

# The Religious Intelligencer.

AN EVANGELICAL FAMILY NEWSPAPER FOR NEW BRUNSWICK AND NOVA SCOTIA.

REV. E. McLEOD,

"THAT GOD

IN ALL THINGS MAY BE GLORIFIED THROUGH JESUS CHRIST."

Peter.

(Editor and Proprietor.)

Vol. XI.—No. 17.

SAINT JOHN, NEW BRUNSWICK, FRIDAY, APRIL 22, 1864.

Whole No. 537.

## The Intelligencer.

### THE ABOLITION OF HUMAN SACRIFICES IN INDIA.

One of the most interesting aspects in which the establishment of British supremacy in India may be regarded, is that which is presented by the extinction of human sacrifices. We find them recorded with approbation in the most ancient Hindoo epic, and they have been identified from time immemorial with the genius of Hindooism. Amidst all the revolutions to which the continent of India has been subject, these inhuman practices appear to have been perpetuated without any interruption in its various provinces, though in diversified forms. When we first appeared in the country as a political power, we found them in full vigour—Brahmins habitually employed in destroying their relatives, even in the holy city of Benares—mothers sacrificing their children at Saur, in fulfillment of religious vows—sons kindling the funeral pile which was to consume their living mothers—and devotees casting themselves under the wheels of Juggernaut's car.

It was reserved for the British Government to bring this tragedy of superstition to a close, though for a time our public functionaries were regardless of their high and sacred vocation. For more than forty years, those who were placed at the head of affairs exhibited the utmost indifference to the existence of these inhuman sacrifices, which they regarded as an integral part of the religion of the country, with which it was not their province to meddle. If at any time the subject was forced on their notice, they justified their non-interference by advising to the danger of exciting discontent in the minds of the natives. The claims of humanity were smothered by the dread of damaging the interests of the Company. This heartless policy would appear extraordinary, if we had not a corresponding example of it at the same period in this country, regarding the atrocities of the slave trade, the abolition of which was continually opposed, because it was considered at variance with our national interests. It was not till the year 1793 that the first blow was given to this bloody superstition in India, by prohibiting the destruction of females at Benares. But the inhabitants of that city, the citadel of Hindooism, and always the seat of disaffection in the northwest, manifested no hostility to this prohibition, though they subsequently revolted against our Government on the imposition of a house tax. A clear proof was thus obtained that no political danger was likely to attend our interposition in the cause of humanity, and the moral courage of the British rulers acquired new strength. Accordingly, seven years after, Mr. Uxley, the member of Council, and Dr. Carey, united their efforts to induce Lord Wellesley to deal with the sacrifice of children at Saur, and a law was passed to prohibit the practice. A hundred thousand pilgrims were ordinarily assembled there at the annual festival; and in the midst of that great assembly, it was announced that Government had thought fit to interfere the offering of children, under severe penalties. The order was obeyed without hesitation, and without creating the smallest disturbance. Soon after the province of Orissa was annexed to the British territories, and the most strenuous efforts were made, and with signal success, to prevent devotees sacrificing themselves under the wheels of Juggernaut's car.

