utterly incompatible with the purpose, the progress, and the destinies of Christianity, that the ultimate triumph of the latter is only to be consummated in the total extermination of the former; that, as inspired prediction has unequivocally announced, the hour which shall witness the last "going forth of the word of the Lord," the final exaltation of His "house (the Church) on the top of the mountains," and the "flowing of all nations unto it," shall also be the hour, when "they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; when nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."*

If, therefore, the continuance of war is thus so incompatible with the present progress, and final triumph of the religion of peace, it is, manifestly, an evil which every disciple of that religion ought now to oppose, and seek, as far as possible, to prevent. And if, moreover, war is an evil thus destined and foredoomed to be utterly obliterated from the earth, its ultimate suppression is no visionary chimera, but a result of as certain final attainment, as is its prosecution of present and paramount obligation.

The consideration of such a subject is ever suitable; existing circumstances do not render it less so. Among the "signs of the times," "wars and rumours of wars," are not wanting. India has but lately emerged from scenes of sanguinary conflict, and peace, though restored, still hovers, with wavering and uncertain wing, over the arena of recent strife. The political horizon of Europe is not free from clouds of doubtful omen; the British Settlements in Southern Africa are disturbed by insurrectionary war; French aggression still harasses the peaceful and defenceless islands of Polynesia; while in the "far West," a contest even now rages, not at present, indeed, likely to affect the tranquillity of the greater powers, but the ultimate effects of which, on the general peace of the world, it is impossible now to anticipate.

We attempt not to embrace the whole subject before us; nor will our limits permit us to present more than a mere outline of the topics to which we must be restricted. These will chiefly be—The Evils of War—comprising under these both the sufferings which War inflicts, and the guilt which it involves; next, the Causes of War; and finally, the Remedies of War, or rather the one great remedy, the ultimate efficacy of which resides with God, but the present application of which is entrusted to Man.

The Evils of War involve, first, as already mentioned, the sufferings—the personal, social, and national calamities, which it necessarily and inevitably occasions. In this respect alone, whatever be the superficial and prejudiced judgment of mankind in general, no one, who calmly and seriously contemplates the subject, can deny that War is an Evil. Not only those who denounce altogether the practice of warfare, and deem it, in every instance, unwarranted and criminal, but those also who, more justly, (as we conceive) admit, in certain cases, its necessity—its painful, but inevitable necessity—must acknowledge it to be an evil, a necessary evil, it may be—but still, at best, an evil, or rather a mass of evils, which every friend of humanity must not only deeply deplore, but anxiously desire, as far as possible, to remedy. And yet, notwithstanding this—this obvious and well-grounded conviction of every humane and rational mind—how sadly and strangely insensible are we, in general, to the real evils—to the calamities, and crimes, and atrocities of actual warfare. "Our ordinary sympathies," justly observes an eloquent modern writer, "seem to forsake us, when war is named. The death of a single fellow-being often excites a tender and active compassion—the execution of a criminal depresses the mind—a single murder in peace thrills through our frames."* Yet we can hear and speak of the thousand sufferings, the countless deaths, the wholesale murders—for in many cases, at least, they are nothing else than murders—perpetrated in war, with, comparatively, little emotion—often with absolute indifference—perhaps even with feelings, in which the complacency and exultation of triumph overbear, if they do not obliterate, all the deeper and more tender sympathies of our nature. The causes, indeed, of this anomalous and unnatural state of feeling are obvious enough, and will be adverted to in their due place; but the fact—the painful and melancholy fact—that such is the case, renders it all the more necessary that we should endeavour to realise in their true colours—in their naked, undisguised deformity—those evils to which we are thus so inhumanly and inconsistently callous.

In the very idea of war, when seriously considered, there is something deeply abhorrent to every right, we may almost say, every rational feeling of our nature. In the fact, that society—not rude and barbarous, but refined and humanised society—should be in such a state, as systematically to refer its disputes to the sword—to the arbitrement of nothing short of blood and death; that there should actually be a science

* Channing, (Works, Vol. II. p. ) to whose able writings on this subject (though on others of deeper moment, unhappily, so erroneous,) the author of the present article acknowledges his obligations. On many essential points, however, especially as regards the Causes and Remedies of War, his views and treatment of the question differ very widely from those expressed in the writings of Dr. Channing—whose low and inadequate views of the depravity of man, and of the sole and paramount efficacy of the Gospel, have seriously weakened and neutralised the conclusiveness of a truly eloquent, and, all but resistless, appeal in behalf of humanity and religion.
and an art called into existence, for no other immediate end than to enable human beings more effectually to assail and destroy each other; that thousands of men, trained and disciplined for the very purpose, should coolly, and without compunction, proceed to encounter thousands of other men, whom they have never previously seen, and by whom they have never been personally wronged, in order, as their avowed object, to inflict the greatest possible amount of injury on each other—to destroy and ravage their property and territory—to deface God's image in their persons—to strew the earth with dead and dying forms, but now instinct with life—and, worst and most fearful of all, to hurry each other, by thousands, into the presence of their Maker—to send their fellow-creatures, in the very hour of strife and passion—in the state most unprepared to meet Him—before the tribunal of their eternal Judge; that these things should be done by beings of the same nature—by the creatures of the same God—by the children of the same Father—often, by the professors of the same religion—by the avowed disciples of that benignant Faith, which commands them, as their first of earthly duties, to "love one another"—in all this there is something so strangely, so fearfully unnatural, that, were it not the actual fact, we could scarcely believe it to be true; were it only announced to us as an element in the condition of some other, and hitherto unknown world, we should hardly be able to give it credence. And yet it is true: and this is war—this the purpose and business of war—and these the almost every day scenes and realities of war—of that war, the occurrence of which so little affects our sensibilities, nay, of which the fiercest and most sanguinary triumphs so often elicit our highest admiration, and receive our richest and most grateful recompence.

Nor is it only during the continuance of war, or in its actual scenes and fields of conflict, that we behold all its evils. Beyond the field of battle, and the few hours of the deadly struggle—beyond the mere arena, and brief annals of the campaign itself, are extended and perpetuated the fatal consequences of war. Far and wide in the history of individuals, and in the bosom of families, and years after the tumult of strife has been forgotten in the repose of peace, you shall still trace the bitter fruits—the blighting, withering curse—of warfare, in the calamities oftentimes of those most guiltless of its deeds—in wasted fortunes, and ruined hopes, and blighted affections—in the poverty and anguish of the childless, the fatherless, and the widow—in innumerable evils, penetrating deep into the hearts and homes of men, and reaching on to distant years of time.

Nor is this all. War is attended with other less obvious, but not less certain evils. It is fraught with peculiar injury to those who are engaged in it. However elevated and improved the general tone of the profession of arms, and however exalted the instances of moral and religious character which it presents, it cannot be denied that the practice of warfare is directly calculated to deteriorate the moral condition of
those by whom it is pursued. The camp—the slaughter—the siege—
the sack—what fatal schools for the debasement of human character.
How obviously do such scenes and pursuits tend to promote immorality
and licentiousness—to deaden the sensibilities of the heart, and call
forth and cherish the worst and most malignant passions—to engender
indifference to human suffering, disregard of human obligation, reck-
lessness of human life. At the best—if so it can be called—how in-
compatible is all this with the spirit and practice of the great "law of
love"—with the exercise of the meekness and gentleness of Christ, with
the indwelling of the Spirit of peace—with all the higher and more
spiritual elements of the Christian life. All this, we say, is the obvious
tendency of war; we do not, of course, mean that it is the general
character of all engaged in the profession of war. Doubtless there
are noble exceptions of virtue and devotion; but those, who form
these exceptions, are what they are, not in consequence, but in despite,
of their vocation of strife and death.

But wider still extend the calamitous results of war. It operates
most injuriously on the interests of nations and communities them­selfes
—on their moral and religious, their social and political welfare. While
warfare actually lasts, it keeps up a state of excitement and uneasi­ness
in the public mind, adverse to internal improvement, and to the
prosecution of all useful, peaceful, and philanthropic enterprise. It
tends also, in communities as in individuals, to foster the ascendancy
of the bad and hateful passions. It makes adverse nations rejoice in
their mutual calamities, and long for each other's humiliation and ruin.
It weakens and relaxes, and would, if unrestrained, wholly dissever the
bonds of amity which hold together the great family of man. And
even when war has terminated, its social and political evils do not
end. To instance only one result out of many. It leaves a state—
always when defeated, often even when victorious—impoverished in
its financial resources; and, as the necessary consequence, imposes
on the people, perhaps for generations, aggravated and burdensome
taxations; thus crippling, at once, national industry and individual
benevolence; diminishing, alike, the economic wellbeing of the popu­lation,
and their means of promoting the cause of humanity and religion;
crushing and grinding the poor; producing both destitution and
disaffectation; till, with augmented poverty, come augmented crime, and
all the elements of a nation's moral degradation and decay.* And

* This is no ideal picture. Our own country affords too true and sad an illustration.
To what do we mainly owe the present destitution—demoralization—and smouldering
disaffectation of its teeming and struggling masses? Assuredly, in no small degree, to the
overwhelming amount of debt, and consequent taxation, which has, for more than
forty years, been the incubus of the population. And whence came these burdens?
They are the legacy of war; a war, the bitter effects of which are still felt, though,
since its close, a generation has almost passed away, and which are, to all appearance,
likely to descend, more heavily and bitterly still, to generations yet to come.
Thus, both morally and politically, is war an evil; alike a wrong to heaven, and a curse to earth; at once impeding the social progress and the religious welfare of a country, and wasting on objects, hateful to God and injurious to man, the resources given only to be devoted to the glory of the One, and the welfare of the other.

And—though we can but touch upon the topic—how deeply are the evils of warfare aggravated by its folly—by the fact of the wars actually waged being often wholly unnecessary, and even on political grounds, obviously inexpedient. Were the conflicts of nations never engaged in, save in fulfilment of stern and righteous obligation—or from the pressure of some dire and inevitable necessity—or as the sole means of attaining the general good—there would be much to palliate, and even in certain cases, to justify, their attendant evils. And that there have been wars admitting of such justification we do not deny. But how utterly needless have been the vast majority of the wars that have, in all ages, desolated the earth. Arising often from the most trivial and unwarrantable causes; from false views of policy, or unfounded apprehensions of danger;* from the most frivolous and contemptible grounds of offence;† from accidental misunderstandings, which the most moderate exercise of a wise and temperate diplomacy might easily have rectified;‡ not to say, most frequently of all, from the mere lust of power, and the dictates of a wanton and unprincipled ambition. And yet it is from such causes, and for such objects—so trivial, so worthless, so criminal—that earth is laid waste, and nations desolated, and mankind slaughtered and sacrificed, and the countless calamities inflicted, ever sure to follow,

“When Murder bares her arm, and rampant War
Yokes the red dragons of her iron Car.” §

Oh, how is the heart sickened, and righteous indignation aroused, and patience well nigh exhausted, by the reckless and wanton folly which can prompt so often, thus needlessly, the perpetration of such deeds of blood.

If such, then, be the evil, need it be asked what must be the guilt—the criminality of war? True, indeed, and this is probably the most fitting place for adverting to the subject—all wars are not necessarily criminal. Defensive warfare, whether against external or internal

* As, for instance, the recent disastrous invasion of Afghanistan.
† One of the wars of modern times, (we think that of the Spanish Succession) was precipitated, at least, if not occasioned, by an accidental affront offered to a lady—the spilling of a cup of tea on the gown of the French Ambassador’s wife.
‡ Less threatening embarrassments than those lately arising from the Oregon question with America, and the Montpensier marriage with France, would, in days not long past, have ended in an appeal to “the last logic of kings.” We should be thankful for the wiser and more temperate spirit of diplomacy now evinced: though perhaps, one of the sources of danger now mentioned is not yet wholly evaded.
§ Campbell—Pleasures of Hope.
enemies; wars undertaken to repel invasion—to resist unjustifiable en-
croachments, either on the liberties or territories of a state—to main-
tain the rights, or preserve the integrity of nations unjustly oppressed,
and which *all other* legitimate and more peaceful means have been
found ineffectual to vindicate—such wars, however much we may la-
ment, we cannot possibly condemn. Such conflicts in behalf of free-
dom, patriotism, and humanity—conflicts such as those of a Leonidas,
a Tell, a Bruce, a Hofer, a Washington, a Kosciusko—such national
struggles as those of Switzerland against Austria—of the Netherlands
against Philip—of Spain, and Russia, and the Tyrol against Napoleon—
and, more recently, of Poland, Greece and Circassia, in defence of their
violated independence—we are warranted not only to justify as necessary,
but to venerate as noble, and truly glorious. But with such, and similar
exceptions—exceptions, be it remembered, "few and far between" in
the annals of the past—exceptions which, alas! leave excluded nearly
nine-tenths of the wars—the utterly wanton and unjustifiable wars that
darken and deface the pages of history—there can be but one con-
clusion come to as to the criminality of this fearful and sanguinary
evil. And we have but to think of the picture already attempted to
be drawn, or rather of that which every thoughtful man will delineate
for himself, of the wrongs, and calamities, and sufferings which war
inflicts, in order to estimate the amount of guilt which it involves.
If the system—the practice—the thing—whatever be its name, which in-
evitably tends to stifle every dictate of humanity, and nourish every
evil and vindictive passion—which abbreviates the existence, and tram-
ples on the happiness of mankind—which impedes the social and moral
advancement of nations, and opposes the progress on earth of the
pure and peaceful kingdom of heaven—which wantonly inflicts pain,
and suffering—and injury, and wrong, and death, often on the most
innocent and helpless of God's creatures—which, in the fearful con-
tests to which it gives birth, makes a very hell of earth, and invests
men, for the time, with the aspect and attributes of fiends—nay,
which is, itself, the very minister and caterer of hell, cutting short the
day of grace of sinful and perishing man, and sweeping thousands and
millions of immortal beings to an eternal and hopeless doom—if that
which is, and does all this—and does it, as we have seen, so often for
nothing—for no conceivable end, for no compensating good, but in
mere needless and wilful wantonness—if the practice, by which such
enormities are perpetrated, be not a Crime—what act of atrocity com-
mitted on earth can ever deserve the name? Even the partial judg-
ment of man, himself a party to the offence, must pronounce its crim-
ninality; what, then, must it be in the estimation of Him who "judgeth
righteous judgment"—whose mind cannot be deluded by the specious
sophistry, nor his eye dazzled by the false glory, now thrown around
the splendid deeds of human wickedness—but who "seeth not as man

seeth," and beholds the crimes of earth in all their native hideousness, and undisguised deformity? Can we doubt that with Him there is—that with us there ought to be—but one name given to this gigantic form of sin? And need we say what name? If, by the laws both of God and man, every unjustifiable infliction of death on a human being is—murder—what must be every unjustifiable war—a war which is but one continued infliction of unjustifiable deaths—what but Murder? or rather, one vast and fearful accumulation of murders? And if so, what then is he who wages and prosecutes such a war—and what every one who wilfully and deliberately shares in the deeds, or aids and countenances the prosecution of such a warfare? We shrink, indeed, from the conclusion. But can we evade it? We fain would leave the word unspoken. But does it need to be uttered? ——

Nay, if, as there are, there be degrees in crime, by whom is the "Murderer's" name most justly merited? By him who has won it on the blood-stained fields of lawless conquest, or by the paltry, common-place malefactor of the highway? By the author of ten thousand needless slaughters, perpetrated in cold-blooded ambition, or by the miserable wretch, driven to the commission of his solitary deed of blood, by the cravings of hunger, or the anguish of despair? And yet the mightier criminal is the hero—the far less guilty the felon. For the one we have the plaudits of admiration, the recompence of wealth and honours, a glorious name, a deathless memory: for the other, shame and dishonour, the fangs of inexorable justice, the givés, the dungeon, and the scaffold.

It will not, we trust, be imagined, that in the observations now made, we purpose any reflections on those personally engaged in the profession of arms. As long as any wars are justifiable, and many unquestionably are so, there must obviously exist the means and Agents by whom they are to be maintained. Besides, the guilt arising from unjustifiable warfare lies far too widely and deeply on all the members of the community involved in it, to allow us to exonerate ourselves, by transferring its odium to particular classes or individuals. But, at the same time, wherever the principles of our reasoning may legitimately apply—whomsoever they may condemn, as culpable and criminal—and however deeply that condemnation may fall, whether on ourselves or others—we must not hesitate to state what we believe to be the truth, or refuse to designate either Men or Things by their right names. "Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!"*

But we have already exceeded the limits necessary to be observed in such a publication as the present. The consideration of the Causes and Remedies of War must be reserved to our next number.

K. H.

* Isaiah v. 20.
Strictures on the Proceedings of a Public Meeting, held in the Compound of the Roman Catholic Cathedral, Madras, November 30, 1846.

To the Editors of the Madras Christian Instructor.

