

that is essential to the particular purpose without discussing the literary attainments of each person respectively, or the peculiar religious notions of each one, or the age of each. This is precisely the case in the historic portions of the Bible. And no one has a right to expect or demand more.

Moses gives us a history of mankind, and God's dealings with mankind from the creation to the giving of the law, inclusive. He tells us at the outset that God formed man from the dust of the ground. It was not essential to his purpose in this connection to enter into a discussion of man's spiritual nature, and yet the notice he takes of God's first purpose to make man, in the 26th verse, shows that he was to be superior to the beasts; that he was to be more than a physical corporation, consisting of flesh and blood, and bones and muscles, governed by instinct. That he was to be in the image of God and after his likeness, possessed of high moral and intellectual faculties, and to be an associate for Deity. Moses' silence, at this point, respecting man's immortality, is of no more force than his silence respecting his mortality, both which were to appear in due time and proper place. So in pursuing his narrative, he tells us how many went down into Egypt, (See Genesis 46.) denoting them by the word "soul" to signify man's superiority over every other order of animate nature, without either denying or affirming man's immortality, as the question did not come within the range of his subject.

The Apostle Paul argues upon man respecting his physical system which is undeniably mortal. He maintains that it shall become immortal, 1 Cor. 15, 42. "So also is the resurrection of the dead." "It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption," or in other words, it is sown in mortality, it is raised in immortality. "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." All this is said of the body. Will any one therefore infer,—have any a right to infer?—from this, that Paul did not consider that man possessed another, a spiritual nature, which was thoroughly immortal? But is there not rather propriety in inferring that none doubted or disputed that doctrine, but raised objections only to the mortal body becoming immortal!

Would any persons have a right when listening to a minister preach, who chooses for his subject "Christian duties," to conclude that he did not believe that sinners were accountable to God, because he was silent respecting that subject? Whereas the subject he had chosen to discourse upon, did not require him to treat of that, nor any other than the duties of Christians.

Although Paul in his first letter to the Corinthians and in the 15th chapter has dwelt particularly upon the mortal body becoming immortal, he has, in his second epistle, while sustaining the same sentiment brought out in connection therewith, at the 5th chap., under a figure, the immortality of the soul. He likens the body to a house which is falling into decay. The inmate is expecting soon to remove into one that will never fail, and longs for that time to come. Our bodies are the houses. In this physical house dwells the spirit. It is preparing for a higher style of living. It is not so tired of the body that it wishes to be disembodied; but it is so pleased with the prospect beyond, that it is anxious to possess the heavenly body. The identity in all this is with the spirit immortal. The "we" in this case is the spirit man, and not the physical man. The terms life and immortality are used by some as synonymous. This may in some instances be, according to conventional usage, correct enough, but in the text, while they do not signify entirely different things, they signify at least different shades of the same thing. They present different aspects of the one subject. "Zao" is the verb, the root of the word that is in the text translated "life." It signifies both existence or living, and the true enjoyment of living. "Living like a gentleman," as one has said. The true idea is then, not that the gospel creates life, but it teaches one how to live to enjoy life and secure the real object of existence. So the Greek word "Aphtharasia" rendered in the text immortality, signifies, imperishable, incorruptible, and the idea is that the gospel teaches that the immaterial, or spirit man will exist for ever, and teaches how to render that existence comfortable to us. In other words, immortality may denote uninterrupted, interminable existence. Life may denote the pure enjoyment and bliss of such existence.

(To be continued.)

FIRE AT LOWER GRANVILLE.—I regret to state that Capt. Z. Johnson, of Lower Granville, had his barn filled with Hay and grain destroyed by fire on Thursday last the 18th inst. The fire was occasioned by his little boy igniting a match in the barn. Estimated loss \$600. I. W.

Christian Messenger.

HALIFAX, JANUARY 31, 1866.

THE SABBATH QUESTION.

