

expect, I was thankful that it was plain and unmistakable. Why? Because I was anxious to display talents and knowledge of which we are all assured I am destitute? Nay? but simply that the whole subject, so important—"Philo" notwithstanding,—might undergo the closest scrutiny, and such as would result in sound conclusions and correct action. Therefore I replied as I was best able, and, duly considering all the circumstances, I think there are those who will do me the justice to admit, in a tolerably decent spirit. But how is such a response treated? The answer lies before me in the "Valediction."

And what is the substance—I will not say "pith," for were that "punched out" what would remain?—of this communication? Why some seven or eight sentences are devoted to, at least unnecessary, personalities, in addition to those previously indulged; thrice he reiterates the declaration that "he will not enter into controversy with one concealed;" more than a dozen separate—I cannot say distinct—criticisms are offered upon my style, &c.; at least half a dozen times the assurance is repeated that I have waived "the point;" and the balance—except that portion of the closing paragraph not considered—is made up of misrepresentation and ridicule. After his introduction come some sage inferences—a little out of the usual order—and having presented an untruthful caricature of the whole, and repeatedly declared that on the main point we do not differ. His concluding effort is to convince us that he has done my article "no violence," and himself, his subject, and his readers—saying nothing of me—no wrong. But has he succeeded? The sequel will shew.

I. Let us consider his personal allusions.

These have reference principally to my occupation, ability, diligence and progress. As respects the first, he withdraws the insinuation with which he entered upon his former article, and in the others "exonerates [me] from the charge of being unaccustomed to write." This is honest and more generous than was anticipated. Will he so promptly retract the rest?

II. His reasons for declining "controversy."

This he represents as simply that he has not had the pleasure of a personal introduction. Now there is a mistake somewhere. In his previous article he states that he does not think mine "worth a reply;" that I am "small game;" my questions "are not put for the sake of information;" I am "unaccustomed to write;" and he does not wish to "discourage" me. The fact that I was "concealed" was only one reason, and all were so far set aside that he could occupy five times as much space with his rejoinder as I with my queries. Had he at first distinctly declined replying on such terms, and requested me to "shew my colors," I would not have refused. But to abuse me for withholding what it was optional with me to grant, was worse than useless. It seems to me then injudicious for him now to urge this with such persistency.

III. His deductions.

Respecting the "first" I shall simply ask, Is it important, or has it any bearing upon the case in hand, whether or not my opinions were matured when I started my inquiries?

"Secondly," He maintains that I have wandered from "the point," and that the "question [I] would naturally have been expected to discuss" is "Have persons a right to establish and conduct a Sabbath School upon their own authority, or is it the prerogative of the Church to control all that its members do?" What! "expected to discuss" a question respecting which, according to his own shewing, we agree? No, Mr. Editor, this has not been the point at issue, if for no other reason, because it could not be. That question at first was simply, Whether the Church had a right to control her individual members, or they, her? And subsequently, Whether church members are less "fallible" and more efficient in their individual than their associated capacity?—And this I take the liberty of stating thus distinctly, because it was I, not he who started the discussion, and it is always the questioner's privilege to explain his inquiry.

He objects then to the length and "variety" of my remarks—though as respects the former, up to date, we have occupied equal portions of the Christian Messenger, and having pointed me to a minister of his acquaintance whom I will soon noice, I would simply inquire, Is there nothing in my previous course to remind him of the apology of that clergyman, who, being accused by one of his parishioners of "wandering," replied, "If you will wander to the devil, I will wander after you?"

"Thirdly," Here we are in doubt whether most to admire, or wonder at his candor. And it he really has been thus signally vanquished, according to his own representations, the contest has much resembled that of another "stripling" with a certain ancient giant.

"Fourthly," Not being familiar with Burns, I am unacquainted with the "article" alluded to. Had it any connection with those remarking that,

"A man's a man for a' that?"

"O wad some power the gifts gie me,
To see oursel's as others see us," &c.

And lastly, The question of "church authority" then, is something "I know and we don't;" her duty, something "he knows and I don't;"

what the prerogatives of an individual is "what nobody knows." On this point then he is confessedly a blind leader of the blind.

IV. His review.

And first, I remark that "paragraphing" is largely a matter of taste. I have heard that Editors sometimes assist in it a little! Some might suppose that his communications would not be injured by a slightly different arrangement, &c., but shall we on this ground quarrel with him, especially when convinced that he is doing his best? And then could he expect an inexperienced and incompetent writer always to do these things "most advantageously? Come, be generous my brother!"