Gentlemen—In compliance with the request of a friend, I send you some Strictures on the proceedings of a public meeting, held in the compound of the Roman Catholic Cathedral, Madras, November the 30th, 1846; convened for the purpose of presenting a congratulatory Address to “His Holiness, Pius the IX.” on his accession to the Pontifical Chair, when “The Right Reverend Dr. Fennelly presided.” The resolutions were ten in number, and were moved and seconded by six Priests and various Laymen.

1. With reference to the resolutions, I cannot withhold a passing remark, at the risk of being considered impertinent by the gentlemen who sanctioned the sixth and the seventh. The former contains a determination to send to the “Holy Father” “a more substantial testimony of their spiritual allegiance and attachment, than words are able to convey,” i.e., to “recommend—for universal adoption, that a yearly collection be made on the Sunday within the octave of St. Peter and St. Paul, on the principle of that which was introduced into his dominions by the Anglo-Saxon King Ina; and which was perpetuated in England for many centuries, in the good old Catholic times!” This petty sovereign Ina succeeded to the throne of Wessex, in 689, and had the reputation of being devout, as instances of which, his annual contributions to “The Holy Father,” also his pilgrimage to Rome and his retirement on his return to a cloister, where he died, have often been alluded to. But I must be permitted to doubt, not the power (that were heretical indeed)—but the propriety, of reviving the tribute of Ina’s Peter Pence—which had to be paid out of every family “in the good old Catholic times;” and though we have but few words of favour for Henry the Eighth, I commend him for enacting “that none, henceforth, shall pay any pensions, Peter Pence, or other impositions, to the use of the Bishop or See of Rome.” I question much this subsidy to the Papal State, both as it regards this, and the other Presidencies; nay, I think it worthy of inquiry, as to the legality of levying a contribution, for the benefit of a foreign Monarch, and believe that such a measure would not be permitted in England, without strict investigation by those in power.

The 7th Resolution, to quote its own words, is that “in order to simplify the payment of individual subscriptions in the currency of this country, the Honorable Company’s anna be adopted as the amount to be expected from each person, instead of the penny of Great Britain.” Now this is doing the thing boldly and liberally, and will be far more welcome, I doubt not, to the coffers of the church, than the penny gifts of “the good old Catholic times.”

2. As to the “Address” itself, I have read it, neither in anger, nor surprise, for I have long been accustomed to the haughty assumptions of the Romish Hierarchy; and am glad once more to have full proof in the document under Review, that there is no abatement of their lofty pretensions in the most palmy days of “the good old Catholic times;” showing to a demonstration, beyond all mistake, that those mild views entertained, res-
pecting the increase of the tolerancy and liberality of the Papacy, are found­ed in mistaken charity, or erring zeal, which can believe to exist that which has no being, but in fiction; no mercy, but in fear of results; no motive, but in aggrandizement; no love, but for those in its own pale; and no hope for those who are beyond it.

I arraign not, at the Bar of public opinion, the Roman Catholics for ad­ressing their spiritual head, on his becoming, what is called, “the Vicar of God”—but I have a few words to say about their congratulations, adula­tions, and adorations, to the “Most Holy Father”—as well as to their con­demnations, and slanders on those who differ from them: for it is im­possible to view the anathemas of these priests, who consign to perdition those who are not of them; who consider these as too bad for the divine clemency of an all-merciful God, and treat them as the abandoned victims of earth; doomed for a while to wander, without a single claim to the sympathy of our common brother­hood, and at last to close the scene in remediless woe. Let not these intolerant men think that they will gain favour by their scorn of others; for there are highly intelligent cha­racters in their own pale, who take the liberty of thinking for themselves; and many, many in other creeds, who have been in the habit of looking liberally and respectfully at them, and who will now inquire what do these things mean?

And lest I should be suspected of writing thus strongly without a reason, or of accusing without guilt, I will quote the exact words of the Madras Address to the Pope; which will best speak to the hearts, and minds of my readers. “To your Holiness belongs, by divine right, the primacy of order and jurisdiction over all the earth. As the successor of St. Peter, your Holiness is invested with the exclusive power of feeding the whole flock, both sheep and lambs, both pastors and people. To your Holiness alone, in the person of the same glorious Apostle, the keys of the kingdom of heaven were confid­ed by Christ with an unfailing faith. Whoever enters not by the door, but ascends another way, is a thief and a robber. Whoever gathereth not with you, scattereth. Although a person should lay down his life for the truth of his religion, he cannot receive the crown of martyrdom, if he be not in communion with your Holiness.”

3. The alleged Supremacy of Peter—from which—the primacy of orders, and jurisdiction, over all the earth!”—the Pope professes to derive his authority; and therefore I pro­ceed briefly to examine that supposed fact. In Matthew xvi. 18, 19, it is written, “Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.” But who was this rock? Peter, or Christ? In the 16th verse of this same chapter, Peter had confessed his faith in the divinity of Jesus Christ—“Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.” The Saviour im­mediately pronounced him “Blessed” for that declaration, and added, “Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in hea­ven.” Revealed what? That “Christ was the Son of the living God.” But Peter himself, in his own Epistle, (1. Peter ii. 7.) expressly and emphati­cally calls Christ the Rock—and quotes from the Prophet Isaiah xxviii. 16, who foretells the true relation which the Messiah should bear to his Church, in the following words, “Behold, I lay
in Zion for a foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a precious comer stone, a sure foundation;" and Peter says, "Behold I lay in Sion a chief corner stone, elect, precious." Again, "The stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner;" and in verse the eighth, Jesus is called the "Rock." The Jews, however, instead of building on that Rock, "disallowed" it, but it was "made the head of the corner." I therefore see, from this testimony, that Christ was the Rock—on which the Church was to be built, and the confession of Peter, "Thou art the Christ," referred precisely to that great fact.

But "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven"—which words have been strongly insisted upon, as giving the supremacy to Peter. If, however, we look at Matthew xviii. 18, we shall find similar language addressed to the disciples generally—"Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven;" so that the privilege was not Peter's only. And it is very remarkable that this declaration made to all the disciples was after that which was made to Peter; and probably had arisen from some murmuring at the previous distinction which had been conferred on him. Our Saviour, however, now showed there was nothing exclusive in the prior commission, and that, in that respect, they were equal. In confirmation of this truth, we have another testimony in John xx. 21—23, "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained;" clearly proving the equality in power of all the Apostles. That Peter was the first to open the kingdom of heaven to the Gentiles, is most true—as is seen in Acts ii. 14—where he gave his opinion in respect to the Parthians and Medes, and many others; also in Acts x. 15—17, where we have an account of his being sent to the heathen Centurion; and before him he declared, that "God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness, is accepted with Him." But the other Apostles also preached to the heathen, and Paul especially gloriied in being sent to them.

As to the divine authority given to the disciples, to retain or remit sins, to bind on earth, and have it bound in heaven; I find our Saviour had just "breathed" on His servants, and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost"—and through this process they were the recipients of a privilege never previously and never subsequently conferred; hence it is presumptuous for any, in this respect, to pretend to be their successors. Ananias and his wife are struck dead—at the words of Peter, and so many other wonderful things were done by the Apostles. But ministers at this day have not the same power—to remit or retain sins, which refer to the divine Being—for He, being the offended, can only give the pardon; and therefore their province is simply to declare the terms of forgiveness to penitent believers, and not, as the Priests of Rome, who take upon themselves the prerogative of Deity.

There is, however, another proof that all the disciples had the same degree of dignity, which I must not omit; for in Luke xxii. 24, I find they had been disputing as to the primacy, which is rather strange if Peter had been placed in that position; and what is still more impressive, and affecting, in this same chapter, where this strife about being the greatest
is recorded, the fearful fall of Peter is also noticed. Our Saviour, on hearing the controversy about priority, checked them, and said, "the kings of the Gentiles" had lordship, but He added, "ye shall not be so"—"but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief as he that doth serve;" and they were told as to the future, that they should still be similar in their honour or rank, for hereafter they were to "sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." But the very next verse contains the announcement "Simon, Simon, Satan hath desired to have you," all showing that Peter was not in any degree superior to his brethren; that in authority and privileges they were equal; but that in fidelity they were not so, for Peter denied his Master.

From these views, it is impossible for me to admit the Primacy of Peter, and if I am correct, how could he transmit what he did not possess? Nay, I am prepared to go still further, and say, if he had possessed all that the Romanists attribute to him, how could he bequeath it to others? "His graces, gifts and acts;" his "following Christ;" his confession of, and his subsequent adherence to him; his faith, his love and zeal; his courage, activity and ready gift of speech,* could never have been made hereditary, even to the most pious followers of Christ; how then could they be so to men of most licentious lives!! to Pope Joan, a woman of abandoned character, who gave birth to a child during her Popedom, a fact not denied by the ecclesiastical writers of the five succeeding ages.† What! these the Vicars— the chosen servants of Jesus. What! men of such infamous character the channels of his message and mercy to man? These the divinely appointed rulers of the Church of Christ! Impossible.

The sacred office is not an heirloom in the church—not a right by birth—but of election; for though the Jewish Priesthood had, under certain circumstances, the inheritance—yet their office was finally annulled. And I read of the Lord "departing" from men, from sovereigns, and from kingdoms, on account of their crimes. Thus, I think it evident, that Peter, in no respect, had the pre-eminence over his brethren; and consequently, could not give it to those who profess to be his successors: and even if he had attained that distinction, still it was not in his power to bequeath it.

4. I hasten to glance at another feature of this address, i. e. at the profane assertion, "He that gathereth not with you, scattereth"—which is a mutilated quotation from Matthew xii. 30. "He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad," words uttered by our Divine Lord—referring doubtless to the duty of endeavouring to gather souls for Christ—showing most strongly the obligation placed on all true Christians, whether in or out of the sacred office, to engage in this solemn and delightful employment of bringing new subjects into the kingdom of Jesus Christ. Thus did our Saviour assert his right to co-operation, and at the same time says, to those who refuse to engage in this enterprise, they are against Him—are actually scattering abroad—are hindering the progress of the work of God by their indolence, their carelessness, and their fear.

But the priests of Rome (for Dr. Fennelly's assumption is but the repetition of the ancient dogma of the Papal Hierarchy) have the temerity to apply the announcement of the Saviour of men, to their Pontiff—to Pius the IX. the man now wearing an earthly crown. Jesus the immortal, "the Son of the living God," said, "He that gathereth not with me!"

† Ibid. pp. 499.
but these profane flatterers say to their Pope, "he that gathereth not with you scattereth"—thus putting a poor, erring, sinful mortal, in the place of God; thus attributing the prerogative of the Creator to the creature; and confirming the charge made against the "Holy Father," "that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God."

Shall I gather "with you"—in your false doctrines, in your worship of images, in your alteration of the commandment, in your prayers for the dead, in your fulsome, and blasphemous adorations of Mary, the "blessed among women?" gather "with you," in your invasion of the sole right of the Most High to forgive sin? gather "with you"—in your haughty claims on the spiritual homage of all men!—in your idolatrous and profane treatment of the supper of the Lord—in your worship of Saints, made so by your own pretended power, and of Angels unknown to all but God—"with you" in your insults to the intercessions of the Saviour Jesus, our sole, one, all-sufficient advocate with God? March, "with you," in your pompous processions, or go on distant pilgrimages to tombs, and relics, and fountains—"with you" in your votive offerings in your cloisters and your mummeries, to your Monasteries, and your Nunneries—"with you," counting your beads and saying your prayers, like Hindu Pandarams, or Mohammedan Fakeers;—"with you" crossing your breast;—"with you" in your ridiculous ceremonies; "with you" to that accursed house, where the Priestly Tyrant tortured his victim on the rack, with the knife, and the fire—"with you" to Smithfield? gather "with you" when we remember the Waldenses, the Albigenses, and Lollards, and Huss, and Jerome, Hooper, and Latimer, and Ridley, and Cranmer? No, no: we go not—we gather not "with you"—but with the man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief— with Him who hushed the tempest to repose, and calmed the stormy sea—with Him who healed the sick, who dried the widow's tears, and gave life to her dead son—with Him whose majesty abashed demons, and conquered Satan, the conqueror of men—with Him who went to Calvary, and suffered in our stead, and died that we might live—with Him who went to the tomb, who consecrated the grave, and left it in peerless glory—with him who said to the weeping mourner "Mary!" who sent the message of tenderness to the broken-hearted Peter—with him to Olivet, whence He ascended high above all height, and received gifts for men—with him who is "the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of His person." O yes, I would fain gather with Him, whether in obloquy, or honour, disease or death, till he shall say "well done," and take His wanderers home.

Listen then, O ye thousands of Reverend Ministers, and Missionaries, in the Protestant Churches of Europe, of America, and other regions; listen to these candid and charitable Judges. The flocks you have gathered into the fold of your great Shepherd, by your tears, by your prayers, by your teachings, and the blessings of your God, both in savage and civilized lands, these—by the dictum of your disdainful accusers—belong not to Christ but to Satan; they are scattered and must be his lawful prey. Listen men of Christendom, to these impassioned, these childish bigots; the messengers of the Cross, you sent forth to barbarous lands, who fell beneath the spear, the knife, or the assagai of the Pagan, these shall not wear the martyrs' crown; for your judges tell you, in their address to Pope Pius the IX., "although a person should lay down his life for the truth of his religion, he cannot receive the crown of
martyrdom, if he be not in communion with your Holiness." Here is a climax for you; your judges, not content with the expression of their condemnation in this world, follow your honoured servants to another; they invade the territory of God, and pluck from his head the martyrs' crown. What! have none of the three thousand of the Waldenses, men, women and children, who perished in the caves by your fires, or in the field by your sword—have they not this glory? None of the ten thousand, who fell at the massacre of St. Bartholomew, in 1572—amongst whom were those eminent Protestants, Petrus Ramus, Lambinus, Plateanlus, Lornenius, Chapesius—have none of these this glory? What! not one of the seventy, who perished under the knife of the executioner in Italy, whose sad history is narrated by a humane Roman Catholic; who states in terms, enough to make the stoutest shudder, the cool ferocity of the butcher, who at intervals had the bloody knife betwixt his teeth—none of these the martyrs' crown? What! and are those proscribed, who bled and died in the valleys of Piedmont? Those thousands who gave their last groan on the rack, in the fires, or beneath the sword, in various parts of Europe, in England—and O I blush—in generous, noble Ireland? Are none of these "the Martyrs of Jesus," these who fell before the "women drunken with the blood of the Saints, and with the blood of Martyrs?" So say the priests of Rome, and so says the "Bishop of Castoria, and Vicar Apostolic of Madras." Well, then, let them enjoy their intolerance, but let us manifest another spirit; we cannot say with Milton:

"Avenge, O Lord, thy slaughtered Saints, whose bones
Lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold;
Even those who kept thy truth so pure of old;"

for we remember, "Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord."

5. But in this address, so adulatory to the Pope, and condemnatory to others, there is also something truly jubilant; for I learn from it that "Within the last few years, in this vicariate alone, (Madras) nearly 800 persons have been converted to the true faith, from the errors of Protestantism." Now, it is very convenient to say within "the last few years." How many? and it looks very conscientious to say "nearly 800," but we must ask from what Christian folds have they been taken?—because, from our recently formed and comparatively small churches, such a large number would surely be missed. We must be pardoned for doubting the perfect accuracy of this statement, because I have a tolerable acquaintance with the different missionaries and ministers, who know well their flocks; and except such as have been seduced by mixed marriages, I question much whether one eighth of the number referred to have gone to the Church of Rome; and it must not be forgotten, that many (I say not 800) have left that Church for others.

6. In this address, however, so flattering and exulting, there is mixed up no little calumny; for "Protestantism (is said) to disseminate its errors by the allurements of mammon." My Lord Bishop of Madras, and you ye Reverend Clergy, and you ye Reverend Missionaries, I will not inquire are you guilty of this charge, but I ask you well to ponder, the animus which has produced a slander, so foul as this.

7. I have, however, another count in the charge, i.e. of our being guilty of "the profuse circulation of heretical books," meaning I suppose, such as are forbidden in the Papal "Index Expurgatorum et Prohibitorum;" and this part of the accusation gives the favourable opportunity to hint to the
different missionaries, the propriety, the duty, of doing something more in the vernacular languages, to expose the fatal errors of Popery.

8. I conclude with something to cheer the gloomy scene, even in this address to Pius the IX, for I read, there are "those infatuated persons, who although they may call themselves Catholics, are not ashamed (in their zeal for the return of a state of things, which it is impossible to re-establish) to vilify, with unmeasured abuse, the sacred congregation de Propaganda fide, and the Holy See." To such we say, go on in your inquiries after truth—despite the thunders of the Vatican, the fulminations of the priests, or the threatenings of the people; remembering the voice of your Saviour—who says,"Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden—and I will give you rest. Take my—yoke upon you, and learn of me—for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy—and my burden is light."

