

Christian Messenger.

A RELIGIOUS AND GENERAL FAMILY NEWSPAPER.

"Not slothful in business: fervent in spirit."

NEW SERIES. }
Vol. XIII. No. 44. }

HALIFAX, N. S., WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 1868.

WHOLE SERIES. }
Vol. XXXII. No. 44. }

Religious.

For the Christian Messenger.

Pen Sketches.—No. 11.

KIND PERSONS.

In this world of trials and there are some who have the milk of human kindness and seek to ameliorate in different ways the sad condition of their fellow-creatures.

They speak *kind* words, these seem to spring up from a *tenderness* of nature which they seem to possess. Kind words are like oil to the machinery of the moral life, helps along the work of a rough world. Kind words are like soft and harmonious notes of music, producing melody in the soul, cheering on the discouraged ones of earth. Kind words never die, yes—they ever live, enshrined in the hearts of many. Kind words have acted upon hard hearts, as Moses' rod upon the rock—has caused the waters to flow. These kind souls have kind words as current coin in the daily traffic of life.

But they also delight in *deeds of kindness*, helps that may appear trivial at the time, but they were just the right things at the time, and thence important; the nursing of a neighbour through a serious illness, the quieting of noisy children, the lifting up of a fallen one, the small sum given, or a meal bestowed how these will glitter with moral beauty in the day of final account. How cheap it is to be *kind*, and oh what great results, something like the seeds put into the soil, giving not only in return but something over. The short time while we are here upon earth, let us all learn to speak kindly, even reprove kindly, (if need be), and render all the help we can to the many sorrowing weary ones of earth.

JOHN.

Christianity and Friendship.

It has been objected to Christianity that it does not place friendship in the list of duties. To this it might be well replied that Christianity rises infinitely above mere friendship, and covers us with a whole firmament of love. It commands universal love, reaching even to our enemies, and leaving the particular affections to group and adjust themselves under the general law. Friendship, indeed, is one of the forms of merely human enjoyment, though capable of being touched and elevated by the spirit of religion. It is a luxury, provided for in the constitution of human nature, but Christianity is a system so fraught with the earnest purpose of saving mankind that it does not dally with mere delicacy, but presses on toward its great end. It scatters a thousand beauties and fragrances in its pathway, but these are only the blossoms that prelude the fruitage, or the verdure that expresses the inward life—the polish on the genuine gold, or the bright chips that fly from the chisels of those engaged in building up the Church of God.

Under the heathen religions, friendship easily and naturally took a prominent position. There it would not be merely a special form of pure human affection, or even a simple mode of social enjoyment or improvement. Unrestrained by any such principles as are furnished by Christianity, it would readily degenerate into a mere partnership of interests. It would lightly take the garb of romance or of honor to conceal selfish and corrupt purposes, and the laws binding two persons together might sander those binding them to society and to the race. Experience has shown that the highest poetry is possible under the inspiration of a rigid Christianity. Nay, it is only when Christianity presents itself to the eye of the poet, in its broadest and deepest aspect of purity, that the grandest poetry becomes possible. What else can be so sublime as the universal charity of the Gospel, expressing itself in the incarnation, gathering around the supernatural person of the incarnate, and culminating in the crucifixion? And yet it is precisely here that breadth of doctrine and height of sacrifice seem to throw human friendship in the shade. It is for no friendly race that Jesus intervenes, but for a world in foul revolt. He is not concerned for the beauties and delights of a narrow sphere, but for the tie of universal bro-

therhood. His command is, not that we shall love those who love us, but every soul of man; that for the truth and for Him the dearest ties, if need be, are to be accounted nothing—not those of friendship merely, but even the closest of nature.

But as eloquently as Cicero and other heathen have illustrated and praised friendship, as strikingly as the story of Damon and Pythias has set it forth, Christianity, while subordinating it to a broader and higher principle, still leaves it ample scope, and furnishes many of its noblest historic examples. To Christianity belongs a friendship without excess, a personal intercommunion which holds itself subordinate to the rights of God and man. And precisely for this reason is it the noblest and the happiest. It presupposes honest intentions, and is required to be clouded by no base understanding or even possibility. It must deal truthfully as well as lovingly, and, in promoting the happiness of friends, the reputation and welfare of others must be sacredly respected.