A fierce discussion is being carried on among Presbyterians especially in Scotland on this subject. It arose from the introduction of a pastoral address on Sabbath Observance in the Presbytery of Glasgow, in connexion with the Established Church of Scotland. The object of this address was to check the Railway Travelling and Sunday Excursions in that country. The following is given as an abstract of said address:—

It stated that, in the judgment of the committee appointed to prepare it, very lax and unscriptural views were held by some as to the nature and purpose of the Christian Sabbath, and that many temptations were put in the way of the young man and the thoughtless for turning the Lord's day into a day of mere worldly pleasure and amusement by excursions on Sunday, steam vessels, and other public conveyances. It pointed out that the primeval and Divine institution of one day in seven as a day of holy rest was recognised in the promulgation of the law from Mount Sinai, and our Lord Jesus Christ in declaring himself to be the Lord of the Sabbath indicated, not his intention to abrogate that portion of the law, but to fulfil it, by freeing it from mere Jewish peculiarities; and, by restoring it to its original position, rendering it a fitting institution for the New Testament Church. The committee thought it necessary to remind the brethren that they did not look on the Fourth Commandment as of more obligation than any other of God's Commandments, but they thought that the due observance of the Lord's day was inseparably connected with the due observance of the other Commandments, the very position of the Fourth Commandment in the Decalogue, occupying, as it did, by the Divine arrangement, the middle space between our duty to God and our duty to our neighbour, seemed to indicate its special use as a link connecting reverence towards God, with truth, justice, and charity towards man. The committee accordingly called on the brethren to discourage, by word and by example, all unnecessary encroachments on the duties and privileges of the Lord's day, and to pray for such of the brethren as did not yet know the blessedness of being risen with Christ to newness of life.

On the address being moved in Presbytery, Dr. Norman Macleod the editor of *Good Words*, arose and made a long powerful speech occupying a large portion of two days' sittings. He took exception to the grounds for observing the Lord's Day and asserted his freedom from any obligation to keep the day on the ground of the command given to the Israelites. In doing this he freely ridiculed the practices of certain Presbyterians who regard the day as one of severe austerity and asceticism. The following may be taken as a sample of his style of remark:—

"Look" said he "at the Judaism in some parts of our country to the north in the nineteenth century. I challenge any Free Church minister, and perhaps I might extend it to those still freer—the Establishment—if he would dare to shave on Sunday morning before his people, or take a razor or brush to shave on a Sunday morning. A friend of mine, a deacon, went away last summer to fish in the Western Isles, and lived with a most excellent man, but a regular Jew. Well he had a very excellent ham, which he proposed to have for breakfast, and did not refuse to cook the ham, for he liked his victuals, and to have wanted it would have been rather much self-denial. So he cut the ham to the bone; but, when he came that length, he put down the knife; he would rather not cut any more as it was Sunday. So my friend the deacon had to cut the bone, while his host cut the ham. This illustration of the argument would be of no value whatever, unless I was speaking a simple fact. This is a fact. Now, this is slavery to the letter, and it bounld down a great many in our part of the country."

Dr. Macleod made light of the Divine sanctions of the Sabbath-day, but acknowledged that the Lord's Day is of necessity "a part and parcel of our Christian faith," that Christian men, having faith in Christ, should meet together for worship, to remember Christ, and that a day should be set apart for this purpose. He argued that,—

"If you admit that they are to meet together in such a capacity and for such a purpose, they must have a day set apart, because the one is involved in the other. Supposing this is admitted; then I go farther, and find as a Christian man there is this day. I am born to it. I never made it, but I awoke and found myself a baptised man, a Christian in the light and glory of the Lord's day, and as a Christian man I began to look at it and its work. I find it most exquisitely adapted to my whole wishes as a Christian, and as a man I find it adapted to my wants physically; I feel I need rest."