I am, gentlemen,

Yours faithfully,

December, 1846.
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BRIEF SKETCH OF THE LIFE AND LABOURS OF THE LATE REV. W. P. CROOK, chiefly gathered from his own Writings, and with occasional extracts from several Publications.

(Communicated.)

(Continued from last Number, page 32.)

After seeing the Missionaries and their Families settled as comfortably as he could, Captain Wilson sailed for the Friendly Islands, and there left 10 single Missionaries.

In Picken's "Travels and Researches of Eminent English Missionaries," we have the following account, selected principally from the voyage of the ship Duff, and relating to that period of Mr. Crook's life at which we have now arrived:—

"It was not until the 11th June, 1796, a little before sunrise, that the Captain of the Duff descried Santa Christina, one of the Marquesan Islands. The next day they got safe into Resolution Bay, and began to get acquainted with the interesting inhabitants of these islands. The two missionaries who had destined themselves for the island of Santa Christina, were a Mr. Crook and a Mr. Harris. When the chief, whose name was Tenae, was informed by the Captain of the intention of the two Englishmen to settle among his people, for their instruction, the good natured barbarian was highly delighted, and offering them a house to live in, he also promised them a share of all that he possessed. The two missionaries afterwards going on shore to reconnoiter the place, Tenae, the chief, received them on the beach, and conducted them a little way with much decorum. He was evidently proud of the visit, and desiring to show off the strangers to the natives who crowded round. He made them all halt, and form a ring round the object of their curiosity, those in front sitting down to allow the others to see over their heads. When the chief had exhibited the missionaries in this manner to the people for about a quarter of an hour, he conducted them to the valley, to show them the house which he intended for their reception. When they reached it, they found it small and mean, compared with the lofty building that their brethren occupied in Tahiti; and all the food that was set before them was a few cocoa-nuts. The chief, however, seemed anxious to treat the
strangers with kindness as far as his means went. Upon the return of the two missionaries to the ship, the obvious discomfort of the dwelling they had seen, and the apparent difficulties before them in this place, seemed entirely to have damped the ardour of Mr. Harris, whose impression, from all he had witnessed, was very different from that made upon his brother Crook, and he was by no means willing to be left on the island; but Mr. Crook being perfectly satisfied from present appearances, with all he had seen, and still impressed with the importance of the undertaking, it was at length agreed that both should accept the chiefs invitation for the following day, and that taking their beds on shore, they should make trial of their new quarters, at least for one night; but Mr. Harris subsequently declining to go, Mr. Crook went, and took with him a boy, whom the Captain brought from Tahiti, to keep him company for the night.

"On the 20th of the month, Mr. Crook went on board the Duff, and there held a meeting with Mr. Harris, who was to have been his companion, and in the presence of Captain Wilson, desired to know his mind as to his intention of settling on the island. The impression he had taken of the poverty and discomfort of the place, however, was so strong with Mr. Harris, that he could not bear the idea of being left in such quarters; besides, he said, he could not eat the mahi,* and the hogs and fish were far from plentiful. Mr. Crook, though only twenty-two years of age, was by no means so influenced by considerations of personal comfort, and much more ardent in the cause he had undertaken.

"Ultimately Mr. Harris consented to accompany Mr. Crook on shore, and to make another trial of the situation of a missionary on the island, but an unexpected and ludicrous disaster was the consequence of his second trial; and he determined to leave the island and return to the vessel with all possible speed, which with considerable difficulty and annoyance, he finally accomplished, leaving Mr. Crook behind. The experience Mr. Crook had acquired on the island led him to conclusions directly contrary to those of Mr. Harris. Finding that Captain Wilson was preparing to depart, he intimated his resolution to stay on the island with no other companions than the kind-hearted chief­tain and his friends. This worthy young man, having had the good sense to accommodate himself, as far as possible, to the feelings and circum­stances of the islanders, undertook their instruction with cheerfulness; and though sensible that the conversation and sympathy of a Christian missionary from his own country, would be a great comfort to him in these regions of ignorance, yet, as that was denied, he was willing in the strength of his Divine Master, to labour alone while there was any prospect of doing good among the people. Taking with him, therefore, an assortment of garden seeds, to sow in the valley, with some implements of husbandry, some medicines, books, and other useful articles, he contentedly prepared for his solitary labours.

"Before the departure of the Duff, the Captain went on shore on the island, but on the same evening, the party being about to return to the ship, they reached the beach, when the Captain and his friends took an affectionate farewell of the chief and of Mr. Crook, the intrepid and youthful missionary. The conduct of the latter was on this occasion as manly and gallant as it had all along been.

"Betraying no sign of fear at being left alone by his friends, nor any way daunted by the work he had undertaken, 'the tears glistened in his eyes,' says one of the journals, 'but none fell,' and he resigned himself to the care of Him, by whom he knew he should not be forsaken.

"On the morning of the 27th June, the day following that on which the Captain had taken leave of Mr. Crook, he weighed anchor and set sail, intending to return to Tahiti, to ascertain what was the position of the missionaries he had left there three months before.

"It now only remains (continues the narrator) to say a few words regarding the fate of Mr. Crook, the young man who was left by the Duff in

* Preserved bread-fruit.
1796, without any English companion on the island of Santa Christina. Mr. Crook undoubtedly possessed all the enthusiasm and courage so requisite for a missionary. For many months after he was left on the island, the chief hardship he suffered was from scarcity of food, the former improvidence of the natives having left the island in such a state, that he and they were almost starved."

The little food which he obtained in his present situation was of the coarsest and most unpalatable kind; and he was often so pressed by hunger, that he used to tie a line with a hook and bait around his neck, and swim in the surf; and when he caught a fish, he would immediately nip off its head and eat it raw. At times, however, he was feasted, for when a person of distinction died, a sacrifice was made of two or three fat hogs, to which he was generally invited by an herald, dressed out in native costume, who would sound his conch, and name the person invited.

Some time had elapsed before he discovered that these people were cannibals; but one Sunday morning, while attempting to make known the Gospel to them, he observed a canoe coming with a white flag flying, which he learned was a signal of captives, or of dead bodies being on board. He went to the beach, and saw the bodies of three men and a woman, who had been peaceably fishing on the coast of a neighbouring island, and whom the people of the island where he was, had treacherously murdered. The children were playing with the bodies with the greatest coolness and indifference. Two of them where deposited on a neighbouring marae, (or altar) and the other two baked and eaten. When Crook expostulated with them, they inquired if there were no wars in his country? He was obliged to acknowledge that there were; they then inquired, what was done with the bodies of the slain, and being informed that they were buried, they laughed and said, "they were no such fools, for the human body was more palatable than pork."

"On one occasion (observes the author already quoted) a poor woman took a bread-fruit which had fallen ripe from one of the king's trees; when the king was informed of the fact by one of the men, he coolly ordered the woman to be killed. She was accordingly cut down with an axe and baked, and her body divided among them. One arm was given to Mr. Crook as his share, but being horrified and disgusted, he took it and buried it in the sand; but being watched by a native, he came and laughed at him—took up the arm from the sand, and eat it. He with much difficulty escaped being tattooed in the face by force."

(To be continued.)

* Picken's Travels.
In our former notice of this publication, our remarks were chiefly preliminary. This necessarily arose from the nature of the work under review, and the limited space to which we were restricted. The pamphlet itself is so utterly destitute of all logical arrangement—so full of personal allusion and insinuation, wholly irrelevant and uncalled for—and so prominently characterised by a spirit of ostentatious and exclusive pretension—that in order to arrive at the proper subject matter of the discussion, we found it necessary to clear our way, as far as possible, through the irrelevant and offensive mass of personalities in which the real topics of the controversy are thus imbedded; as well as, by exposing the author's flagrant inconsistencies with his own pretensions, to enable our readers to judge what claim he has to the high moral and Christian position he has assumed, and what weight they ought to attach to his authority, as an impartial, candid, and truthful disputant, in the further and weightier matters of debate on which he has pronounced so authoritative a judgment.

Our limits, however, did not permit us to bring these prefatory, but necessary, observations to a close; and although we have no wish to detain our readers needlessly on the threshold, we deem it proper, for the reasons now mentioned, to call their attention to one or two further instances of our author's mode of treating the statements of the antagonist he has thought fit to assail, before entering on the consideration of the great topics themselves, the truth of which he has ventured to call into dispute.

It is an admitted rule of all honourable controversy, not to say, an obvious principle of Christian duty, to give a fair and honest representation of an opponent's opinions and statements—if any thing is doubtful, to allow his meaning the best construction—and above all, to avoid the imputation of bad motives and intentions. Yet all these obvious requirements, our author, not only wholly neglects, but systematically violates. Wherever it is possible, his opponent's language is misrepresented, often actually misquoted—unfavourable, and obviously erroneous constructions are imputed—and not unfrequently, discreditable motives insinuated. Let one or two examples suffice. One meets us even on the first page, almost in the first sentence. It seems that the "great unknown" himself, and some other individuals of his own way of thinking, had found some "difficulty in getting hold" of the Pastoral Letter: a circumstance not much to be wondered at, when it is remembered that the letter in question was not published, but only addressed to, and chiefly circulated among, the members of the Bishop's own communion. But disregarding this very obvious account of the matter, the author not only insinuates, without hesitation, that "care was taken that it (the letter) should not fall into the hands of Unitarians;" but assuming this gratuitous supposition as a fact, he proceeds not only to censure it as an intentional dereliction of duty,
but as "naturally" giving rise to the question, whether "the Right Reverend Prelate" did not thus act, because it was "known that the Pastoral, if weighed in the balance, would be found wanting?" It were a waste of words to comment on the utter want of charity, or rather of candour, which this insinuation evinces. Its palpable untruthfulness is equally evident. But were the imputation thus implied, actually true, which it is not, the author seems to have forgotten how much more justly it may lie against himself. How has he, in this respect, acted with regard to his own pamphlet—and the degree and kind of publicity given to it? We shall not imitate his example by insinuating motives: we are quite content with an inquiry as to facts. We only ask the question—Is it true, that this controversial production, involving as it does some of the most recondite questions of divinity—was extensively circulated among certain classes of the laity of the Presidency—among men of the world, and men of fashion—among men, indeed, of gentlemanly education and intelligence, but not such as are generally supposed to possess peculiar theological attainments, or likely to be familiar with the sophistries of polemical controversy—among men, also, young and inexperienced, and such as are generally not very decided in their religious principles—and circulated, too, among such parties, not under the guise of an anonymous scribbler, but under the sanction of an influential official name—is it true, we ask, that among such parties our author's insidious attack on the doctrines of Catholic Christianity was thus numerously, and industriously, and imposingly disseminated—and yet, that not one solitary copy was, in like manner, transmitted to a single Clergyman in Madras—not one put within reach of any of those who, according to the author, most needed to have their darkness enlightened—or, as the truth really is, who were least likely to be deceived by the sophistries of Socinianism, and best qualified to detect and expose them? Was this, or was it not, the case? If it was not, let the yet nameless author, or the not nameless promulgator, of the heterodox pamphlet, openly come forward, and disprove it. If it was—we leave our readers to draw their own conclusions.

A similar instance of imposing an unfair, and obviously erroneous construction on his opponent's language, occurs at page 8, where the Bishop's very natural expression of confidence in the stability of the Clergy, is tortured into an involuntary admission of their sordid and self-interested orthodoxy. But the misrepresentation is too apparent to require explanation; and we only now notice it, because this palpable perversion of his antagonist's meaning—and that too, in a single, unimportant sentence—furnished the author with a text for four pages of rambling discussion, irrelevant quotation, and malevolent invective against the Clergy. Four pages of the professed argument of a comparatively short pamphlet based on a false reading—on the pretended sense of a passage, which obviously means, and is, the very reverse! A characteristic example at once of the logical method, and scrupulous veracity of the whole composition, as well as of the desperate shifts of the author in creating imaginary grounds of exception, where he can find no real ones. But to take a more important instance of the writer's habit of misrepresenting, and virtually misquoting, his opponent's statements; the author of the Pastoral Letter had observed—"I have no fear that the utterly unscriptural doctrine to which I refer," meaning obviously (to use his own
words, only two lines before) the doctrine "that Christ is not truly God"—
"will corrupt those who are really qualified," &c. But the author of the pamphlet, after quoting the first of the above sentences, as far as the word "refer," instead of adding the Bishop's own words—"that Christ is not truly God"—to explain the doctrine objected to—coolly fills up the hiatus with the words, "that there is but one God the Father." Thus, not only inserting a gloss of his own in the middle of a quotation from an opponent, but obviously intending to imply, that what the Bishop and other Trinitarians condemn as unscriptural, is, the Deity of "God the Father," and not (as is the case) the denial of the Deity of God the Son. Whether we consider this unscrupulous artifice as the misrepresentation of a well-known doctrine, or as the dishonourable treatment of a fair and candid antagonist, it is alike unworthy and discreditable.

Another instance of the author's perverse ingenuity in the same process of malevolent misconstruction, occurs at page 17—but so utterly childish and absurd, that did the gravity of our subject permit, it were fit only to be treated with ridicule. The Bishop, it seems, has quoted, on his title page, a passage (asserting the Deity of Christ) from the Greek of Ignatius, one of the Apostolical Fathers. And what, do our readers suppose, is the argument which our author derives from this simple and very natural circumstance? He actually claims it as a "proof"—we use his own words—"a proof—that the doctrine of Christ's Deity, is not derived from Scripture, and cannot be explained in the language of Scripture," because, forsooth, the Bishop has quoted on his title page (not in the course of his argument) the testimony to that doctrine borne by an "uninspired writer." And hence the still further, equally logical conclusion—that "had there been one (proof) equally good in the Bible, we should have had it in preference; but his Lordship, of course, chose the best he could find, and it was not in that book?" So that according to this novel species of reasoning, every man who happens to quote, on any occasion, the words of another writer, on any alleged doctrine of religion, necessarily implies, by doing so, that that doctrine is utterly destitute of any proof from Scripture! Such a passage needs no comment. As an attempt at argument, it is utterly contemptible: as an instance of deliberate untruthfulness—of the cool assurance with which utterance can be given to what is known to be false—it is scarcely paralleled, even in the annals of Socinian effrontery.

The exposure of such dull imperfections—and there are many more of them—must, however, be tedious to our readers; we shall, therefore, dismiss them from the ordeal, after one more infliction. "At one time," exclaims our author, with reference to his own innocent, and unjustly aspersed sect—at one time, branded with 'heresy,' and at another with the 'pride of reason,' they now stand before the world, with their motives and integrity impugned. They are dishonest and unprincipled men. O ingenuous, O generous Prelate—courteous disputant!" &c. Who would not suppose, on reading these words, that the "ingenuous and generous preliminary" so dramatically apostrophised, was the person who had thus "impugned" the "motives and integrity" of the assailed "Unitarians," and accused them of being "dishonest and unprincipled men?" Such is the obvious, and only meaning, which the passage bears; and unless we suppose the author writes one thing, while he means another, such evidently was the impression he intended to con-
vey—one obviously discreditable to the Christian temper of his opponent, and calculated to palliate and justify his own acrimonious retaliations. And yet, will our readers believe, that all this is a mere ruse? an insinuation utterly destitute of truth? another instance of the author's unprincipled misrepresentation both of persons and of facts—and obviously designed to give a false impression of the Bishop's sentiments and expressions to all who had not an opportunity of reading and judging for themselves? Such, however, is the case; for we defy our author, or any one else, to find, in the Pastoral Letter, a single expression, which, either directly or indirectly, "impugns" the motives or integrity, the principles or honesty, of the misguided advocates of Socinianism. On the contrary, the author of the Pastoral, as formerly observed, expresses himself, throughout, not only with the greatest forbearance, but with deep and affectionate anxiety, towards the deluded votaries of this unhappy system of error. Let our readers judge for themselves; and let them mark the striking and instructive contrast, in this respect, as in every other, between the tone and spirit of the two writers. "I wot that through ignorance they do it," is the charitable—perhaps too charitable, excuse which, in one place, the Bishop makes in behalf of those he is accused of "impugning." In another, it is his "earnest request," that those whom he addresses, "will make it the subject of continual prayer, that all who now sit in this darkness and shadow of death, may be brought—to honour the Son, even as they honour the Father." And not only so. "But how," he adds, "shall we win them back to the whole truth as it is in Christ? By railing, by ribaldry, by unchristian denunciation? God forbid. It should be our endeavour affectionately to 'persuade,' and thus to convince them, that the Omnipotence of Christ is not merely an incontrovertible theological dogma, but likewise a most precious reality, to each individual believer; indeed, the only full realization of the Saviour to the sinner's soul." These words require no illustration from us; they speak for themselves: they not only show how utterly false are the odious personal insinuations of this unscrupulous writer; but they exhibit, in marked and impressive contrast, the wide and essential difference, in Christian spirit and temper, between the Trinitarian believer, and the Socinian sceptic. In reference to the practical effects of the two systems, our author more than once appeals, with evident self-complacency, to the standard—"By their fruits ye shall know them." Is he willing to submit to that standard now? If he is, which of the two parties shall be weighed in the balance, and found wanting? He frequently claims for the self-styled "Unitarians," the possession of "more of the spirit which pervades the Gospel" than has ever been exhibited by their opponents. Will he venture to make that claim now? "Look on this picture, and on that." Judge of the two different systems, by their two respective advocates. Compare the truthfulness, the forbearance, the charitable, yet earnest affection of the one, with the perversions and misrepresentations, and bitter animosity of the other. And say, which of the two is more fit to stand the test of being known by its fruits—which exhibits the benignant spirit of the Gospel—which the enmity of the unrenewed and carnal mind?—

We have deemed it advisable, for the reasons formerly mentioned, thus fully to expose our author's treatment of the Pastoral Letter itself; we have no concern, however, with the present controversy, as one of personalities, although the "Bible Christian," has
done all he can to give it such a character. Our chief business is with his mode of treating and assailing that deeply important doctrine, to which the Pastoral Letter refers, and which its author, and all orthodox Christians, believe and maintain as the undoubted truth of the Word of God—namely, the Supreme Deity of the Incarnate Son. This, indeed, is the truth of the Bible—the grand fact of revelation—the basis of the whole scheme of redemption—the true and only ground of human hope—"great is the mystery of godliness—God was manifest in the flesh." That such a truth should be impugned, is not to be wondered at; it has been so for ages: but ever in vain. Infidelity, and scepticism, rationalism and false philosophy, religious formalism and Pharisaic self-righteousness, impiety and profanity, blasphemy, ribaldry and licentiousness, have in every age feared, hated, and assailed it; for eighteen hundred years the surging tide has swept around and against it: but firm and unshaken, it has met and repelled every onset; and now stands, as it has stood from the first, and will stand for ever, amid the lapse of time, and the sea of human passions, the solitary but imperishable "Rock of Ages."