But although the country had exhibited an unequivocal acquiescence in these humane proceedings, the Government shrunk, for a quarter of a century, from the duty of dealing summarily with the most atrocious rite of female immolation. The Hindoo considered it the glory of their religion, as it attested the love of life, and the respect for humanity, and provided seven hundred victims annually for the funeral pile; and the public functionaries in India and in England were staggered by the apparent array of national feeling in favour of this brutal practice, not discerning that it owed more than half its strength to their hesitation. Attempts were made, by a timid legislation, to regulate the rite and reduce the number of victims, but as in the case of the slave trade, it was found that to compromise the claims of humanity, was to aggravate the evil. While the Council of Directors were temporizing with this enormity, and looking to the slow progress of knowledge and civilization to eradicate it, Lord William Bentinck landed in Calcutta as Governor-General, "with a full sense," as he said, "of the dreadful responsibility hanging over his head in this world and the next, if he, as the head of the Government of India, consented to the continuance of this practice for so long a time longer than could be helped. He was so thoroughly in earnest as to consider even the question of our political security subordinate to the claims of humanity, and on the 9th of December, 1829, passed the ever-memorable act, which peremptorily prohibited *Suttee*, and attached the severest penalties to the crime of aiding or abetting them. To consummate this deed of mercy, he had not only set at defiance the hostility—with a small exception—of the territorial, priestly, and the mercantile interests in the native community, but to encounter the morbid and Brahminized sensibilities of some of the most eminent European servants of Government, headed by the great Orientalist, Dr. Horace Haynes Wilson, who reproached "this direct and unequal interference with the Hindoo religion." Under his auspices, a petition was drawn up to the Privy Council, denouncing the proceedings of Lord William Bentinck, and demanding the restoration of the privilege of burning widows, on the important assumption that it was included within the scope of the principle of toleration which the British Government had pledged itself to maintain in India. The appeal, though supported by the forensic talent of Dr. Lushington, was dismissed; the rite was irrevocably abolished; and to borrow the line of an Indian poet—

"The Ganges flowed, unclouded to the sea."

The latest interference with these barbarous rites has been exercised in the case of the Meriah sacrifices, a report of which has just been published by General Campbell in a "Personal Narrative of Thirteen Years' Service among the Wild Tribes of Khondistan," for the suppression of work we have glanced at the following particulars. Khondistan—the abode of Khond—is a large province in the hilly portion of the ancient kingdom of Orissa, which is known to the Christian public of England as the sacred land of the god Juggernaut. Orissa, because a British province in 1809, but it was only in the twelfth and in the

district of Cuttack that our ordinary system of administration was established. The region in the hills, inhabited by various wild tribes, remained under the management of their own chiefs, with whom we held little intercourse, and never interfered except when they became refractory, and refused to make good the tribute imposed on them. Taxation was, in fact, the only element of civilization which we introduced among them. Khondistan was divided into several principalities, each under some Orissa ruler, one of whom, the chief of Goomsoor, about the year 1835, resisted the British authorities, when a large force was sent against him from Madras, and the country was speedily reduced to submission. It was this expedition which brought us for the first time in contact with the Khonds and revealed a system of human sacrifices more revolting than any recorded in the annals of human cruelty and superstition. In order to propitiate the earth deity, and obtain rich crops, these savages were in the habit of sacrificing human victims, termed Meriahs. To render the sacrifice efficacious, it was necessary that the victims should be purchased; but, although they might be of any sex, or caste, or age, men were generally preferred as being of higher price, the value of the offering being in proportion to its cost. The Meriahs were often procured from their friends or relatives when reduced to distress, or suffering from famine, but were generally stolen from the plains by a gang of professional kidnappers. The Meriah women were frequently allowed to live till they had borne children to Khond fathers, and these children were reared for sacrifice. For a month prior to the act of immolation, the victims were kept in a state of intoxication, and were made to dance around the victim, who was adorned with chaplets of flowers. The day before the tragedy he was stupefied with drugs, and bound to the foot of a post, while the assembled multitude danced round him to the sound of their barbarous music, and addressed the earth deity—"O God, we offer thee this sacrifice; give us good crops seasons, and health." On the day of the sacrifice, they marched in procession round the village, bearing the victim in their arms, and then conveyed him to the post, where a hog was slain, and its blood allowed to flow into a pit dug for the purpose. The Meriah, who had been again drugged, was then thrown in and smothered to death; the priest proceeded to cut out a piece of flesh and bury it near the village. The multitude followed his example, and hastened with the bloody prize to their respective villages, and buried the flesh on the same day near their local idol. But this was the least inhuman mode of consuming the sacrifice; among some of the tribes the flesh was cut from the living victim.