This is then his strong ground for a day of rest. No wonder his Presbyterian brethren have taken the alarm. The first published reports of his speech he charged with unfairness, but has now published it himself in pamphlet form. Yet it does not materially alter his position. He was "accused of ex-

aggeration in his statement about the objections to having on the Sunday, but he gives a letter from a gentleman, whose name is added, in which we read:—"Shortly after your speech on the Sabbath question, at the meeting of the Glasgow Presbytery, I was in company with three West Highland ministers, of the established church, to whom I expressed my doubts as to the correctness of your assertion that a considerable number of ministers abstained from shaving on Sundays from conscientious motives. To my great surprise I found that two out of the three themselves performed the operation over night for fear of breaking the Sabbath; and the third mentioned that when he was a student he was found fault with for not having a close shaven chin on Monday, the inference being, that, as he had not shaved that day, he probably had done so on the one immediately preceding."

A great difference of opinion on the subject of Sabbath observance exists in Scotland amongst members of the same churches. The Free church, we believe, is pretty generally opposed to the views entertained by Dr. Macleod. There is probably more sympathy with him in the Kirk, although there was a large majority in favor of the Pastoral. The subject has been taken up here to some extent, and the organs of the two Presbyterian bodies have indicated the different views they take of the question. The *Monthly Record of the Church of Scotland* (January) says:—

"While adhering to the old view, and thinking that, if there be any difference between the Jewish and Christian Sabbath, the difference is that we have more to commemorate and therefore ought to be more zealous in the observance of a Sabbath, we cannot but admire the courage of Dr. Macleod in boldly announcing his opinions."

And further, "It is evident that there is a party arising, among all churches in Scotland, who are determined, in the cause of religion, to claim more freedom of thought and action for individuals than have hitherto been allowed. This was very apparent in the very fair and temperate discussion of this subject, that took place in the Presbytery of Glasgow. The crowd was vociferous, but the members were calm."

The *Home and Foreign Record of the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces*, on the other hand, says:—

"Dr. NORMAN MACLEOD, of Glasgow, has astonished the churches, by boldly announcing it as his belief that the Ten Commandments have been abrogated! He is particularly severe on the fourth commandment and the Sabbath day. He has gravely proclaimed both before the Presbytery of Glasgow and in his own pulpit, the Lord had never brought him out of Egypt and the house of bondage, and therefore he had nothing to do with the ten commandments! Dr. Macleod is one of the Queen's Chaplains for Scotland, and is a very popular writer and preacher; but we believe he will fail to convince the people of Scotland that the Decalogue is dead and buried, although he is even boastfully confident on the point. Professor Tulloch of St. Andrew's, about the same time, came out with a long tirade against the Confession of Faith, showing—trying to show—that it was a mere "growth of the seventeenth century," and hardly worthy of respect in this nineteenth century!"

A large number of sermons, lectures, pamphlets, and articles in periodicals have appeared on both sides in England and Scotland. The subject is, however, one not confined to Presbyterians, or to Scotland. Efforts are being made in England to make the Lord's Day rather a day of recreation than one of public worship and entire cessation from labor. There are powerful advocates for opening the Museums, Public Gardens, and Scientific Institutions on that sacred day. The bulk of the religious public are, however, making more or less active exertions to stem the torrent of Sabbath desecration. A deputation of the working-men representing several Operative Societies in London, recently waited on Earl Granville to protest against the opening of Kensington Museum and other public buildings on Sundays. They were accompanied by Mr. Hughes, M. P. Several of the members addressed His Lordship, explaining to him that their objections to the Sunday opening was "because they were not so selfish as to wish that members of their own class should have an additional day's labour imposed on them."

In the principal cities of the United States the discussion is directed against the issue and sale of Sunday newspapers, which is becoming quite general, and the source of much annoyance to the religious portion of the community.

It becomes Christians everywhere to be on the alert, and to guard this great witness for God and for his claims from being silenced. We are no advocates for Pharisaical punctiliousness, but believe that the Sabbath was made for man, and whatever interferes with the sacred employment of its hours, in any community, is calculated to weaken the religious sensibilities of the people, and to deprive mankind of this great boon.

Execution of Harry Dowcey.