That such a verity of the Faith is capable of being endangered now, least of all by such an assailant as the present, is a supposition not to be entertained by any man of sane mind. The ambitious blue-bottle fly, of the Italian fable, who buzzed full tilt against the dome of St. Peter's, expecting to level it in the dust, but who, as might be expected, perished in his suicidal attempt—was just about as likely to succeed in, and survive his onset, as is the present assailant of this incontrovertible truth of Scripture. Indeed, a much less dignified insect would more fitly represent him than the one now mentioned. Yet even insects may be troublesome. At present, 'tis but the buzzing of a gnat around the repose of a giant—nevertheless the ephemeron must be brushed away.

In addressing ourselves to our task, however, we meet, even at the outset, with a difficulty. Not occasioned, indeed, either by the obscurity of the great doctrine itself, or by the ability of its assailant—but arising rather from one of his own most palpable defects as a controversialist. It is what we formerly noticed. The utter want of all order and method in his argument. Seldom, indeed, if ever, did we meet with a professedly argumentative composition, which so systematically defies all the ordinary rules of logical, or even common sense reasoning. The author enunciates no principles, lays down no premises, draws no (at least warrantable) conclusions. His treatise has literally (as an argument) neither a beginning, a middle, nor an end. It is a rudis indigestaque notae—a confused, heterogeneous medley of assumptions and assertions, insinuations, animadversions and quotations—indicating, indeed, sufficiently, the conclusions he maintains, or rather assumes, but never advancing towards, or arriving at them, in such a way as to exhibit the links in the process of reasoning, or to allow of their accuracy being tested. Had the writer adopted the usual course pursued by all men who profess to reason upon a subject, it would have been easy to have followed him in the steps of his argument—to have examined his premises—analysed his inferences—rebuted his conclusions—exposed his fallacies. As it is, we have done our best to disentangle the ravelled mass, and extricate something in the shape of general principles; but if our examination should be found defective in logical arrangement, we trust, without any undue forgetfulness of our own faults, that our readers will as-
cribe it, in some degree at least, to the anomalous and intractable materials we have to deal with.

So far, then, as we can make out, our author's reasoning may be resolved into two parts—both, indeed, intricably mixed up together by the writer, but necessarily requiring distinction by us—viz., first, an attack, and (attempted) disproof of Trinitarianism—so far, at least, as regards the question of Christ's Deity—and secondly, the defence, and (alleged) proof of Socinianism, so far, in like manner, as concerns the fact of Christ's humanity. The establishment of these two conclusions is obviously the essential object of the author's entire argument; and, therefore, whatever needs to be said in refutation of his opinions, must fall under one or other of the heads now mentioned.

We have no ground of quarrel with this distribution of the topics of controversy: on the contrary, it is fair and legitimate enough, and sufficiently exhausts the subject; and had our author succeeded in making out either one or other of these two conclusions—had he either disproved Christ to be God, or proved him to be merely man—he would have sufficiently attained his object, and demonstrated Socinianism to be, if not the “Catholic,” at least, “the Apostolic” and Scriptural “faith.” But after a careful, and as far as we can speak for ourselves, a candid, as well as a reiterated perusal of the whole of our author's reasoning, we must unhesitatingly say, that not only has he not made out, nor even attempted to make out, either of the two conclusions now mentioned, but that the only conclusions, or rather conclusion he has established, is one totally different, from both of these now stated, and wholly irrelevant to the actual question at issue. In other words, he proceeds throughout on a misrepresentation of his opponent's doctrine, and on a false assumption, with regard to his own, and the conclusion at which he arrives, is equally irrelevant to both. Thus, on the one hand, he takes it for granted, that because Trinitarians assert Christ to be divine, they therefore deny him to be human—a gross misrepresentation of the doctrine they hold, and a virtual begging of the whole question in dispute; and consequently, on this point, instead of proving, as he requires to do, that Christ was not God, all he does is to prove that he was man—a conclusion unquestionably true, and admitted by every Trinitarian to be so, but totally foreign to the only conclusion requiring to be proved—namely, not merely that Christ was human, but that he was not divine. On the other hand, he equally assumes and takes it for granted, that in order to prove Socinianism to be true, all that is necessary, is to prove that Christ was, a man; whereas, what is really necessary, is to prove that he was, not merely a man, but nothing more than man—so that consequently, here also, the only conclusion he makes out (i.e. that Christ was a human being) as little proves Socinianism to be true, as it fails to prove Trinitarianism to be false. In short, the whole object of the author's reasoning—both as regards the negative and positive conclusions of his argument—both with the view of disproving his opponent's doctrine, and establishing his own—is simply and solely to demonstrate the single truth already mentioned, that Jesus Christ was a human being—that there was and is, “the man Christ Jesus”—and having done this, as certainly, there was no great difficulty of doing, and done it as conclusively and satisfactorily as the soundest Trinitarian could do it himself, our author seems perfectly satisfied that he has done all that is necessary to attain his object; that because he has proved the reality of the Saviour's
humanity, he has therefore completely disproved the doctrine of his divinity; and thus, by this simple process, at once exposed the erroneous creed of his opponents, and demonstrated the truth of his own.

This is, no doubt, a short and easy way of going to work; it has the unquestioned merit, of brevity and simplicity. But is it necessary to say, that it is throughout utterly fallacious—that the whole argument involves, from first to last, a palpable and egregious sophism? Do we need, after what has already been implied, to remind our readers what the subject matter of debate really is between the two parties in the great controversy touching the nature of the Son of God? That, on the one hand, the Catholic and orthodox belief is that Christ is both human and divine—as truly and literally man, as he is truly and supremely God; and that, consequently, merely to prove that he is a human being, is absolutely to prove nothing—nothing against the truth impugned, but on the contrary, an essential element of the truth believed. While on the other hand, that the Socinian belief is, not merely that Christ was man, but that he was nothing more than man; and that consequently, merely to prove that he is a human being, is absolutely to prove nothing—nothing against the truth impugned, but on the contrary, an essential element of the truth believed.

While on the other hand, that the Socinian belief is, not merely that Christ was man, but that he was nothing more than man; and that consequently, merely to prove the truth of Christ's humanity, equally, in this case also, goes for nothing, and of itself serves as little to prove the truth of the Socinian creed, as the error of the Trinitarian. And yet this—the mere proof of Christ's actual humanity—is in reality, the sum and substance of our author's whole demonstration. Is it necessary to say another word to prove it an utter fallacy? Let a simple illustration suffice.

Suppose I am arguing with a materialist—with a man who disbelieves the spirituality of human nature—who denies and impugns the existence of the human soul. What should I think of the conclusiveness of his arguments, if all that they amount to is to prove (what I never deny) that I have a material body—and hence to argue, that because I am a material, therefore I cannot be a spiritual being—that because I have a body, ergo, I cannot have a soul? Does the proof of the one fact involve the disproof of the other? Because I have a body, does it therefore follow that I have not a soul? Assuredly not. And does the proof of Christ's humanity involve the disproof of his Deity? Because you have proved him to be human, have you therefore disproved him to be divine? Assuredly no, also. The cases are entirely parallel. If, therefore, your proving yourself to have a body, does not disprove your having a soul, just as little does your proving Christ to be man, disprove him to be God. Yet this is the miserable fallacy—the shallow, sophism that runs, from beginning to end, through the whole tissue of our author's argument.

But our readers may possibly imagine that we cannot be fairly representing the reasoning of our opponent. Let him speak for himself. In proof of his misrepresentations of the doctrine he opposes, let the following passage suffice. Speaking of the Gnostics, an ancient sect of heretics, who believed Christ to be a mere phantom, and not a real human being, he coolly observes, that “they (the Gnostics) asserted, as his Lordship seems to do, that Christ was a divine being—and denied that he was man.” Thus virtually insinuating that the Bishop, and those who agree with him, in believing Christ to be divine, like the Gnostics, deny him to be human! This indeed is only insinuated, but any further or more direct affirmation of so palpable a falsehood, would not have been safe: it is, however, assumed and taken for granted throughout all the rest of the argument, the
whole of which is so couched and expressed, that no uninitiated person could form any other idea, than that the very essence of the Trinitarian Creed is a denial of the human nature of the Saviour.

In like manner, with regard to the conclusion which, as a Socinian, he is himself bound to establish, our author equally mystifies and misrepresents the truth. To prove this, would be to quote almost the whole pamphlet. The sophism, as is the case with all sophistry, is never honestly and explicitly affirmed; but silently assumed, and insidiously diffused throughout the whole composition: so that here also, as in the former instance, no ordinary reader, unacquainted with the peculiar merits of the controversy, could draw any other conclusion, than that to prove Socinianism to be true, all that is necessary is to prove Christ to have been an actual human being. But our readers will perhaps be surprised to learn the extent to which this misrepresentation—this virtual falsification of the truth—has actually been carried by our author. Will it, then, be credited, that although he has adduced no fewer than nearly sixty texts of Scripture, in proof of what he represents as the true nature of Christ, the whole of these texts, (with two solitary exceptions) refer merely to the human nature of our Saviour—i. e. are proofs of only one half of the truth of which he professes to prove the whole; and further, that although there are, at least, a hundred passages of Scripture, in which the Deity of Christ is either distinctly stated, or necessarily implied, not one of these passages (with the exceptions already mentioned) is even so much as quoted by the author; nay, that although these are the passages which constitute the impregnable proofs of the true doctrine of Christ's person—which establish a fact that is utterly subversive of Socinianism—and which, consequently, it was the author's bounden duty to examine, and if possible, dispose of—yet not one of them, without a single exception, receives from him one word of argument, comment, or explanation—and yet these the very passages, not only essentially necessary to the full and impartial statement of the truth, but which, if not satisfactorily explained and refuted, prove the author's system of belief to be utterly erroneous! And these are the statements—the actual words of inspiration—the undoubted assertions of Scripture—which are passed over in total silence—as utterly disregarded as if they had no existence—as if there was not a sentence in the whole Bible which affirmed Christ to be divine—not one which represented him as being anything more than an ordinary human being—a mere worm of the dust!

And this is "the Catholic and Apostolic faith," with respect to the nature of the Son of God! And neither prophet, nor evangelist, nor apostle, ever mention Christ except as a "human being!" And he is never spoken of as God—or as receiving the names, and titles, of God. No—there are no such passages in the Bible as those which declare "the man Christ Jesus" to be also "the Mighty God," "Immanuel, God with us"—"Jehovah our Righteousness," "the Word,"

(1) The passages actually mentioned, are no exceptions. They are not made the subject of a single argument. One (1 Timothy iii. 16) is got rid of, doubtfully, to say the least, as an interpolation. The other (John i. 1) is dismissed, not with a refutation, that was impossible, but with a sneer—the profane resource hitherto only adopted by the Infidel—now patronised, however, by the "Bible Christian." Socinianism has often been termed the "half-way-house" to Infidelity. The author seems to have got somewhat further.

that "was God"—"God manifest in the flesh"—"God over all, blessed for ever," "the true God, and eternal life," "our God and Saviour Jesus Christ," "the first and the last, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty." And it is not the Bible that ascribes to Christ the attributes of God—the qualities and perfections of Supreme deity. It is not that Book that speaks of his Eternity—"whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting," nor his Immutability—"Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever," nor his Omnipresence—"Lo I am with you alway, even to the end of the world." And it is not the Word of God that ascribes to Christ the acts and deeds of Deity: He is not the author of the work of Creation—all things were made by him (the Word,) and without him was not anything made that was made; nor of Providence, and universal government—"upholding all things by the word of his power;" nor is it He who is to raise the dead—"all that are in their graves, shall hear the voice of the Son of man, and shall come forth;" nor He who is to judge the world—a work itself for which infinite knowledge alone can qualify, and which infinite justice alone can execute—"we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ." And it is not Christ who sits on the throne of celestial glory—"the Lamb . . . . . in the midst of the throne;" not he who receives the honour and worship of Supreme Deity—"that all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father;"—not he to whom angel and archangel, and cherubim and seraphim, "and every creature that is in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them," render the adoration due only to the Eternal, "saying, Blessing and honour, and glory and power be unto . . . . the Lamb for ever and ever." And these, and many more such as these, are statements nowhere to be found in the pages of Revelation—the "Bible Christian" could not find them in the Book; they had no place in his Bible. And we are to be so credulous as to believe all this; and we are to expunge these things from our Bibles also—to obliterate them from our memory—to treat them as if they never existed, or were intended to have no meaning—in order that we may be able to comply with the modest and reasonable request of our author, when he asks us to acknowledge the system which makes the Incarnate Deity a frail and mortal creature—"a fallible and peccable man,"—and which deliberately "takes away the words of the Book" of life—as the doctrine of Scripture


(0) Revelation v. 13.

(2) The actual words of Priestly—a high Socinian authority. Nay, Belsham goes even further, and says—of Him who was "holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners," that we have "no sufficient data by which to determine whether, during his private as well as his public life, he was free from sin or not; and that it is to us a matter of no material consequence!" —Wardlaw, p. 240.

(3) This is not at all unusual with Socinians, and it is not to be wondered at, considering the sentiments they generally entertain regarding the inspiration of Scripture. The following are some extracts from the opinions of their highest, and universally admitted authorities on this subject. "Unitarians admit," says Belsham, "that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament contain authentic records of facts, and of divine interpositions; but they utterly deny the universal
—as the truth of God—"the Catholic and Apostolic faith!"

Truly, if such statements as those now quoted are not the statements of Inspiration, we are, indeed, yet "in our sins;" "our faith is vain;" and cold and dreary Socinianism rises triumphant over the ruined hopes of mankind. But if they are—if these passages, which are but samples of a multitude of others—are in truth the testimony of revelation—then, unless the whole Bible is a delusion, and the word of truth a tissue of lies, the Deity of Jesus Christ is alone the truth of God, and the system that denies it—a daring and impious falsehood.

Nothing further, we apprehend, requires to be said, in order to show how justly we have represented the opinions and arguments of our author; nor is there need, we hope, of additional argument to prove the palpable and monstrous fallacy of his conclusions. An illustration, however, may not be out of place; and one has

*inspiration of the writers of those compositions, as a qualification to which, indeed, they make no pretension, and of which they offer no proof*? (Calm Inquiry, pp. 541—2.) Again, with regard to the Scripture doctrine of the Son being the Creator and preserver of the world, Priestley observes, "I do not see that we are under any obligation to believe it, merely because it was an opinion held by an Apostle!" (History of Early Opinions, p. 63.) And on the text, John vi. 62 "What, and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before," the same writer says, "I would not build an article of faith of such magnitude on the correctness of John's recollection, and representation of our Lord's language;—and . . . . sooner than admit it, I would suppose the whole verse to be an interpolation; or that the Old Apostle dictated one thing, and his amanuensis wrote another!!" (Letter to Dr. Price, p. 57.) After this, it is not difficult to account for our Author's omission of those "opinions" or "interpolations" of "Apostles"—i.e. of those statements of Divine Inspiration—which assert the Deity of the Son of God, occurred to us, which may relieve the (to some minds) oppressive tedium of dry polemics.