The British Government no sooner became cognizant of this practice, than it was resolved to adopt the most energetic measures to extinguish it. A distinct and costly agency was established for this purpose in the hills, and General—then Captain—Campbell, who had acquired a good knowledge of the country and the people during the campaign, was nominated the representative of the Government in Khondistan. He commenced his crusade against the Meriah immolation in December, 1837, by convening an assembly of the Goomsoor chiefs, to whom he explained that they were no longer under a native chief, but under the British government, which abhorred the rite, and was determined to extinguish it. They were desired to consult their people on the subject, and communicate the result to the Commissioner. At the second conference they informed him that, though they had always followed the rite, they felt that it was imperative on them to obey the Government to which they were now subjects, and that they were prepared to abandon human sacrifices, and, like the inhabitants of the plain, sacrifice animals to obtain good crops. Then seating themselves on tiger skins, they bound themselves by a solemn oath to the performance of their promise—"May the earth refuse its produce; may rice choke me; may water drown me and my children, if I break the oath I now take, for myself and people, to abstain forever from the sacrifice of human beings." One hundred victims, destined for sacrifice, were then surrendered, and from that day this bloody rite has ceased in Goomsoor. The same happy result followed the exertions of Captain Campbell in the neighbouring districts of Bapat and Kintedy. Council after council was convened, and there were endless discussions. No little reluctance was manifested to give up a practice, on which the fertility of their fields, and their own means of subsistence were supposed to depend, but Captain Campbell pressed on them the stern and inflexible determination of the Government to extinguish the practice, by persuasion if possible; if not, by compulsion; and thus, with admirable patience, tact, perseverance, by alternate coaxing and menacing, and on one occasion by a demonstration of force, he succeeded in rescuing all the victims in these and other districts, and putting an end to the practice. For thirteen entire years he was employed in this great mission of humanity, visiting every nook and corner of a region which is considered fatal to European constitutions, delivering those who were appointed to death, and exacting the most solemn pledges from the chiefs and people to relinquish the practice for ever. In 1854, the government considered his mission completed, and withdrew the agency as being no longer necessary. During the period of his operations, the number of victims rescued from destruction amounted to 1,500—the females being about a tenth in excess of the males. A considerable number of them were restored to the friends and relatives from whom they had been torn, or adopted into families of respectability; others were given in marriage to small parties from the Government. Two hundred were placed, at the expense of the state, in mission schools, and three hundred settled as cultivators in different villages.

"And thus," to borrow the language of an eloquent writer in India, "in a country where bits of flesh, cut from living men, were strewn on the ground as a miraculous manure; where the land, so to speak, was guanoed with human blood, this, worse than any known in Europe, has, in eighteen years, ceased to exist; and fifteen hundred human victims have been rescued from a horrible death. An entire people have been induced to forego crime sanctioned alike by antiquity and superstition, and a district as large as Wales has been raised a whole grade in the career of civilization. All this has been effected by a Government declared to be oppressive, and by a class whom India honours, and England stigmatises as political."

On a review of these various rites which have continued to pollute India with innocent blood for twenty-five centuries, it will appear to be a matter of no ordinary gratification that the establishment of British authority has been the instrument of extinguishing them. We leave it to others, to whom it may be more congenial, to dilate on the political crimes, which are said to have marked the growth of our power in India; though we may be allowed to express our satisfaction that they are so much fewer than have ever attended the acquisition of so extensive a dominion at so vast a distance from the centre of authority, in any age and country, and that the more disposition they are scrutinized, the less aggravated do they appear. To our feelings it is more agreeable to dwell on the auspicious effects which have resulted from the introduction of our power, more especially in regard to the universal extinction of these diabolical practices. We think that as men, as Englishmen, and as Christians, we have just cause for exultation that the triumph of our arms has been invariably followed by the triumph of humanity. Viewed in this light, it may not be considered presumptuous to connect with the designs of that higher economy to which all human movements are subordinate, the position we have attained in the east, and which enables us not only to exterminate human sacrifices, but to communicate the blessings of civilization and the treasures of divine Revelation to a hundred and fifty millions of people.—*Baptist Magazine*.

### OUR STUMBLING BROTHER.

BY REV. THEODORE L. CUYLER.