We were unable last week to inform our readers positively what was to be the fate of Dowcey, as the reply of His Excellency to the petition for a change in his sentence, had not appeared when we went to press. Much anxiety was felt in the city, and various were the conjectures as to what answer would be given. Many of our readers will have learned his fate, before this, but as others will be desirous of knowing the nature of the Lieutenant Governor's answer, we copy it for their information:—

REPLY TO PETITION.

Provincial Secretary's Office,
23rd Jan., 1866.

Gentlemen,—I have it in command from His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor, to inform you that he has given the memorial praying for the commutation of the sentence of Harry Dowcey the careful consideration demanded by the expressed wishes of so many of the inhabitants of this city upon a subject of such deep moment, and to inform you that His Excellency cannot consider it consistent with his duty to comply with the prayer of that memorial.

I am further directed to say that although strongly impressed with the guilt of Douglas, His Excellency could not, without establishing a most dangerous precedent, order the execution of a man whose conviction had been referred under the Statute by the Chief Justice who tried the case, to the Bench of Judges; and when after full examination two out of five Judges declared their conviction that the evidence on the trial was insufficient to warrant a conviction, and that Douglas ought to have been acquitted, and the Chief Justice and the remaining Judges, while sustaining the legality of the verdict, declined to express any opinion as to his guilt.

Under these circumstances His Excellency inflicted the most severe punishment in his power compatible with that respect to the Court which in all civilized countries forms the strongest safeguard for life and liberty.

But even assuming that Douglas has escaped the extreme penalty of the law by a partial failure of justice, His Excellency fails to perceive how that should in the slightest degree affect the fate of a man who has been found guilty of the perpetration of a foul, deliberate and cruel murder, and in whose case no doubt has been or can be raised, nor any reason for mitigation of his sentence offered.

I have the honor to be, Gentlemen,
Your obedient servant,
(Signed) C. TUPPER.

To W. A. D. Morse, Esq., Very Rev. Dr. Hannan, John Tobin, Esq., M. P. P., J. S. D. Thompson, Esq., and the other signers of the memorial, praying for commutation of Dowcey's sentence.

We were not disappointed at this decision.

Accordingly on Wednesday morning about half past six o'clock, on the invitation of the High Sheriff, His Worship the Mayor and several of the Aldermen and city officials arrived at the jail, and about thirty of the City Police soon entered the yard. Four companies of soldiers also shortly arrived and were stationed on either side. It being so early, but few—not more than about one hundred and fifty—civilians were present. Next the coffin for the remains of the man about to suffer the extreme penalty of the law, was brought out and placed near the scaffold.

At 7 o'clock the doomed man with his arms pinioned, accompanied by Fathers Hannan and Carmody, who had been in attendance upon him from an early hour, appeared at the door of the prison and walked to the scaffold, accompanied by the High Sheriff, his deputies and the executioner. Here the Sheriff read the verdict of the court, and the death sentence. The two clergymen remained a short time in conversation with Dowcey, performing their last offices. On their leaving him the rope was adjusted around his neck. The Sheriff then asked him if he had any thing to say, whereupon he broke the dead silence which ensued, by saying:—

"I am here this morning to be executed for the murder of Capt. Benson, of the brig "Zoro," but I was not the instigator of Capt. Benson's murder. I wish to say that what I have done in the matter I am sorry for, and I am sorry for having had anything to do with it. I can assure you that what I have done towards it, I was pushed to it, by a certain person whom you all know, and whom I need not name. I will say that unless it had been for him, I would not have been here this morning. To conclude, he is the cause of my life being taken away. I have no more to say, gentlemen. I wish you farewell, and God Almighty for us all."

The executioner then pulled the cap over the culprit's face, and drew the bolt, which let the drop fall, and Dowcey was no more in this world. About ten minutes after the medical attendant examined the pulse, and pronounced the body dead. After remaining a few minutes longer, the rope was cut, and the corpse placed in the coffin, whence it was taken and interred in the Roman Catholic cemetery. Soon after the execution had taken place crowds of people assembled, greatly surprised to find that the awful tragedy was all over.