We remember having once laid our hands, now several years ago, on a unique and singular little book, entitled, somewhat facetiously, (as the sequel will show,) "A History of France." It was written by a Jesuit of the ultra-royalist school, and designed expressly for the perusal and instruction of the then youthful Duc de Bordeaux, now the *soi disant* Henry V. of France. Its singularity consisted in the principle on which it was composed. It was simply this—the insertion only of such historical facts as were favourable to the despotic claims, and palatable to the bigoted prejudices of the, then, dethroned and exiled Bourbons; and the careful and systematic exclusion of every thing of an opposite character. Of the application of this principle, we can only advert to the illustration afforded by one particular chapter. This chapter professed to treat of the history and exploits of "General Napoleon Bonaparte," and in it the truthful and impartial method already mentioned was most felicitously exemplified. All that related to the history of the illustrious Corsican, as a *subject and a soldier*, from the Lieutenant of Artillery, up at least, to the General of Division, was carefully inserted, and, on the whole, accurately narrated. Every thing connected with him as the Republican Chief, as First Consul, and above all, as Emperor, was as systematically omitted. The biography of the *man*—the *subject*—*Bonaparte*, was faithfully given; the history, the very existence, of the *Emperor Napoleon* was wholly obliterated. And had any, otherwise ignorant, person read the work, he could never have imagined that the latter personage ever existed, much less that the former and latter of these persons were one and the same individual. We need scarce-
ly ask our readers whether such a work was, as it professed to be, the true history of Napoleon Bonaparte? No doubt, all that it told was true; but it told only half the truth: and the misfortune was, it had professed to tell the whole. To have told the whole, the real—the true history of Napoleon, required him to be spoken of both as the subject and the Emperor. The Jesuit, however, while he wrote of him as the one, never mentioned him as the other; and consequently his work, though a true history of the subject, yet, as a professedly true history of the man who was both subject and sovereign, was, practically, a positive falsehood.

The biography of the Jesuit and the theology of the "Bible Christian" are productions of the same school. Just as the former has treated the human subject of his narrative, so has the latter treated—we desire to say it with deepest reverence—another and very different Being. Equally scrupulous is our author in telling us of "the man Christ Jesus," but just as systematically as his ecclesiastical prototype conceals the imperial dignity of the hero of his memoir, does his present imitator suppress the Divine Majesty of the misrepresented Author of Christianity. We need not pursue the parallel. The cases are precisely the same. And so also is the conclusion. As both authors agree in telling only half the truth, while professing to tell the whole, that which is actually told is, in both cases, equally and alike—false. For in every such case, "partial truth is equivalent to positive falsehood."(1) The historical facts of the Jesuit, and the alleged doctrines of the "Bible Christian" are, therefore, precisely on a par in point of veracity. The theology of the latter, like the biography of the former, is a deliberate and systematic untruth. It is hard to say, indeed, which of the two is the more thoroughly mendacious.

This, however, reminds us that the exposure of our author's Socinian emendation of Jesuitical sophistry unavoidably gives rise to questions of a graver aspect, and more personal bearing. There is something more, and something worse here than a mere fallacy in logic: there is mis-statement, misrepresentation of the truth, suppression of Scripture, and, whether intended or not, actual and positive deception. And how happens all this? We have but two suppositions to choose between. Our author's mis-statements are either unintentional, or wilful. He either does not really know the doctrine held by his opponents, or else he has wilfully misrepresented it: he either is not aware of the existence of those Scripture texts which assert the Deity of the Saviour, or else he has purposely and deliberately suppressed them. Which alternative must we take? Even were we to adopt the former and more charitable one, and to give our author the benefit of the unmitigated mass of ignorance which it necessarily implies—to what conclusion must we come? Plainly, that such a man ought never to have presumed to write on such a subject—that such a shallow dabbler in theology—so utterly unacquainted even with the rudest elements of the Christian creed—not to say, with the plainest truths of the Bible—was the last of all men who ought ever to have presumed to emerge from the obscurity of ignorance, and to arrogate to himself the dignity of authorship. Far more becoming, as well as far better for himself, had he allowed the "talent" of which he so loudly vaunts, to have remained for ever either "hidden in the earth," or wrapt up in its napkin, or in whatever still smaller and nameless article of household apparel would have sufficed to envelope its insignificance. But is it pos-

---

(1) Sir James Mackintosh,
sible for us to entertain even this comparatively favourable supposition? Unfortunately, every thing forbids it. The author’s own words sufficiently convict him. The language he uses, in repeated instances, shows that he is perfectly aware of the real tenets of his opponents; while it is utterly impossible to believe that any man, who knows the Bible so well as he seems to know it, or at least, who has ransacked it, for the nonce, so thoroughly as he has done, for the host of texts he has quoted, can, by any possibility, be ignorant of those almost countless passages, in proof of the Saviour’s Deity, which it contains, and some of which we have already quoted. Nay, the author admits that he was himself “once a firm believer in the doctrines of orthodoxy,” and that “there was a time when he knew no other system.” The plea of ignorance, therefore, is utterly untenable, and with it also falls the plea of unintentional error. What conclusion then remains? That all this mass of misrepresentation—all these instances of the suppressio veri—of withholding and suppressing the truth—have been knowingly and purposely adduced—done with wilful and deliberate intention. And what is it thus wilfully to suppress, and thus knowingly to misrepresent the truth—that at least, which is known to be alleged as the truth—but to give utterance to a falsehood—to what, as a professed statement of the whole truth, must have been known to be false?

This conclusion there is no evading: of this offence our author, whoever he may be, now stands accused, and self-convicted. And this is the high-minded votary of “truth”—the self-proclaimed antagonist of “error.” This the paragon of consistency, who so indignantly repudiates the practice of “concealment.” This the impersonation of conscious truthfulness and self-satisfied integrity, who calls upon his readers “to place their condemnation on every word and sentiment he may utter at variance with the revealed will of God.” This the modest and unassuming teacher, who “dictates to no man, and seeks not to force his views on others”: who, with such scrupulous regard to veracity, cautions his readers against the danger of “smothering the truth under glossing delusion”—and yet who not only attempts, in every page he writes, to “dictate his views” to other men as “the Catholic faith”—the only truth of God—but who stands self-convicted, not merely of “withholding” that truth, but of substituting for it what is equivalent to positive falsehood! Oh “guide of the blind—light of them which are in darkness—instructor of the foolish—teacher of babes—thou that teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? Thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal? (1) “And there shall in no wise enter in—anything that defileth—neither—whosoever loveth and maketh a lie.”(2)

There are several other topics in this publication to which we had intended to have called the attention of our readers, but we believe that they, as well as ourselves, have had enough both of the author and his lucubrations, and that it is time to bring our intercourse with him to a close.

We naturally feel reluctant, however, to drop the acquaintance of illustrious characters, even though nameless; in a personal point of view, especially, nothing, since the days of Rousseau, has been so interesting to dwell on, in connection with great personages, as their Confessions. On this point the present author has manifested a laudable desire to gratify the natural curiosity of the public. He has favoured us also with a chapter of “Confessions.” In the preface to

---

(1) Romans ii. 19—21. (2) Revelation xx. 27. xxi. 15.
another production of his pen, published at the same time (we believe) as the present pamphlet, and relating, in part at least, to the same subject the "Bible Christian," with that characteristic absence of egotism, by which he is so happily distinguished, has modestly committed to publicity, and consigned to future ages, some brief but important revelations of his own religious history. Of these revelations we solicit attention to that contained in the following passage, as peculiarly calculated to throw light on some of the chief peculiarities of the publication we have been reviewing, and as affording the best grounds for forming a proper estimate of the writer's qualifications, as an authority on matters of such deep thought, and vital moment.

"The author," he observes, "was once a firm believer in the doctrines of orthodoxy—if it can be said that any man can believe what he does not comprehend; and, had he been destitute of the moral courage to examine those doctrines, he might now have been a firm believer in them; or—he fears a MANIA, for his feelings were acutely alive to their awful tendency, and to this day has he to regret their baneful influence upon his mind."

This "confession" reveals three important secrets: 1. According to the author, a man cannot be said to believe what he does not comprehend. This evidently is a personal statement; the inference, therefore, is logical with regard to the author himself, that he only believes what he comprehends—that whatever is beyond his comprehension he rejects as an article of belief. This is quite enough. It fully and satisfactorily accounts for our author's rejection of the Deity of Christ. According to the principle now stated, he disbelieves that doctrine, not because it is not true—not because God has not revealed it—but because he cannot comprehend it. Yes, because this worm—this human insect—this mortal atom—this ephemeron of an hour—does not comprehend the inscrutable nature of infinite Deity, nor the particular mode in which that nature can coexist with a visible human form—therefore, the fact of that coexistence—in other words, the fact of the Deity of Jesus Christ—is an incredible falsehood! Admirable logic! Most sound and conclusive reasoning! Carry out these principles, and where will you stop? Once admit the axiom, that you are only to believe what you can comprehend, and what will thus be left to be believed at all? Assuredly, not one fragment, not merely of revealed, but even of natural religion. For what is more utterly beyond all human comprehension than the nature of God himself—the unfathomable mystery of Deity? And therefore, on the same principle, equally incredible, and equally to be rejected. Let our author proceed as he has begun, and we do not require to be told where he will end. His last, if not his next publication will be, not 'Unitarianism,' the only credible faith—but "Atheism," the only comprehensible scepticism.

2. The author further "confesses" that he "was once a firm believer in the doctrines of orthodoxy:" in other words, that he is now a renegade—an apostate from the truth he once believed. This lets out another secret. It fully accounts for the bitter animosity he uniformly evinces towards "the truth as it is in Jesus," and for the unscrupulous invectives he heaps on the heads of its disciples. None so "good a hater" as an apostate; no animosity so virulent as that of a renegade towards his old faith. The intensity of his hatred to the truth is in exact proportion to his desire to
justify his own adoption of error. This fact fully explains the spirit of our author’s whole composition. Perhaps also it accounts for another fact. The consciousness of apostacy may well make any man ashamed of his—name.

3. But there is a still more important revelation. The author tells us that “had he been destitute of the moral courage to examine those doctrines—(i.e. the doctrines of orthodox Christianity) he might now have been—he fears—a Maniac”—and that even “to this day, he has to regret the baneful influence,” thus exerted “upon his mind.” Had we had any idea of the author’s personal identity, and had we known, from other sources, the fact of this melancholy mental infirmity, we should have been the last persons in existence to have adverted to it. We should have pitied and sympathised with the unhappy subject of such a calamitous visitation of providence. But this unfortunate personage not only reveals the fact himself, but represents it—publishes it—boastfully and triumphantly exhibits it—as a proof of the “baneful” influence—of the irrational, and insane tendency of the creed he has abandoned. Any regard to the delicacy of reserve is therefore quite unnecessary. Our readers will judge for themselves how far the saving truth of God is likely to disturb the sanity of the human mind. It is not to this point that we wish to speak.

We desire to notice only one fact. What is it that the author actually confesses? That he was once—whatever may have been the cause—on the verge of insanity; that he might, even now, have been a maniac; that he still speaks of a “baneful influence”—apparently, not even yet, wholly got rid of. After this, we think it quite unnecessary to draw any further conclusion. However painful, it is sufficiently obvious. The man who goes so far as to admit that he was once on the brink of derangement, and over whom, the “baneful influence” of that evil hour is still acknowledged to linger, can scarcely be expected to be yet entirely exempt from the “influence” of mental aberration. Such hallucinations do not soon pass away. Even when their victim deems himself again secure, they are frequently in their highest ascendant. How far such a man is qualified to be the instructor of the saner portion of his fellow-creatures, especially on subjects requiring the deepest thought and the soundest judgment—and how much weight, therefore, is due to his opinions on the momentous topics he has undertaken to elucidate—on matters so closely connected with “the deep things of God,” and so seriously affecting the spiritual sanity and eternal welfare of the human soul—his present candid “confession” will sufficiently enable our readers to determine.

One word more. In another respect, the present confession of our author is still more important. It serves, in no small degree, to alleviate the painful feelings, which, in regard to himself, his whole composition is inevitably fitted to awaken. It furnishes, indeed, our almost only ground of hope, in behalf of this unhappy and misguided man. Pain would we believe that he has written the pages we have now reviewed, under the irrational and irresponsible influence to which he alludes. Thankful should we be to think that his erroneous belief—his denial of Christ—his sad and melodious tissue of error, and falsehood, and profanity—could be imputed to mental alienation—that though unknown to, as he shall be unjudged by, us, He, “to whom all hearts are open,” can trace in that bewildered soul enough of the vestiges of—insanity, to lighten, if not to annul its else hopeless responsibility. For while “he that believeth in the Son
hath everlasting life: he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but—the wrath of God abideth on him."

We have felt it our duty in the course of the preceding remarks, to express ourselves plainly and unreservedly, both in regard to the author and his writings. But if to any of our readers we appear to have done so more strongly than was necessary—we must remind them that this, of all others, is a case which allows us not to "speak smooth things," or to say, "Peace, peace, where there is no peace." What we have had to animadvert on has been, not merely the errors of the author's own belief, and his misrepresentation of that of others; but his perversion and suppression of the most vital truths of the Word of God—his inculcation and dissemination of errors most fatal and ruinous to man. The doctrine he has assailed and ridiculed, and endeavoured, though unsuccessfully, to impugn, is no mere speculative theological dogma, but a truth of most essential moment, and of the deepest practical importance. If Jesus Christ is not essentially divine—if he is only a being of ordinary humanity—a mere frail and mortal creature of the dust—the atonement is an unreal mockery—the guilt of human sin is still unc cancelled—the hopes of mankind destroyed—the whole scheme of redemption annihilated. For "none" (of "all the inhabitants of the world"—none of mere human beings)—"none can by any means redeem his brother, or give to God a ransom for him."(1) No language, therefore, can ever be too strong to expose—to reprobate—to condemn—the system of error and delusion that would wrench from the grasp of perishing sinners the one and only source of their redemption. But to the man himself, by whom this delusion has now been espoused and advocated, we entertain none of the feelings, which he, unhappily, so obviously cherishes towards his own religious opponents. With him we have no personal quarrel, as of him we have no personal cognisance. Whoever he may be—whether or not the individual whom common rumour indicates—whether, as is said, the fabricator, as well as the circulator of the base coin that has been issued—we care not to know, and certainly shall not so far demean ourselves as to inquire—much less, so far forget ourselves as to insinuate. But whoever he may be, we only look upon him as a hapless, misguided being—"deceiving and being deceived"—whose opinions, indeed, merit only contempt, but who himself requires the deepest commiseration. And if the supposition we have formerly made should, unfortunately, be unwarranted—if these sad and melancholy pages we have been reviewing, have indeed been written in the exercise of a rational and responsible mind—our only desire is, that their deluded author may even yet be led to see the error of his way, and to "pray God, if perhaps the thought of his heart"—and the utterance of his lips "may be forgiven" him. For though he has "spoken" not one "word"—but many, "against the Son of Man"—and "denied the Lord that bought him"—and madly dared to heap mockery and contempt on the glorious majesty of "God manifest in the flesh"—yet the very Being whose truth and dignity he has impugned, still deigns, in unspeakable forbearance, to declare, that "all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men"—to humbled, penitent, believing man. Let this hapless being, whoever he may be, even "to-day hear," that "voice," whose divine accents he has hitherto despised—let him "receive, as a little child," the truth he has as yet contemned—let him seek the influence of
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(1) Psalm xlix. 1—7.
that Spirit who alone can "lead" him "into all (the) truth"—"the truth as it is in Jesus"—and the slave of error may yet be "made free." And truly and unfeignedly thankful should we be, if such shall yet be the issue—if this hapless victim of delusion shall yet be found, "sitting, clothed and in his right mind, at the feet of Jesus"—ready to avow, as his only belief, "the faith which once he destroyed"—and able, thankfully and believingly, to say, to a no longer unknown Saviour, "My Lord and my God!"

As regards the Deity of Christ, our remarks in the preceding pages have been, necessarily, almost entirely negative. Our space has not permitted us to exhibit, in any adequate degree, the positive statement of that important doctrine. If we ever do so, it must be on another occasion; when released from the irksome task of disentangling the mazes of Error, all the more grateful will be the contemplation of the simple majesty of Truth.

DEATH OF ULRIC ZUNGLER.—But the death of one individual far surpassed all others. Zuingle was at the post of danger; the helmet on his head; the sword hanging at his side; the battle-axe in his hand. Scarcely had the action begun, when, stooping to console a dying man, a stone, hurled by the vigorous arm of a Waldstette, struck him on the head, and closed his lips. Yet Zuingle arose; when two other blows which struck him successively on the leg, threw him down again. Twice more he stands up; but a fourth time he receives a thrust from a lance, he staggers, and sinking beneath so many wounds, falls on his knees. Does not the darkness that is spreading around him announce a still thicker darkness that is about to cover the church? Zuingle turns away from such sad thoughts; once more he uplifts that head which had been so bold, and gazing with calm eye upon the trickling blood, exclaims: "What evil is this? They can indeed kill the body, but they cannot kill the soul!" These were his last words. He had scarcely uttered them ere he fell backwards. There, under a tree (Zuingle's Pear-tree) in a meadow, he remained lying on his back, with clasped hands, and eyes upturned to heaven.