An aged man—the noblest man then living on our globe—once sat down and wrote, under the inspiration of God, these words: "It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor anything which thy brother stumbleth." Now, who is our "brother?" In this passage Paul may have referred to his brother in Christian fellowship; he was to do nothing willfully offensive and injurious to his fellow disciple in God's household. But if he is to be so tender of the feelings and watchful of the interests of other Christians, how much more ought he to avoid anything which would be morally hurtful to the impotent masses of his fellow men!

Let us look at the teaching of this famous passage, so redolent of Christian philanthropy. What does the passage teach? To our mind it clearly teaches the moral obligation to abstain from practice and usages that inevitably injure others. We are to abstain from that which works mischief to our brother-man, and we are to do so from the love of love. This is the drift of the passage, and of the whole chapter in which it is imbedded. Even so conservative an exponent as Professor Hodge of Princeton says (in treating of this passage), that things not sinful in themselves are to be given up for the sake of others. The legal liberty of a conscientious man, is never to be exercised where a moral evil will inevitably flow from such exercise. If "liberty" puts a stumbling block in the way of another, and trips him so that he falls, then we unto me for persisting in using this liberty. The principle is a broad one, and it is as noble as that of the Gospel of love, that gave it birth. It is the principle that good men are to sacrifice everything and anything that is destructive to the best interests of humanity.

We lay down, then, this proposition, that no man of conscience has a moral right to adopt any system of practice which is known to be inevitably hurtful to his neighbor man. I have a legal right to do many things which, as a man of principle, I ought not to do. I have a legal right to take opium or arsenic, or swallow vast quantities of fourth proof brandy; but I have no moral right to thus commit self destruction, and to tempt others to do the same. I have a legal right to attend habitually a theatre, even to the neglect of their enacted statute, which is surcharged with moral poison, and every tier were thronged with harlots. There is no written law to forbid my going there, and no officer stands guard to repel me. But I have no moral right to go there—not merely because I shall see and hear what is enraging and polluting to myself, but because that whole garish and glittering establishment, with its sensual attractions, is to many of my fellow men a chancelled and crimsoned hell; a yawning maelstrom of perdition. The dollar I give at the entrance is my direct contribution toward sustaining an establishment whose dark foundations rest on the murdered souls of hundreds of my fellow men. What right have I to contribute my money and to give the sanction of my example to the support of a perfect slaughter house of character and of immortal souls?

Now on this same principle—not merely of self-preservation, for that I am not now speaking—what right have I to sustain the magazines of moral death where poisonous drinks are vended? What right have I to sustain a traffic which is simply dealing out death by measure? What right have I to abet the drinking usages of society? If I glass of intoxicating drink on my table (be it sparkling Madeira or Bourbon whisky) will entrap some one of susceptible or excitable temperament into dissipation, what right have I to set that trap for his life, to tempt him to his own ruin, and make his *particeps criminis* in his destruction? If the contents of the glass which I give to my brother cause him to stumble he stumbles over me. If his moral restraints are broken, I helped to break them. I am an accomplice in his sin. If he goes away from my table with an increased thirst for the bottle, I have helped to make him a drunkard; and, to that degree, have helped to shut him out of heaven. The words he may have spoken, the blows he may have struck, the excesses he may have committed under the stimulation of my offered glass, are to a certain degree, my words and deeds of folly and of wickedness. But for me he would not have uttered the words or done the deeds. The man who (in the language of Scripture) "puts the bottle to his neighbor," is partially and largely responsible for all the havoc which that bottle makes, and for the dark damnation which may follow in its train. Of course, this principle makes fearful work with the wild traffic in intoxicating drinks as a beverage; and when society punishes the drunkard for his outrages, and licenses the drunkard maker, it simply punishes the effect and protects the cause!