But, only my "fourth and thirty-second paragraphs" touch the question; and furthermore, they agree with him. Now it is pleasant to know that where we understand each other we do not differ! What then do they teach? The "fourth," according to his digest, is "an apology for Romanism." He then can apologize for Popery, as well as I. And verily I think he may! But what is the doctrine of the "thirty-second"? Will the reader kindly refer to it, and remember that this is all that Bro. Goucher "claims." But does he mean by this, all that he ever claimed? If so, I demur. It teaches that only when the church "is not, and cannot be in a position to engage in this work," does it become "the privilege and duty of individuals to act!" But is this all with which he has occupied his "one-eighth of the Messenger"? I trow not! Probably however, he means that this is all he now claims. If so, then this discussion has not been as unprofitable as some would have us suppose. And, "thankful for small favors," we will accept him as our first acknowledged convert, and no mean earnest of "the good time coming." But I will not boast, having noticed that he subsequently withdrawn his claim upon the "32nd" and substitutes the "36th."

But he pronounces all the rest of my article "worthless." Now how strangely people will differ. The balance is, in my opinion, worth the most. Will our readers, who are the real arbiters, re-examine, without the aid of his index, which we are fast approaching—and decide.

And here allow me to answer his question, "If he considered them orthodox, what ails him," by another. Is there no distinction between "denouncing a thing heterodox, and inquiring into its orthodoxy?"

"Again, if I admit all he claims," why talk of "controversy" at all?

But he asserts that I have "argued against himself." Now Sir, I challenge him to the proof; to lay his finger on a sentence or a single word that justifies the charge. And this being the only criticism he has ventured touching "the character of the reasoning" I have employed, I ask if this is that for which he pronounces himself "no match" for me? If so, I here and now appeal from his decision to a generous but discriminating public?

Having then sufficiently taxed his powers as a critic, he now appears in the somewhat anomalous character of an indexer, thereby doing my article unexpected, and—I would suppose from his previous declaration—undeserved honor, and exhibiting his capabilities of computation and analysis. But though he may be commended for his ingenuity, his correctness, and, I think, taste, are not altogether reliable. And having considered his reason for adopting such a mode of reply, let us briefly point out its errors, not forgetting that he is anticipating some "lightning."

REVIEW OF INDEX.

"Paragraph 1st," is an illustration of his idea of "invective." Will he then designate his own personalities, or is our language too meagre to supply a word sufficiently emphatic?

"2nd," Will he tell us why the "egotisms" were necessary, and whether in the circumstances they were not as advisable as though my name and fame were known?

"3rd," Very imperfect.

"4th," Incorrect in both cases. I merely said "that he could not defend the statement" that I had pronounced his sentiments heterodox; and defence of the right is not "apology" for the wrong.

"5th," Imperfect again.

"6th," Incorrect.

"7th," to "10th," are very imperfect, and require revision.

"11th," Incorrect.

"12th," Equally so.

"13th," Incorrect. It is earnestness.

"14th," It says that such sympathy will be "better for all." Remember that!

"15th," Correct!

"16th," It shows the process of weakening the sense of responsibility, viz, by working the S. S. as an independent "society."

"17th," That I was not then done. Will the reader note what follows up to the "22nd," the "index" not very clearly pointing it out.

"23rd," The wish was sincere, Come brother, enter on the work; not forgetting her "prerogatives." It will be more profitable than this.

"24th," Incorrect.

"25th," Incorrect. The "declamation" was his.

"26th," Mistake. I am only its brother.

"27th," He here admits that the resemblance to its "reputed,"—is not striking, and yet does not seem to recognize the banishing.

"28th," and "29th," Correct.

"30th," Wrong again. It was the "application" of his illustration in my hands to the case really under consideration.

"31st," Entirely wrong. I was only trying to remove J. B. so that W. G. G. might not again "stumble" over him.

"32nd," All wrong, unless his views were changed at this writing, or he signally failed in

expressing them. The "application" was found when "sought."

"33rd," Did go over it briefly.

"34th," Don't believe in burrowing, or tunnelling where it can be avoided.

"35th," Would his have been injured by something of the same nature? And as it is due to all concerned, is it yet too late?