Meanwhile Zuingle lay extended under the tree, near the road by which the mass of the people was passing. The shouts of the victors, the groans of the dying, these flickering torches borne from corpse to corpse, Zurich humbled, the cause of Reform lost—all cried aloud to him that God punishes his servants, when they have recourse to the arm of man. If the German Reformer had been able to approach Zuingle at this solemn moment, and pronounce these oft repeated words: "Christians fight not with sword and arquebuss, but with sufferings and with the cross," Zuingle would have stretched out his dying hand, and said, "Amen!"

Two of the soldiers who were prowling over the field of battle, having come near the reformer without recognising him, "Do you wish for a priest to confess yourself?" asked they. Zuingle, without speaking (for he had not strength), made signs in the negative. "If you cannot speak," replied the soldiers, "at least think in thy heart of the Mother of God, and call upon the saints?" Zuingle again shook his head, and kept his eyes still fixed on heaven. Upon this the irritated soldiers began to curse him. "No doubt," said they, "You are one of the heretics of the city!" One of them, being curious to know who it was, stooped down, and turned Zuingle's head in the direction of a fire that had been lighted near the spot. The soldier immediately let him fall to the ground. "I think," said he, surprised and amazed,
"I think it is Zuingle!" At this moment Captain Fockinger of Unterwalden, a veteran and a pensioner, drew near: he had heard the last words of the soldier. "Zuingle! that rascal, that traitor!" Then raising his sword so long sold to the stranger, he struck the dying Christian on the throat, exclaiming in a violent passion, "Die, obstinate heretic!" Yielding under this last blow, the Reformer gave up the ghost; he was doomed to perish by the sword of a mercenary. "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints." The soldiers ran to other victims.

At length the day appeared. The Waldstettes spread over the field of battle, running here and there, stopping, contemplating, struck with surprise at the sight of their most formidable enemies stretched lifeless on the plain; but sometimes also shedding tears as they gazed on corpses which reminded them of old and sacred ties of friendship. At length they reached the pear-tree under which Zuingle lay dead, and an immense crowd collected around it. His countenance still beamed with expression and with life. "He has the look," said Bartholomew Stocker of Zug, who had loved him, "he has the look of a living rather than of a dead man. Such he was when he kindled the people by the fire of his eloquence." All eyes were fixed upon the corpse. John Schonbrunner, formerly canon of Zurich, who had retired to Zug at the epoch of the Reformation, could not restrain his tears; "Whatever may have been thy creed," said he, "I know, Zuingle, that thou hast been a loyal confederate! May thy soul rest with God!"

But the pensioners of the foreigner, on whom Zuingle had never ceased to make war, required that the body of the heretic should be dismembered, and a portion sent to each of the Five Cantons. "Peace be to the dead! and God alone be their Judge," exclaimed the Avoyer Golder and the landamman Thoss of Zug. Cries of fury answered their appeal, and compelled them to retire. Immediately the drums beat to muster; the dead body was tried, and it was decreed that it should be quartered for treason against the Confederation, and then burnt for heresy. The executioner of Lucerne carried out the sentence. Flames consumed Zuingle's disjointed members; the ashes of swine were mingled with his; and a lawless multitude rushing upon his remains, flung them to the four winds of heaven.

Zuingle was dead. A great light had been extinguished in the Church of God. Mighty by the Word as were the other Reformers, he had been more so than they in action; but this very power had been his weakness, and he had fallen under the weight of his own strength.

Zuingle was not forty-eight years old when he died. If the might of God always accompanied the might of man, what would he not have done for the Reformation in Switzerland, and even in the Empire! But he had wielded an arm that God had forbidden, the helmet had covered his head, and he had grasped the halberd. His more devoted friends were themselves astonished, and exclaimed: "We know not what to say! . . . . a bishop in arms!" The bolt had furrowed the cloud, the blow had reached the Reformer, and his body was no more than a handful of dust in the palm of a soldier.—D'AUBIGNÉ.

ANTICIPATED DESTINY OF THE WORLD.

The following remarks, from the pen of one of the most eminent scientific men of the day, are interesting, as illustrative of the coincidence of the anticipations of science with the announcements of Revelation. After reviewing the discoveries of Baron Cuvier as to the previous geological revolutions which have taken place in the structure of the globe, the author proceeds:

Before Cuvier's time, history and tradition, and stern reason, had indicated to man but one creation, and one period for its duration. The starry heavens disclosed to us no indications of their origin, and exhibited no prospect of their passing away. But, now that it has been proved that our globe has been the theatre of such transcendent movements—the seat of so much revolution and change—the birth-place and the grave of so many cycles of organic life—may we not expect to find analogous laws in the planetary system of which that globe forms a part? Launched on the boundless ocean of space, the ark of human reason has no pilot at its helm, and no pole-star for its guide, but an authority which cannot err, has issued the decree, that the heavens themselves shall
wax old as a garment, and as a vesture shall be folded up: and that while they shall perish and pass away, a new heavens shall arise—the abode of happiness, and the seat of immortality. What this change is to be, we dare not even conjecture; but we see in the heavens themselves some traces of destructive elements, and some indications of their power. The fragments of broken planets—the descent of meteoric stones upon our globe—the wheeling comets welding their loose materials at the solar furnace—the volcanic eruptions—are all foreshadows of that impending convulsion to which the system of the world is doomed. Thus placed on a planet which is to be burnt up, and under heavens which are to pass away—thus treading, as it were, on the cemeteries, and dwelling in the mausoleums of former worlds—let us learn from reason the lesson of humility, and wisdom—if we have not already been taught it in the school of revelation.—Sir David Brewster.

**Things New and Old.**

**Christian Paradoxes.**—A Christian is one who believes things his reason cannot comprehend; he hopes for things which neither he nor any man alive have seen: he labours for that which he knoweth he shall never obtain; yet in the issue, his belief appears not to be false; his hope makes him not ashamed; his labour is not in vain.

He believes a Virgin to be a mother of a Son; and that very Son of hers to be her Maker. He believes him to have been shut up in a narrow room, whom heaven and earth could not contain. He believes him to have been born in time, who was and is from everlasting. He believes him to have been a weak child, carried in arms, who is the Almighty; and him once to have died, who only hath life and immortality in himself.

He believes the God of all grace to have been angry with One that hath never offended him; and that God, that hates sin, to be reconciled to himself, though sinning continually, and never making, or being able to make him satisfaction. He believes a most just God to have punished a most just person, and to have justified himself, though a most ungodly sinner. He believes himself freely pardoned, and yet a sufficient satisfaction was made for him.

He believes himself to be precious in God's sight, and yet loathes himself in his own. He dares not justify himself even in those things wherein he can find no fault with himself, and yet believes God accepts him in those services wherein he is able to find many faults.

He praiseth God for his justice, and yet fears him for his mercy. He is so ashamed as that he dares not open his mouth before God, and yet he comes with boldness to God, and asks him anything he needs. He is so humble as to acknowledge himself to deserve nothing but evil; and yet believes that God means him all good. He is one that fears always, yet is as bold as a lion. He is often sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; many times complaining, yet always giving of thanks. He is the most lowly minded, yet the greatest aspirer; most contented, yet ever craving.—Lord Bacon.

**True Grace is a growing principle.** The Christian grows in discernment; a child may play with a serpent; but the man gets as far from it as he can: a child may taste poison; but the man will not suffer a speck of poison near him. He grows in humility; the blade shoots up boldly, the young ear keeps erect with confidence; but the full corn in the ear inclines itself toward the earth, not because it is f处处er, but because it is matured. He grows in strength; the new wine ferments and frets; but the old wine acquires a body and a firmness.—Cretz.

**Eloquence.**—True eloquence, I find, to be none, but the serious and hearty love of truth: and that, whose mind soever is fully possessed with a fervent desire to know good things, and with the dearest charity to infuse the know-
ledge of them into others, when such a man would speak, his words, like so many nimble and busy servitors, trip about him at command, and, in well ordered files, as he would wish, fall aptly into their own places.—Milton.

Test of a Ministry.—He is a poor minister—he is good for nothing, who never makes you feel that you need Christ; and think what you will of him, he is a good minister, and a faithful one, who disturbs your consciences, and forces you to feel, that you must find Christ, or perish.—Bradley.

A Prayer-Book.—A minister who had been characterized by the fervour of his preaching and praying, was observed to decline in the spirit with which his public duties had been performed; whereupon some of his flock ventured to hint the change to him. His simple reply was, "I have lost my prayer-book!" "Your prayer-book!" said the astonished visitors; "we never knew you used one!" "You are mistaken," said the minister: "I relied much on my prayer-book; I mean, the prayers of my people; but since they have ceased earnestly to pray for me, I have been disqualified for labouring diligently for them."

Alas! how many ministers are left to labour up-hill from the same cause. The people wonder that they are not more animated and successful in their public duties, never adverting to the fact that the fault is in themselves, as they suffer weeks, and even months and years, to pass without offering one fervent and heartfelt prayer for their success. Paul felt the necessity of this kind of co-operation, and earnestly besought his Christian brethren to pray for his ministerial success; and nothing, we should suppose, has since occurred to diminish this necessity in regard to God's ambassadors. Of one thing we are very certain, that there would be better preaching if there was more praying.

Religious and Missionary Intelligence.

England: Education.—The public mind seems awake to the importance of education. Educate! educate! educate! is now the cry from one end of the country to the other. The Schoolmaster is abroad, and we are glad to behold him with the Bible in his hand. The Bible supplies the only proper basis for the education of beings, destined for immortality. "Life and immortality" are "brought to light by the Gospel." Happy will it be for our native land, when her millions of sons, are instructed not merely in that knowledge which enlightens and enlarges the mind, but in that which sanctifies and saves the soul. The various advocates of education are by no means agreed in their plans. But the agitation of the subject will do good, the moral and religious wants of the country are becoming better known, and it is hoped some well-concerted scheme will ere long be devised, to compass the end proposed. "Wisdom and knowledge shall be the stability of thy times."

Popery.—The watchmen on the walls of our spiritual Zion, are justly anxious on account of the alarming increase of Popery. The cloud which seemed small at first, is becoming larger, more dense and threatening. There is now every reason to anticipate the endowment of Popery. The Churchman's Monthly Review, (an organ of the Evangelical party in the Church of England) thus endeavours to awaken the fears of the Dissenters—

"Do they not know—every body else knows full well—that Lord John Russell has become many degrees higher in his Church-manship within the last ten years? Do they not know that he is a regular attendant at Mr. Bennett's Church, St. Paul's, Knightsbridge, and is smitten with the rubrical performances there carried on? Do they not know, that on assuming the Premiership, his first step was to have a
long interview with the Archbishop of Canterbury, with the tenor of which conversation, his Grace declared himself to be "entirely satisfied"? And do they not know that—very recently at least—Lord John entertained a project which would have terrified Sir Robert Peel; namely, that of increasing the number of spiritual Peers in the House of Lords?

"Popery has been rapidly gaining on Dissent—not on Protestantism merely, but especially on Dissent, for several years past. Have they kept any record of how many young Dissenters have entered the Church as ministers since 1830, and of how many of these have gone to the extent of Tractarianism, and some to that of Popery itself? Or among their lay-men, how many have gone over to the Church, and have become very high-Churchmen, or even more?

"They were, in 1830, a great and powerful body in England—the Romanists a despised and inconsiderable sect. Are they now, with all their wealth and numbers, building as many chapels in each year, as the Papists build of mass-houses?

"But take a still clearer view. Are not the Romanists counteracting, ruining, and tearing up the fairest missions to the heathens, which it has cost the Dissenters so many years to establish? Where is the Tahitian Church, after an expenditure of tens of thousands of pounds, and of many precious lives? And look at China, where the London Missionary Society has long had its two or three missionaries, a number it has since raised to eight or ten. Within the last few weeks—the Romanists have contracted with certain ship-owners to carry out for them to China, within the year, one hundred Missionaries!"

Truly there is enough, in the statements thus interrogatively put, if not to awaken the fears, assuredly to arouse the energies of every advocate for Evangelical Truth. We wonder that a sense of common danger does not tend to produce greater unity of aim and purpose among those, who though attired in various denominational uniforms, are nevertheless, parts of the same army, and under the direction of the same leader and Saviour. When the Church is compared to a compact city, she is said to be "terrible as an army with banners."

**Bible Distribution.**—The circulation of the Bible in Great Britain has of late been mightily quickened and increased. In Scotland alone, from January 1845, to January 1846, sixteen editions of the Bible were printed, consisting of 312,000 copies. In Manchester and the surrounding country, an unprecedented circulation has been obtained, and immense sales effected. "At
the annual meeting of the Manchester Auxiliary of the British and Foreign Bible Society on Tuesday, the Report which was read stated, that, previous to the present year, the number of copies of the Bible distributed in that district annually, amounted to from 5,000 to 10,000; whilst this year no less a number than 96,000 have been disposed of, being equal to the number disposed of in the previous twelve years.

**Foreign.**

**Pesth.** Interesting information is furnished, respecting the present condition of the Jews in this place, by the Rev. R. Smith, of the Free Church of Scotland. "Six weeks ago," writes Mr. Smith, "we had no school for Jewish children, nor had we the prospect of getting one established. The Lord has taken this matter into his own hand, and done what could not have been accomplished had we moved directly in it, as you will presently see. Mr. Saphir's eldest son, (by his present wife) the first who was baptized by us in Pesth, after having spent two years in Germany, in a seminary for training schoolmasters, returned home upwards of a year ago, broken in health, and lame of a complaint in his foot, which remains still unhealed. He has been a comfort to us all from the first day even until now, walking in humility and in love, increasing in knowledge and in grace. The Lord put it into his heart, about six weeks ago, to assemble a few children round his bed-side (for at that time he was so ailing as to be confined to his bed,) to give them daily instruction, chiefly in the Scriptures. For the first week three or four Jewish children attended. Shortly after they increased to fourteen—all Jews, with a few exceptions. Their teacher receiving new energy, even bodily, from the blessing of God on his labours, rose from his bed, and has not since laid himself down, except for sleep. His room became too small and confined. We provided him with means for a more suitable locality. The numbers went on increasing. Now the daily attendance is between forty and fifty, of whom but a very small proportion consists of Gentiles. There are one or two remarks I would make on the principles on which we have acted to this school, and on the position in which we at present stand towards it. First, It has been our desire, that as the Lord began this work himself, he should be allowed to carry it on, and perfect it in his own way. We felt that our interference would but mar it. No kind of formal arrangements or preparations, therefore, were made. Nothing of an external kind was got, till an urgent necessity demanded it. When more children came, a new bench was added. The school was left to develop itself, or rather was left in the hands of Him who made it. The growth was first from within. The outward frame-work was not first raised to invite the persecution of the Jews. The shell grew unobtrusive and unseen with the growth of the school itself. So that if an attempt be made now to overturn it, the sympathies of many must be cut through before it can be reached. It is of great importance, both for these sympathies and for the position of the school otherwise, that it remain without break, or any such change as would imply a loss of identity, historically the same little school which assembled round Philip's bed. Secondly, In reference to our relation to it, we wish it to remain, as it has been from the beginning—Philip's school. This saves us and the school itself from a thousand difficulties.

Our new edition of the Hebrew Bible is now finished. I suppose you will by this time have received the copy we sent you by the Rev. Mr. Grant. You will see that the execution is beautiful, and that it forms one of the finest editions of the kind that have yet been published. We have already begun the work of circulation. We sent two of our colporteurs with one assortment, a journey of 250 miles, through Hungary, to Poland. We wished to see especially if an entrance could be got for them, through the frontier, into that dark land. They sold a large number of copies in the towns and villages of Hungary through which they passed. But when they came to the boundaries, their progress was stopped. They learned from the custom-house officers, that they have the strictest orders to let no book, of whatever kind, from Hungary. Our colporteurs were commissioned not only to circulate among the Jews their own Scriptures, but also to direct their attention to Him to whom Moses and the prophets bear witness. Their work seems in this respect to have been much blessed, especially in one town (Gyongye,) where a great stir was made and much in-
quiry existed. Another colporteur we sent with a similar assortment down the Danube, to the lower regions of Hungary. A still larger blessing rested on this undertaking than on the other. The Jewish mind is in a state of movement, as we expected. Many have heard a distant report of the truth, and are anxious to hear more. The fields are whitening to the harvest. We pray the Lord of the harvest to give us a supply of suitable labourers. Many Bibles were sold on this journey, and much inquiry was awakened. Besides the Hebrew Bibles, he sold all the German Bibles and New Testaments he had with him, with a few exceptions, exclusively among Jews. He as well as the other two, kept daily journals. We may afterwards present you with extracts from these, that you may see more clearly the nature of this work. We feel greatly the want of a right supply of good and suitable tracts to leave behind in the places visited, to nourish and deepen the impressions made. What a field lies before us in Hungary, when we are once ready fully to enter on it. Our work is but beginning yet. A few souls in a single city can never satisfy us. Our station must be a centre from which streams shall issue forth through the whole land. You will observe that though we are yet far from the position which we should occupy, yet, by the grace of God, we are approaching nearer to it. The Gospel is being preached. A school is in operation. The Bible is printed, and being circulated. Men are being trained for carrying to the dispersed of Israel, among the towns and villages of Hungary, the joyful tidings that Messiah is come.