It is thus that friendship reveals itself in the history of Christianity. Jesus said to his disciples: "Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you." By this he did not mean to sweep away all special affections all tender personal ties founded on mutual adaptations, mutual sympathies, and similar tastes. Far from it. Even he himself loved Mary and Martha and Lazarus—not as he loved all, but with a peculiar human love that finds its way to the tenderest spot in our heart. And what, too, means the allusion to "the beloved disciple"? We must be willing that Jesus should be a man here as elsewhere, and permit him to lift friendship with the other spheres of life, up to his own exemplary elevation. It we proceed from the Master to the servants, the apostles, how are we touched by Paul's affection for Timothy! So intense is it that gleams out through all the terrible earnestness of their times, and even in the face of death it self.

In later times we see it in Augustine and Alypius, beginning before their conversion, continuing through it, and ending only with their lives. The stronger nature of Augustine enveloped that of Alypius, and thus they were as one. The same was true of Basil and Gregory Nazianzum. They formed their attachment while at school at Athens, and its basis was a firm devotion to Christ. The ardent and polemic temper of the former found an affectionate check and, as it were, a cooling rest in the contemplative spirit of the latter. Further on in the history of the Church, we meet with Bernard of Clairvaux, and his striking, almost motherly love for his brother Gerard. It was not a mere brotherhood of blood, but as he said, much more of religion. It was the old story of the strong and stormy spirit finding rest on a softer and gentler heart; of the quieter and less ambitious spirit giving the hand to the sturdier and bolder to be guided; and repaying that guidance by a wealth of love and grateful confidence. The same experience repeats itself between Luther and Melancthon. How Luther sunned himself in the quiet love and clearer light of Melancthon, and how the timid scholar supported himself by the arm of the dauntless reformer! Competition was impossible, as much so as between a sculptor and a painter. Each had what the other lacked and needed. This finds its parallel, in a certain degree, between Wesley and Fletcher. One met the foe in the field, the other in the closet. We might almost say that Fletcher was the inner life of Wesley, and Wesley the outer life of Fletcher. They were part and counterpart, and their love was like that of David and Jonathan.

It is doubtful whether a complete and constant friendship can exist between two bold and powerful characters especially if their ruling bent take the same direction. Not only do such men get in the way of each other's plans, and thus seem to thwart each other, but in any great movement unity is essential, and unity implies a single head and due subordination. The contestants, however honest, are apt to stand apart; they may remain at their posts and be friendly, but not particular friends. They may, if thoroughly penetrated with the spirit of Christ, live happily together, but they must still want the qualities that would suit

have not yet made up their minds as to the them to one another. But if one of them is poisoned by an unconscious egotism, the seeming or temporary friendship is likely to end in a rupture. This was the case with the historic attachment between Jerome and Rufinus. Jerome, called by Neander "irritable and self-seeking," writes his own condemnation when he says: "The friendship which can cease was never a true one." Egotism and ambition ever find the highest crime in resistance to themselves, and avenge themselves in proportion to former professions of love. But these considerations cannot tarnish the lustre of genuine Christian friendship, which has universal love for its general ground, and a diversity of honest natures for its indispensable condition. Oh! what a luxury is such a friendship! Consciously to utilize it is to degrade it; it exists on the supposition of perfect independence and perfect equality; it implies high mutual honor and admiration; it renders mutual homage, even while conscious of reciprocal defects and virtues. Each friend sees in the other the trait which he himself is most ashamed of lacking, and does especial honor to that as it is allowed by union with his friend's personality. We say again, such a friendship is a luxury, perhaps more than anything else; but if so, it is certainly the crown of its class—all delicate odors and pleasant savors, and fine pictures and music, are its dim types.—N. Y. Methodist.

Dr. Pusey and the Wesleyans.

Dr. Pusey, the great champion of the Romanizing party in the Church of England, recently sent a remarkable letter to the Wesleyan Conference. Taking advantage of the undetermined attitude which the Wesleyans observe with regard to the State Church and Dissenters, Dr. Pusey proposes to them an alliance against the reforms which the Liberal party endeavors to introduce into the ecclesiastical legislation in the United Kingdom. Dr. Pusey, in particular, wishes to enlist the cooperation of the Wesleyans in opposing Mr. Coleridge's bill for the nationalization of the English universities, which have heretofore been open only to the members of the Church of England. Depriving the Church of England of its monopolies, appears to Dr. Pusey as to all defenders of the State Church, equivalent to letting in a flood of indifference and infidelity upon the country, and he therefore entreats the Wesleyans to come to the aid of the universities.