"36th," What portion will he and his communications share?

V. His conclusion.

This is an unsuccessful effort to make it appear that he has not done "violence" to my article. Now sir, people have different ideas of what constitutes violence. We can imagine a ruthless savage tearing the quivering flesh from his writing victim, and presenting in his stead a disjointed and grinning skeleton. But who would believe him, with however innocent or injured an air he should declare that he had been guilty of no outrage?

Rev. W. G. Goucher seems to suppose that his name is an all sufficient guarantee for his writings. This is only another of his mistakes. I admit that there is a certain degree of license granted to one who has established a reputation, not awarded to unknown and insignificant Sabbath School Workers, and here my Bro. has the advantage of me. But I warn him that there is a limit to this, "and let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed." It requires something more than "a name," even though it were hoary with age and redolent of christian sanctity, to commend efforts such as these. And let me assure him that had he labored half a century with the zeal and success of his fathers,—instead of the paltry dozen years of which he boasts—it would not atone for literary vandalism such as this. Those who are familiar with his "name," may seek to put a charitable construction upon his communications, but what opinion of him would they form who were obliged to accept these as his only recommendation. I may have erred in his correspondence—"to err is human"—but I cannot conceive of the possibility of me thus treating an opponent. And more, I challenge any one—"Philo" not excepted—to point to an instance of anything like intentional misrepresentation, saying nothing of ridicule, in my correspondence on this topic.

And now, though his articles are not as easily "analyzed" as mine appear to be, will the reader tell me the design of this? I did not designate my own as "solid shot," but I pronounce his an unworthy effort to turn a serious question into ridicule, and either divert attention from the main point, or by a desperate effort, cover a lame retreat. And if I wished to illustrate his position as it appears, I could scarcely do it better than by reference to that aquatic animal which, when too closely pursued, emits an inky fluid, in the obscurity of which it seeks to make good its escape.

And since he has so unceremoniously taken his leave, I shall ask the liberty gentle reader, of submitting to you a few inquiries.

First, Have Bro. Goucher's personalities, criticisms, and deductions any bearing upon the case in hand? If I waived the point, has he discussed it? And if not, why? Is it unworthy of consideration? or is the only reason given—that he does not know the name of the inquirer,—just and sufficient? And moreover, is it true of his communication that "nobody is hurt" by it?

Second, Was that "index" intended to assist examination, or divert attention? What would be the result were I to treat his sentences as he my "paragraphs"? Is he fearful or not that, after all, some one will suspect my article to contain more than the index indicates? By adopting such a course which does he render most ridiculous, that article or himself? And though he disavows Romanism, does this bear no resemblance to the index expurgatorius?

Third, Would he not have been as wisely employed in making himself certain that the "shell" accomplished nothing, and in seeking to repair the possible mischief, as in "analyzing" its contents?

Fourth, If he was dissatisfied with the stipulated terms, why engage in the contest? Is it "ambush warfare," or warfare itself that he now "detests"? And further, what is gained by occupying "one eighth of the Messenger" with the declaration that he is "disinclined to hold controversy with" a coward?

Lastly, If he has said all that can be urged on the "other side," will we not each do well to decide with the authorities quoted in my last, "That the nearer in sympathy, our Sunday Schools are kept to the Churches, the better it will be for all?"

And now, my Rev. opponent having waded through the intricacies of my last, I take it for granted that he will not wholly overlook this, I shall then in parting, take the liberty of volunteering a little advice, which I hope will be received "in the same spirit in which it is given." And since I am not much accustomed to this, or indeed any species of writing, I know he will pardon all inadvertencies of style and address.

1. When you speak, or write again, remember that having voluntarily committed your remarks to the public, they become common property, and will be treated accordingly. Freely grant the privilege then, for men will not be persuaded by your efforts at control.

2. When a criticism is offered, even though from many considerations it may not harmonize with your ideas of propriety, comfort yourself with the assurance that it is easier to war than make or mend; that anybody can find fault, and that as "Philo" suggests, and you yourself will not be slow to suspect,—you may be a better man and a more useful writer than your critic. Then even though you believe your opponent to be much your inferior, you will not be disposed to fly into a passion and render yourself ridiculous both in the eyes of those who know, and

perchance, admire you, and those who may till then know you not. And as the moon, unmindful of the baying cur pursues "the even tenor of her way," so you will move in serene and cloudless majesty,—and, to use the illustration of another,—heeding the clamor no more than you do the impertinent fly buzzing at your chariot wheel while you ride on, perchance to nobler work.