Caffre War.—The trying circumstances in which the Missionary brethren are placed, in consequence of the Caffre invasion, will appear by the following extract from the letter of Mr. Calderwood, who writes from Fort Beaufort, under date August 13th—

"The war has now continued about three months and a half, and, I grieve to say it, appears no nearer its termination than when it began. The desolation wrought is truly distressing. The ruin achieved by the hands of the Caffres upon mission property, erected with a view to their own salvation, is most striking and lamentable. Their chief object, I dare say, has been, that the invading force might have no shelter.

According to our last accounts, Mr. Birt's house had been employed as a temporary shelter for the Caffres: it was consequently spared when the chapel was destroyed. But with the exception of Block Drift, occupied by the troops at the very first, the Wesleyan stations at D'Urban, under the guns of Fort Peddie, and Mr. Birt's dwelling house, (if it yet remain,) all the mission houses of the London, Scotch, Wesleyan and German societies, have been destroyed on this side the Kei river. Beyond the Kei, in Hindza's country, a large station of the Wesleyans, Butterworth, has also been destroyed. The destruction of property is immense. It is a sad blow to us all. May we bear the rod, and Him that hath appointed it. These calamities came not by chance. May the church and her agents understand, and may we be enabled truly to humble ourselves under the mighty hand of God! The prospect is dark at present, very dark. But the Lord can, He will, cause light to arise in the darkness. He will accomplish his own plans, and "shall not the judge of all the earth do right?" "We are perplexed, but not in despair; cast down, but not destroyed."

Tahiti.—Tahiti still groans beneath the iron rule of France. Her case appeals to the sympathies of every Christian. We are glad to know that Christians of all denominations are expressing their sense of the great wrongs which she has suffered. Public meetings have been held in many parts of England, and the public voice lifted up in her defence. Memorials have also been presented to government, praying for its powerful interference on behalf of this distressed country. May the time of her deliverance soon arrive.

Turkey.—There has been another cruel massacre of the Nestorians. The inhabitants of thirty-six villages have been put to death by every form of torture. The number is said to amount at least to 3,000; while throughout the whole mountain district the persecuted and famished fugitives are flying into
Persia, hotly pursued by the Kurds. The barbarian at the head of this bloody war upon Christians, is Bader Han Bey, who defies the prohibitions of the Sublime Porte, and has sworn on the Koran to extirpate the Nestorian race.

**FEB.**

Orientals.

SINGAPORE: SCOTTISH PRESBYTERIANS.

—A somewhat numerous meeting of Presbyterians at Singapore, was held December 4, 1846, to consider on the propriety of attempting to obtain the services of a Presbyterian Minister. It was resolved “to request the London Missionary Society to select a Clergyman for the European population of Singapore, on the understanding that one from any of the Evangelical denominations of Scottish Presbyterians would be cordially received without reference to his particular views as to Church Government.” This movement, it is stated, does not arise from any personal dissatisfaction with the Chaplain of the English Church, but from a desire to have a minister of their own denomination.

**TEMPERANCE.** —The Archdeacon of Bombay lately published a little Tract entitled, “The best men are sometimes in error,” in which he pointed out what he considered an omission of duty in the Free Church of Scotland at their last Session, in not recommending the cause of Temperance in an official capacity to their churches—according to a Memorial from a Presbytery in Canada. In answer to this Tract, a writer in the Bombay Witness takes the Archdeacon to task, for charging delinquency upon the Free Church, in not acting in favour of the Temperance movement, as they could not preface such recommendation with —“Thus saith the Lord.” The Archdeacon had shown that they did not require this for the recommendation of Bible Societies, Church Extension Funds, &c.; but he is charged with upholding a fallacy in putting those things connected with the existence of the Church itself on a par with extraneous plans of benevolence—however well intended; and it is maintained that Savings Banks for instance, are not to be recognised in the same way as Institutions of a spiritual nature. So also Temperance Societies, they not being “ecclesiastical.” To this, the Archdeacon has rejoined in the Witness of December 24. We quote the following paragraph.

“I will not dispute about whether the labours of Temperance Societies are ‘ecclesiastical.’ But are they Christian? Are they the labours of Christian Charity and self-denying love? Do they display a tender anxiety to put away the stumbling-block that is ruining a brother’s soul? Are they ‘moral and Scriptural,’ that is, interpreting the Scriptures according to the law of love? We have had far too much parade in the present day about ecclesiastical.”

'The Tractarians and Puseyites have given it us ‘usque ad navis’s. The High Church party both in England and Scotland (especially the Episcopalians) would tell our friends of the Free Church, that none of their proceedings are ecclesiastical, in fact that they are not a Church at all! Surely it is time to lay aside these disputes about ‘The Church,’ and strikes and questions about the word ‘Ecclesiastical,’ (at least in matters like the present) where they are totally uncalled for, and entirely beside the purpose; and unite together in love, to do good, and to put away the stumbling-block which is destroying our country, and sending down sixty thousand annually to the drunkard’s grave, which is the door to an undone eternity! In England and America jointly, one hundred thousand every year die the death of the drunkard, and (if we are to believe the Scriptures) go to everlasting fire; or seven millions in 70 years, the short space allotted to the life of man. Immortal souls are perishing every moment, and the Churches, instead of lending their aid to the only means which has ever yet availed to arrest the march of the destroyer, are stopping to dispute whether or not it is Ecclesiastical! I do not care a pin whether Temperance Societies are ‘Ecclesiastical’ or not. But I will ask a much simpler and far more important question which even a child can answer. Is it the DUTY of a Church to do good with all her might and main, by every possi-
ble innocent means which the reason that God has given her, for that very purpose, can devise, especially by means which God has blessed with a degree of success in arresting the crimes and sorrows of intemperance which he has vouchsafed to no other means yet employed—means in which the self-denying example and influence of the Church would be so lovely and beautiful, and so transcendently valuable, that without it our cause cannot be finally triumphant? Is it the DUTY of a Church to 'put away the stumbling-block' to cut off the occasion of sin, to avoid even the 'appearance of evil?'

BENGAL: GOVERNMENT EDUCATION.—A Report on the state of Public Instruction in the Lower Provinces of Bengal for 1845-46, is noticed in the Calcutta Journals. It appears that the system of instruction, proposed by Lord Auckland, was, "to communicate through the means of the English language, a complete education in European literature, philosophy and science." The only change in this plan is the admission of pupils into the Mofussil Colleges and Zillah Schools for instruction in the vernaculars.

The present Governor General, in the early part of 1845, determined to carry out the principle of establishing in each district a Zillah School, subordinate to a Central College of the district. The Province is to be divided for this purpose into nine circles, each having its College, with dependent Schools. Thus, there is the Calcutta Circle, with the Hindu College, Sanscrit College, Madras School, &c. Hoogly Circle, with Hoogly College, Branch School, Infant School, &c. Kishnagur College, with Jesore School, &c.

The estimated Annual cost, exclusive of the College at Moorshedabad—to be otherwise provided for—was Rupees 1,41,560—of which sum a grant was sanctioned by the Supreme Government 26th September, 1845.

The want of qualified teachers has prevented the Government from commencing with the plan as yet, except in the Calcutta and Kishnagur Circles. The report contains an account of the first examination of candidates for insertion on the list which is to be annually furnished to Government. Only eight candidates presented themselves, all from the Hoogly College, five of whom have since obtained employment in the public service.

BOMBAY: The Bombay Auxiliary of the Church Missionary Society held its Annual Meeting on the 8th December, the Lord Bishop in the Chair. Reference was made to the death of two devoted missionaries, the Rev. Messrs. Dickson and Dredge.—Seven natives had been baptized in course of the year.

THE FREE CHURCH PRESBYTERY OF BOMBAY met on the 2d December, and closed on the 8th. They examined and received as Probationer, Hormazdji Pestonji. He and his brother, Dhanjibhai Nauroji are said to be the first natives of Western India invested with that or a similar appointment. The Report from Poona appears to have been encouraging—six adults and five children had been baptized. The Rev. Mr. Nesbit's Report of the Educational Institution was very interesting. It spoke highly of Mr. Henderson, formerly of the Elphinstone Institution, who joined this School in January last. The number of scholars of all castes had greatly increased—there being 1067 boys and girls under instruction.

MADRAS WESLEYAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY.—The Anniversary of the Madras District Auxiliary was held at the Wesleyan Chapel in Popham's Broadway, on Tuesday evening, the 19th ultimo—the Rev. J. Roberts, Chairman of the District, presiding. Prayer was offered at the opening by the Rev. M. Winslow, of the American Mission. After a short address from the chair, interesting extracts from the reports of the different stations, were read by the Rev. J. Little, Secretary of the Auxiliary. Suitable, and some of them stirring, Addresses were made, by the Rev. Messrs. Gostick, Porter, Batchelor,
Winslow, Cryer, Male and Pinkney. The extracts from the Reports informed the meeting, among other events, of the exclusion from communion of several in the Negapatam circuit for upholding caste; of the happy death in the Lord of two members at Bangalore; and the very interesting circumstances connected with the baptism of a young man in the school at Goobee—and of a pujaure, or Hindu priest, at the same place, who had given up the idol whom he had worshipped into the hands of the missionaries, and fully broken caste by eating with the mission family.

Many other important facts were mentioned, and the Report when printed, will be well worth a careful reading. The meeting was fully attended, and well conducted.

The Public Annual Examination of the Scottish (Free) Church Mission Schools took place, in the new premises on the Esplanade, on Friday, 8th ultimo. About 270 boys were present, and a considerable concourse of spectators. The examination lasted six hours, the new converts and more advanced pupils being, chiefly, those interrogated at the time we were ourselves present. The appearance they made was highly creditable. Some extracts from Essays were also read—written in a superior style of composition—and containing pertinent arguments in favour of Christianity, even when the authors were not themselves converts. The Essay of a young Mussulman, Abdool Cawder, seemed to excite peculiar interest in this respect. It was stated by the missionaries, that during the past year, the greatest number in attendance, including boys and girls, was 349; and that in that period of time, eight new converts had been added to the church. Such a token of the divine blessing attending their labours must be highly encouraging to the missionaries, notwithstanding the withdrawal of pupils occasioned by the baptisms—and which, it is to be hoped, is only temporary. In speaking of teaching the Scriptures to Mohammedans, of whom there are 71 in the Schools, the importance of teaching the New Testament as well as the Old was earnestly insisted upon, and the danger pointed out of making any compromise with their prejudices on this subject. We are not aware that any such compromise is made in any missionary school in Madras. If so, it would certainly be very reprehensible. But we do not know why it should have been intimated, or suspected. The meeting was closed by an earnest and impressive address by the Chairman, Mr. Bruce. Full and detailed accounts of this interesting Examination will be found in the local prints, and especially in the Native Herald.

The Native Girls' Schools in connexion with this Mission had also been examined on a previous day—(24th December) of which, however, from its being comparatively private, we were not aware at the time, and were consequently, to our regret, not present. A very full and interesting account of the proceedings will also be found in the Native Herald of 16th January—to which we have pleasure in referring our readers.

American Mission Native Schools—Chintadripettah.—The first Public Examination of these Schools took place on Monday, the 11th of last month. The chair was occupied by A. I. Cherry, Esq. and the Examination chiefly conducted by the Rev. M. Winslow, and the Native teachers. Several Clergymen, Missionaries, and friends of education were present, and a number of Natives. No fewer than 472 scholars were assembled, of whom 72 were in the English, and 374 (including 133 girls) in the Tamil Schools. The pupils were examined in both languages, and also in Scripture, the Catechism, Grammar, Geography, Arithmetic and Algebra. The higher classes especially showed themselves well acquainted with the truths of Christianity, and their proficiency, in particular, in Quadratic Equations, was highly creditable. The Native girls (nearly all
of whom are Caste children) formed a very interesting class—and were particularly neat, and tidy in their personal appearance.

The Examination was judiciously shortened, occupying much less time than is usual on such occasions, although this probably did not allow the merits of the schools to be so fully exhibited as would otherwise have been the case. As the first examination of these schools which has been made public—the present one was additionally interesting, and deserves particular notice. We trust the practice thus begun will be regularly continued, both in justice to the labours of the missionaries themselves, and for the information and gratification of the Christian public. Our American brethren have too long hidden their light, in this respect, under a bushel. Their services in the department of Native Christian education are highly valuable; and one peculiarly interesting circumstance connected with the schools in question, is that all the pupils, in addition to their weekly attendance, are assembled every Sabbath morning for divine service in the mission premises—presenting thus a large and interesting additional field for the labours of the missionaries.

Jaffna Missionary Alliance.—The Monthly Meeting of the Jaffna Missionary Alliance was held at the Wesleyan Mission House, Jaffna, on Monday the 7th inst. All the American and European missionaries of the Province were present—viz. the Rev. Mr. Arndt, (Colonial Chaplain) the Rev. Messrs. Pargiter and O'Neill (of the Establishment) the Rev. Messrs. Fletcher, Howland, Haisington, Meigs, Poor, Smith and Whittlesey, (of the American Mission) the Rev. Messrs. Percival, Williams and Phillips, (of the Wesleyan Mission)—Dr. Ward, and E. S. Minor, Esq. together with almost all the ladies of the missions and their families.

The Rev. Mr. Percival presided.

The devotions of the forenoon were marked by a degree of hallowed and fraternal feeling, such as might have been anticipated from the heart-felt union of so many fellow helpers in the ministry. They truly strengthened each other's hands in God.

The reports from the various stations contained nothing but what was calculated to encourage those who are set over this people in the Lord.

The meeting was rendered peculiarly interesting from the fact, that one of the long-tried, judicious and beloved members of this Alliance was now for the last time present before leaving for America.

We allude to the esteemed Dr. Ward, who is expected in a week or two to relinquish, for a time, his labours in this Province. The sincere and earnest prayers of the Meeting were offered in his behalf, and unfeigned regret expressed in reference to his departure. We trust that he will still be attended by the choicest blessings of the Great Head of the Church.

The subject of the afternoon address, which was delivered by Dr. Ward, consisted in the importance of the Educational movements now carried on in this Province, and the best means to be adopted for their increased utility.

The Meeting separated at a rather more advanced hour than usual, and we doubt not with renewed determinations on the part of its members, to cleave to each other and to the Lord.—Morning Star, December 10th.

Indian Summary.

We rejoice to learn that the Rev. Dr. Judson has arrived at Moulmein from America. The return of one, who has laboured with such energy and zeal, for thirty-four years, to the scene of his labours, should excite our gratitude and our prayers that he may yet be spared for lengthened service.

The Baptists at Calcutta have commenced the publication of a new religious periodical, to be called the "Oriental Baptist." We wish it success, trusting it will be conducted in a truly liberal, and not a sectarian spirit.

We are glad to see, since writing the above, that such is the promise of the prospectus, from which we quote the following—

"But though denominational, the Oriental Baptist will not be sectarian, nor be conducted in the spirit of bigotry. While the chief object of the
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Magazine is the diffusion of pure religious and practical truth, and of intelligence respecting the progress of the Redeemer's kingdom in India and other parts of the world, and particularly in the division of the church universal under whose auspices it goes forth, its columns are open for the discussion of all questions pertaining to civil and religious liberty; a cause for which our forefathers boldly pleaded and nobly suffered. The aim of its conductors is to render the publication not unworthy the patronage of any of whatever rank or denomination; while the low rate of Subscription places it within the reach of the poorest."

A proposal is made by a Correspondent of the Calcutta Christian Observer, for a General Conference of Missionaries in India. If practicable, in any proper way to represent the different Missions and Societies, at such a conference, and bring together the results of their varied experience, the convocation would produce much good.

We are glad to see that the Standard, a daily Newspaper on religious principles, has been recommenced at Calcutta.

The Bellary Mission Press, it appears, has been relinquished, or has stopped work, which we regret. It has long afforded valuable aid, as well to Bible and Tract Societies, as to the mission which supported it.

In a notice of the Examination of the Free Church Schools in Calcutta, it is stated, that the number of Native youths under English instruction there, may be reckoned at five thousand.

ECCLESIASTICAL MOVEMENTS.