The term of the letter is entirely unobjectionable. It is couched in the most courteous language. It compliments the Wesleyans by recognizing the fact that they are as deeply concerned for the prevalence and perpetuation in England of pure religion and undefiled as Dr. Pusey himself, and that they have never occupied the position of assailants of the Established Church. Coming from some other men, the sweet address might have had no effect. But Dr. Pusey's ultra position in all church affairs is so well known, that even the meek and undecided Wesleyans could not help recoiling from the offer made to them. Dr. Pusey has not only for years been the foremost champion of a theory of the church which excludes the Wesleyans from the body of Christ no less than Presbyterians, Baptists, and Congregationalists, while on the other hand, it recognizes the good standing of the Church of Rome and the Eastern Churches; but he has of late drawn much nearer to the Church of Rome, and again made the absurd attempt to prove a harmony between the doctrines of the Council of Trent and the thirty-nine articles of the Church of England.—Whatever a man like Dr. Pusey may propose to the Wesleyans, it can have from his point of view no other meaning than to be the first step toward re-subjecting the Wesleyans to the rule of the Church according to the understanding of the ultra-High Church party, and toward drawing them into that Roman movement which scandalizes the whole Protestant world.

The advances of Dr. Pusey were declined by the Wesleyans in a courteous and respectful and courteous manner. There was some difference of opinion as to the manner in which the reply should be forwarded, but that no alliance between men like Dr. Pusey and the Wesleyans is possible, was the unanimous opinion of all the speakers. The Wesleyans

evil of State churches in general; but they are at least not so timid as those High Church men, who regard the Anglican State Church as the safest bulwark against Romanism and Infidelity. Dr. Pusey had especially undertaken to represent the nationalization of the State universities as a triumph of Socinianism.—The Wesleyans reply that they are not afraid of Socinianism. To use the words of Mr. Arthur, "Methodism has nothing to fear from Puseyism or anything else, and all they ask for themselves is fair play and no favor."

For once the Wesleyans have spoken like true Dissenters, and the satisfaction with which the rebuff to Dr. Pusey has been received by all the Evangelical denominations in England, may, we hope, tighten the bonds of union which should forever unite them.—The disestablishment of the Anglican Church not in Ireland alone, but in the course of time in England also, will be a great triumph of Evangelical Protestantism. The self-delusion of those men who can represent the State Church as a machine for opposing Popery and infidelity is truly amazing. It is the Established Church of England which is soaked with Romanism, and unable to reject Rationalism; while the Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists, and Congregationalists, have either kept themselves free from both evils, or have long since purged themselves of both. Any prime minister may obtrude Romanizing or Rationalizing bishops upon the Church, and thus give the whole influence of the State to a belief which Evangelical Protestants detest, while the history of the free Protestant churches is well calculated to inspire confidence in the sure triumph and progress of evangelical principles.—*Id.*

BOUGHT SERMONS.—A circular is being sent to the country clergy announcing the establishment of an office for the manufacture and sale of sermons, "whereby every clergyman of the Church of England who subscribes to it can have it in his power to deliver a carefully written, sound, orthodox sermon every Sabbath." To be successful, this plan should be carried out to the length of which it is obviously capable. Every clergyman should have it in his power not only to deliver a sound orthodox sermon, but to choose from peculiar qualities, as in another trade we have the advantage of selecting from various vintages. All sermons are supposed to be orthodox, but there are as many kinds of sermons as of wine; and we venture therefore, to suggest to the enterprising advertiser that he should compile a sermon list, from which clergymen of different tastes and schools might select, with a better chance of getting the precise article required. Thus, for instance:

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 1. A good sound discourse, safe and moderate. | .50 |
| 2. High and dry. | .60 |
| 3. High. | .70 |
| 4. Extreme ditto, with Roman bouquet. | .80 |
| 5. Gushing ditto, very delicate, suitable for ladies. | .80 |
| 6. Full-bodied altar-dinner sermon, an excellent digestive. | .60 |
| 7. Deep, thoughtful sermon, with Broad Church flavour. | .60 |
| 8. Ditto, very broad. | .70 |
| 9. Old-fashioned Evangelical, suitable for family reading. | .49 |

This, of course, is but a rough sketch, presenting only a limited selection. Our prices too, are probably higher than might be charged with a profit to parsons taking a quantity.—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

THE HOLY SEPULCHRE.—The Paris *Liberte* publishes an extraordinary item of intelligence. The Russian Government has demanded at Constantinople the joint proprietorship of the keys of the chapel of the Holy Sepulchre.—These have for very many years past been entrusted to special care of the French consul at Jerusalem. The *Liberte* adds that this demand has been made with the view of weakening French influence in the East; "for, in a country where so much importance is attached to formalities, the consent of France to this step would signify the abdication of the preponderating part which she has hitherto played in the East." The same paper is assured that M. Bourée had addressed a communication to the Marquis de Monstier, in which he strongly recommends that the French Government do not comply with this demand. Remembering that the dispute about the Holy Places was the cause of the Russian war of 1854, this news, if it be true is rather serious.