3. Again, do not trouble yourself about preparing indices for the works of others till you are requested, or have made yourself certain that it "will pay."

4. When you start next time for "game" be sure not to "catch a Tartar," and "don't crow till you are out of the woods."

5. When you have time, jot down in your note book a little paragraph which may be found at the bottom of the 2nd column, 244th page, C. M., dated Aug. 2nd, 1865.

6. And if you should forego your purpose, and write again, be sure that you know what the question at issue is, and try to make some statement that you can defend. Till then, Adieu!

Having thus finished my review of Rev. W. G. Goucher, allow me, Mr. Editor, to make a remark or two more, and conclude.

"Philo" is fearful that "some of the best minds among us," may have been hindered from sending communications to "the Messenger" by fear of unholly criticism. May I be permitted to suggest the possibility of the paucity of such articles accounting in some measure at least for "literary pabulum" such as this discussion has furnished. There are a thousand questions that could be profitably considered, and requests have more than once been made for information on important points, but the "best minds seem to have been pre-occupied. The "second class" are frequently the working minds, and apparently by no fault of theirs, in this case at least, Bro. Goucher talks of "the dog in the manger" policy, but this fault-finding seems to me to savor of it. Were the Messenger full of better matter, there would no place be found there for this. The sure remedy then is at hand and only needs to be applied. Don't be squeamish! Be satisfied with the "usual terms," "a fair field and no favor," and as you neglect no other work, so is it not unwise timidity to shirk this, for fear of wanton criticism?

The Sabbath School question, and this phase of it, is important, and,—for what reason it does not become me here to say,—has been but imperfectly considered. A full and careful discussion of the inquiry, "Which is the best mode of working Sabbath Schools, by an independent society, or directly through the church," would be interesting and profitable. I am willing and more than willing to lay down my pen and give room for others. Could not Brother Goucher be induced to favor us on this point, or perhaps "Philo" himself, if however, reticence continues to distinguish the "best minds," and none volunteer for this service, I make no rash promises.

And now I rejoice that I do not leave my case in the hand of Bro. Goucher, and that even "Philo" is not appointed to adjudicate between us, I leave it with an unbiased and enlightened public, to them I look for justice, and look with confidence. When they demand my name—which is not likely to happen very soon,—and the cause to which I have given myself require me to render it, or even should Bro. Goucher in a gentlemanly manner make the request, I shall not hesitate to comply.

Till then, I am permitted to subscribe myself
A SABBATH SCHOOL WORKER.
Aug 7th, 1865.

For the Christian Messenger.

OBITUARY NOTICES.

MRS. ELIZA GELBERT,

Died at Milton Mass., May 30th, aged 64 years, Eliza, daughter of F. G. Etter Esq., of Chester N. S. and wife of Mr. L. D. Geldert.

The subject of this notice was born in Chester, about the year 1801. In this place she also professed her faith in Christ as her only Redeemer and Saviour. It was during a happy revival of religion in that place, she being one of its earliest subjects, that our Sister gave herself up to Christ. In a private room, might have been seen a number of earnest souls whose pleadings evinced an importunity and struggling which are the precursors of blessings immortal and glorious. Among those now overpowered with the consciousness of God's righteous claim, and of her own deep sinfulness and inability to meet these claims, was the now deceased one. Under a deep conviction of her sinfulness she was seeking pardon, crying for mercy, longing for deliverance. It came. Light shone into her mind, it was Christ the true light, who shone there, and through the cross, she saw God could be just and yet justify the sinner. In these days "conviction of sin" was an expression often heard in the preaching of the gospel—though frequent, it was not unmeaning. Sin was so heinous, that when realized, it must fill the soul with awful apprehension of deserved wrath—and when followed by conversion, that change, was not an imperceptible feeling nor an exercise to be concealed. That translation from "darkness to light," that passing from "death to life"—that being "born again," was too marked too decisive, to remain a matter of unconsciousness. Into this light and liberty our sister was by divine grace brought. Decisions was her exercise. Her soul magnified the Lord, her spirit rejoiced in God her Saviour, the struggle for life was crowned with victory.

It was a solemn Sabbath the day that she with others went down into the baptismal waters, whose margins were lined by many who, with