BOMBAY.—By the Steamer of December 15, eight German Missionaries, four destined for China and four for India, arrived at Bombay. Among the latter was the Rev. H. Moegling, returned after a year's absence.

The Rev. W. Fyvie, of the London Missionary Society, after a long course of missionary services, has left India, designing to go to America, and engage there in ministerial labours.

CALCUTTA.—The Rev. J. R. Campbell and family of Saharanpur, Upper India, are in Calcutta, on their way to America. The Rev. R. C. Mather, of the London Mission at Benares, has returned with his family from England. The Rev. J. Linke, and family, also the Rev. M. Lambe, appointed to Meerut, and the Rev. J. Kruckeburg, all of the Church Mission, have arrived at Calcutta;—also the Rev. M. Mackail, the Pastor of the Free Church congregation, the Rev. W. S. Mackay and wife, of the Free Church Mission; and the Rev. Mr. Anderson and Mr. Smith, of the Established Church of Scotland Institution.

MADRAS.—The Rev. T. Halls, and the Rev. A. Kinloch, Assistant Chaplains on this Establishment, have arrived from England. The Wesleyan Missionaries of this presidency have nearly all been assembled at Madras, in course of the past month, for their Annual Meeting; there have been present from the Mysore country, the Rev. Messrs. Garrett, Griffith, Male, Hardey, Gostick and Sanderson; and from Negapatam and vicinity, the Rev. Messrs. Cryer, Batchelor, Pinkney and Jenkins. We much regret to learn that the Rev. J. Tucker, Secretary to the Corresponding Committee of the Church Missionary Society at Madras, is obliged, by the failure of his health, to contemplate relinquishing his important post, and leaving for England, probably in course of next month. The Rev. J. Scudder, of the American Madras Mission, and the Rev. L. Spaulding, of the Ceylon Mission, with their wives, returning from America, and four other missionaries for Madura and Jaffna, are expected at Madras in the course of next month.

Monthly Missionary Prayer Meeting.

The Address at the last Meeting was by the Rev. R. K. Hamilton, A. M.

The next Meeting will take place on the 1st current at the Wesleyan Chapel; the Address by the Rev. T. Haswell.
NEW SERIES

OF THE MADRAS CHRISTIAN INSTRUCTOR AND MISSIONARY RECORD.

With the beginning of the year, we commence, as proposed, a New Series of this Journal, on the same general principles on which it has been hitherto conducted.

To increase its circulation, it is reduced in price from Rupees nine to Rupees six, to Subscribers in general, and for Soldiers and Natives, to Rupees five per annum, if paid within the first quarter of the year; otherwise, the former rates of Rupees nine, and Rupees six will be required.

The Journal is intended to contain about forty pages in double columns (except the first one or two articles,) on a larger page, and generally smaller type than heretofore, so as to embody as much matter as was at first promised at the higher rates, though less than we have usually given. Exertions will be made to increase, in every way, and in no respect diminish, its claim to public support. We are happy to announce that a Clergyman of the Church of England—a Chaplain at the Presidency—is one of the Committee of Publication, thus maintaining the entire Catholicity of the Journal.

At a time when the importance of Christian Union is not only more generally acknowledged than almost ever before, but its benefits more extensively felt, it is certainly desirable that there should be a Journal of this description in Madras; and we hope that both in Contributions to its pages, and Subscriptions to aid its Circulation, it will receive a new impulse. The present number of paying Subscribers would merely support the work at the former rate, and we need to increase it by one half, or nearly three hundred, to make the new terms remunerative, and leave anything for the Society whose funds we wish to benefit.

As the expense of Postage is a great barrier to its increased circulation, we would suggest to Subscribers at out-stations the propriety of their writing together and receiving copies by banghy. Every Sixth Copy will be sent gratis to any one at such station who will kindly act as Agent to receive the publication, and forward the Subscriptions. Without attempting a formal Appeal for support, we add some of the reasons why we think the Journal should be patronized.

1. As a medium of important Missionary information.—The Religious Intelligence of India we propose to make more prominent than before, by giving a Condensed Summary each month. More attention from our Correspondents in different parts of the country will, we hope, also increase the interest in this respect. The most important movements abroad will also be regularly noticed in a similar manner.

2. As an Organ through which active minds and warm hearts may address those who have means and opportunities of doing good.—The Journal goes into families of leading influence in Society, as well as those in a more humble position; and to all it may, and should carry a suitable and profitable message.

3. As assisting to make the Press of India a Christian Press.—Is not this of vast importance when the fourth estate in India is becoming so influential, and stamping its own image upon the country?

4. As being the only Magazine in South India on the broad basis of the Evangelical Alliance; recording without partiality the progress of all the Missionary bodies, and ready to advocate the claims of every truly Christian Society.

5. As designed to aid the Funds of a valuable Institution.—This is no doubt a secondary but yet a legitimate consideration. All the labour bestowed upon the work being gratuitous, let it be borne in mind that every Subscription to it, above its cost, is in effect, a Subscription to the Madras Tract and Book Society. There is then, the double good of assisting to keep in existence a Christian publication which conveys important truth to many families, and of aiding a most useful benevolent Society.

Offering our grateful acknowledgments for patronage and aid through the first stage of our journey, we look with some confidence for continued encouragement and companionship in our further progress. We hope for mutual benefit and enjoyment with our Contributors and Readers, as we proceed with them into the opening vista of the future; and that as we travel-forward, discoursing on the most important of all subjects, we may frequently have occasion to exclaim, “Did not our hearts burn within us, as we talked together by the way?”
A FEW COPIES OF THE
REVIEW
OF
A PAMPHLET ENTITLED
THE LORD BISHOP AND THE BIBLE COMPARED:
OR, UNITARIANISM THE CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC FAITH,
(Originally published in the Madras Christian Instructor)
Are now on sale,
Price Four Annas a copy,
At the TRACT DEPOSITORY, Popham's Broad-way, and at the AMERICAN MISSION PRESS, Madras.
February 1st, 1847.

Madras Auxiliary Bible Society.

Statement of Subscriptions, &c. received from the under-mentioned parties for the Madras Auxiliary Bible Society, from the 21st December, 1846, to the 18th January, 1847.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscriptions</th>
<th>R. A. P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W. Elliott, Esq. for 1846</td>
<td>6 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. C. Foster, do.</td>
<td>6 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. J. Shrieves, do.</td>
<td>6 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. W. Ray, do.</td>
<td>3 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Ramappen, Book-binder, do.</td>
<td>3 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. J. B. Pharoah, September to December, do.</td>
<td>4 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. G. Y. Heyna, Oct. to December, do.</td>
<td>3 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. R. Twigg, for November, do.</td>
<td>0 4 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. W. Boyd, for December, do.</td>
<td>0 4 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. A. Reynolds, Esq. do.</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. A. R. Symonds, M. A.</td>
<td>12 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. S. Simpson, do.</td>
<td>10 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. R. W. Whitford, do.</td>
<td>12 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. F. H. Scott, for January, 1847</td>
<td>2 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. W. Fitzgerald, do.</td>
<td>0 8 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieut. T. E. Holmes, do.</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. R. Jones, do.</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. J. H. Nowell, do.</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. J. H. Bell, do.</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. A. Bertin, do.</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. W. H. Brannon, do.</td>
<td>0 8 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. E. Buckle, do.</td>
<td>4 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Lemoons, do.</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Gordon, Esq. do.</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieut. N. Hobam, do.</td>
<td>3 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. J. Johnston, do.</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. L. Miller, do.</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. H. J. Revis, do.</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss R. Spencer, do.</td>
<td>0 8 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. T. Hogg, for Jan. and Feb.</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. F. Thomas, Esq. for</td>
<td>100 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collected at Guntoor, by the Rev. W. Gunn,
Mr. J. N. Shanker, for Sept. to Dec. 1846, 2 0 0
Lieut. A. Barlow, for Oct. to Dec. do. 3 0 0
Mr. C. W. Clarke, do. do. 6 0 0
Mr. Chateller, do. do. 5 0 0
David, a Native Catechist, for Nov. & Dec. do. 1 2 0
Daniel, do. do. 6 0 0
H. Stokes, Esq. (a Donation) 18 0 0
Collected by Mrs. E. Strange, Madras, 35 8 0
Mrs. E. Strange, for 1846, 24 0 0
Mrs. Evatt, do. 12 0 0
Mrs. McDowell, do. do. 12 0 0
Miss Clemons, do. do. 12 0 0

Mr. J. S. Harvey, 1846, 12 0 0
Mr. T. Ballard, do. 11 0 0
Mrs. Johnston, do. 11 0 0
Capt. J. B. Stainbank, do. 10 0 0
Mrs. Stainbank, do. 10 0 0
Mrs. Bigwood, do. 6 0 0
Mrs. L. Miller, do. 6 0 0
Mrs. Miller, do. 6 0 0
Mr. T. Matthews, do. 6 0 0
M. G. Anderson, do. 6 0 0
Mrs. M. Anderson, do. 6 0 0
Mrs. D. Shaw, do. 6 0 0
Mrs. C. Mitchell, do. 6 0 0
Mrs. M. Court, do. 6 0 0
Mrs. Green, do. 6 0 0
Mr. W. Cruickshanks, do. 5 0 0
Mrs. Foncrea, do. 3 0 0
Mrs. Turnbull, do. 3 0 0
Miss E. Mitchell, do. 3 0 0
Mrs. M. Murray, do. 3 0 0
Mr. T. Ritchle, do. 2 0 0
Mrs. L. B. Taylor, do. 1 4 0
Mrs. M. Phillips, do. 1 4 0
Mr. F. Anderson, do. 1 4 0
Mrs. White, do. 10 0 0

Collected by W. R. Smith, Esq. at Masulipatam,
Mr. D. S. Turner, Sept. to Dec. 1846, 1 0 0
Mr. E. D. Prazer, Dec. do. 0 8 0
Mr. W. Lodge, do. do. 1 0 0
Mr. Lincoln, do. do. 0 5 0
Rev. B. T. Noble, do. do. 1 0 0
Rev. H. W. Fox, do. do. 1 0 0
W. R. Smyth, Esq. do. do. 2 0 0
Donation.
Capt. F. H. Scott, 4 0 0
Collected in the Church in Mysore, Nov. 29th, 1846, by the Rev. D. Sanderson, 42 12 0
Contribution from the Native Church and Congregation at Guddapah, by the Rev. J. Shrieves, 9 15 10
Total Rupees 493 15 10
Mission Chapel, Benares.

It is now about 30 years since the Baptist Missionary Society commenced operations at this most important station. The Rev. Mr. Smith, who during all that period has been resident there as their agent, and prosecuting, with devoted perseverance and considerable success, the arduous work of faith, some years ago set apart a portion of his own private premises to be used as a Chapel. But up to this day there has been no Mission Chapel, properly speaking, connected with the Baptist Society, and the present place of meeting is now much too small for the Church and congregation that usually assemble.

It is therefore proposed, with as little delay as possible, to erect a plain substantial edifice, of suitable size and structure, in the neighborhood of Mr. Smith’s house and Chapel, which shall be the property of the Baptist Missionary Society.

The sum which will probably be required for this purpose is only 2,000 Rupees, but for raising even this small amount the resident missionaries are obliged to appeal to Christian friends in India at large. At Benares itself and the neighborhood, but a very small proportion of it has been, or, from various circumstances, can be expected to be raised. And from the embarrassed state of the Parent Society’s finances at present, as well as from an expressed unwillingness on its part to employ its funds for such purposes, (its liabilities being in a great measure restricted to the support of Agents,) it is out of the question to make application for assistance in that quarter.

Contributions in aid of this specific fund, or of the mission at Benares generally, may be forwarded to the Rev. J. Thomas, Baptist Mission Press, Calcutta; G. Vansomeren, Esq. Madras; the Editor of the South India Temperance Journal, Madras, or Rev. G. Small, Benares.

Sums already received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Amount (Rs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Friend at Meerut</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Col. Parsons, do.</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amicas, (per Capt. Fagan, Benares)</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Tomkyns, Bolarum,</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier Eckford, Lahore,</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Corbyn, Esq. Surg. do.</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Edmonstone, Esq. a. c. a.</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Vansomeren, Esq. Madras,</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Naismith, Sultanapore, Oude,</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Lowther, J. Forrest, do.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chintadrepattah Church and School,

AMERICAN MADRAS MISSION.

The following additional Subscriptions are very thankfully acknowledged. As nearly Rupees 1,500 are still wanting of the 5,000, with which it was proposed to begin the work, the friends of missions and education are respectfully request­ed to grant further aid, as the Lord may have prospered them, and inclined their hearts. The Church Edifice will be commenced immediately, at the risk of one of the missionaries.

MADRAS, January 22, 1847.

M. WINSLOW, SECRETARY,
American Mission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Amount (Rs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Apothecary T. Hogg</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. A. Anderson</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier J. Kelchen, (2d Subs.)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. W. Hundy</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. M. Kickwick</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire Amount Subscribed, 3,370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subscriptions will be thankfully received by either of the Missionaries, or may be sent to Messrs. Arbuthnot and Co., Agents of the Mission.
NOTICES OF MEETINGS.

The Missionary Prayer Meeting is held alternately at the Scotch Church, Davidson Street Chapel, Wesleyan Chapel, and Free General Assembly's Institution, on the first Monday evening of each month. The Missionary Conference is held alternately at the houses of the Members on the second Monday evening of each month.

The General Committee of the Bible Society meet at the Depository Rooms, at six o'clock p.m. on the third Monday of each month.

The General Committee of the Tract and Book Society meet at the Office of Messrs. Bainbridge and Co., at six o'clock p.m., on the last Monday of each month.

NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We have received the Rev. F. A. Bagot's Report of his proceedings at Hassan, but are too full to notice it in our present number. The account of a School Examination and a Tour, by our worthy Correspondent in Bangalore, is necessarily deferred.

Many thanks to Laicus for his Contribution, which, we much regret, a press of matter prevents us from inserting in our present number.

ADDITIONAL PAYMENTS RECEIVED.

For the Madras Christian Instructor and Missionary Record.

Sr. Rs.
Mrs. R. Dunhill, for 1847, 6 J. Ainslie, Esq. do. 6 Lieut. Valliant, Bo. L. C. for 1847, &c. 6
A. Robertson, Esq. do. 6 J. Thomson, Esq. do. 6 1846, &c. 18
J. B. Rees, Esq. do. 6 J. U. Ellis, Esq. do. 6 Rev. J. Tucker, for Jan. 1847, 4
J. F. Thomas, Esq. do. (2 copies) 6 D. M'Kinnon, Esq. do. 6 Rev. P. Batchelor, for 1846 &c. 6 and 1847, 15
Rev. J. Bilderbeck, do. 6 G. Walker, Esq. do. (2 copies) 12 Rev. J. B. Coles, (2 copies) 12
W. E. Underwood, Esq. do. 6 A. Robertson, Esq. for 1845, 6 H. Newill, Esq. 6
J. Birch, Esq. do. 6 A. Barrie, Esq. for 1846, 6 Rev. J. Pinkney, 6
F. Ranken, Esq. do. 6 R. O. Campbell, Esq. do. 6 Rev. D. Sanders, 6
Rev. J. Garrett, 1847, 12 W. H. Drew, do. 6 Rev. B. Rice, 6
W. McTaggart, Esq. do. 6 Mr. G. Kelly, do. 6 Qu. Mr. Sergt. A. Wilson, 6
J. J. Geddes, Esq. do. 6 6 G. M. Swinton, Esq. for 1846, 15
R. O. Campbell, Esq. do. 6 Mr. G. Beily, Esq. for 1847, and half of 1848, 9

NEW SUBSCRIBERS.

We gratefully acknowledge the following new Subscribers to the Instructor.

The Right Reverend Lord Bishop of Madras, Bell, Esq. J. H. Chittock, Hands, Major, Trincomalee,
Bilderbeck, Rev. J. Harington, Esq. W. do.
Boyson, Esq. R. Hooper, Esq. G. S.
Cleveland, Brij, Trincomalee, Key, Esq. Thomas, M. D.
Davidson, Esq. T. H. Literary Society, Madras,
Eat, Esq. E. F. Munster, Lt. Col. Trincomalee,
Pinnle, Esq. J. F. Palamcottah, Morris, Esq. Henry,
Hamilton, Major W. 78th Highlanders, Columboot,
Belgaum.

N. B.—There are a few extra copies of the Lithographic Plates of Hindu Idols on hand, for Subscribers or Non-Subscribers—An. 4 each Plate. Also a few copies of the Instructor from the beginning.

New Books per "Vernon."

THE undersigned has just received and exposed for Sale at his Library, his usual Quarterly Supply of Choice Publications, put up to express order. A General Catalogue of all the Books, including those received by the above opportunity, is now ready, and may be had on application.

All orders from the Interior promptly attended to.

MOUNT ROAD LIBRARY, 26th January, 1847.

J. HIGGINBOTHAM.