We might say a thousand things here on the woes of the drunkard, on the guilt of the dram seller, on the poisonous nature of the most popular alcoholic drinks, and on the frightful havoc which the bottle is working in the army, in our houses, and even in our churches. But we prefer now to speak on one specific point, viz, the duty of all conscientious people to abstain from drink-

ing and offering strong drink, while that drink makes others "stumble." It is for those whom we are now pleading. It is for those whom your wine cup—offered in mistaken hospitality, or under the tyranny of fashion—may precipitate into drunkenness and perdition. Oh! those stumblers! Who are they? I hardly dare tell; for it would touch many of us too tenderly. It would touch many of our secret wounds which pride and affection are attempting, but in vain, to conceal. It would reveal wrecks that angels might weep over. It would open afresh some tombs where the charitable green turf now hides out of sight what surviving friendship would love to have forgotten.

For the sake of my stumbling brother, I am bidden to abstain. Is this asking too much of me? Let a single incident answer. In a certain convention of temperance philanthropists, a clergyman made a plausible defence of the moral right of even good men to drink and to offer alcoholic liquors. Teetotalism he denounced as fanatical and unscriptural. He talked glibly about the wine used at Cana of Galilee, (though not very understandingly) and insisted that for one *herald* should claim the right to use liquors at his own table and in social gatherings. When he had concluded his sophistical argument, an old man arose under much emotion. His voice trembled with grief. Turning to the convention, he said in substance to them, "I know a young man. He is fast becoming an inebriate. I fear he is ruined. When he is urged to give up the wine-cup, he always pleads the example of certain popular clergymen. He says that while that minister takes his glass and defends it, he means to do the same. Gentlemen! that poor intemperate youth is my son; and the clergyman whose evil example he is following is the very same one who has just addressed this Convention!"

### SPECIAL ANSWER TO PRAYER.

The following is from Five Years of Prayer and the answers, by Rev. S. Irenaeus Prime, D. D.:

A young man, who had been connected with a distinguished law firm in the city of New York, gave the following account of his experience, and how the Lord had answered his prayers:—"The past two weeks have been full of the richest experience of the Divine goodness and grace. Two weeks ago I was a hopeless drunkard; a poor lost man I was. My friends had made every possible effort to reclaim me, but with no avail. I had often resolved, with many tears, to break away from the cruel bondage in which I was bound. I took upon myself the most solemn vows that I would reform. What were resolutions and vows before such an inexorable enemy as mine? I could not stand to them a moment. At last I gave myself up to perish. There was no hope for me. I was given up, too, of all the world. In this state of despair I went down to the Fishing-Banks one day. There I was attracted by the very plaintive countenance of a young man. I knew he must be a poor man, and a fisherman by profession. He helped me to understand the art of fishing. There was a world of happiness in his face. I loved to look at him. At last, out of gratitude for the little favours which he showed a perfect stranger, I took out my flask of liquor, and offered him to drink. 'No,' he said, 'never drink intoxicating drink, and I ask the Lord Jesus to help me never touch it!'

"I looked at him in surprise, and inquired, 'Are you a Christian?' 'Yes, I trust I am,' he answered. 'And does Jesus keep you from drinking intoxicating liquor?' 'He does; and I never wish to touch it.' That short answer set me to thinking. In it was revealed a new power. I went home that night, and said to myself as I went, How do I know but Christ would keep me from drinking if I would ask Him? When I got to my room I thought over my whole case, and then I knelt down, and I told Jesus, just as I would tell you, what a poor miserable wretch I was; how I struggled against my appetite, and had always been overcome by it. I told Him, if He would take that appetite away, I would give myself up to Him, to be His for ever, and I would for ever love and serve Him. I told Him that I felt assured that He could help me, and that He would. Now I stand here, and I tell you most solemnly that Jesus took me at my word. He did take away my appetite then and there; so that from the sacred moment of my casting myself on His help, I have not tasted a drop of liquor, nor desired to taste it. The old appetite is gone; and I tell you, moreover, that I gave myself to Jesus in that very hour, and I received Him as a power in my soul against every enemy of my salvation, and He saves me in His infinite grace. I came at once to these meetings. I have been coming every day for two weeks; and O, what happy weeks! I am delivered, through the power of Jesus, from the awful destruction which was before me. Such has been the method of my relief."

### HOW TO READ THE BIBLE.

"Mother," said a careless little boy, "I can't find my mittens, and I am in such a hurry. Do come and help me."

"You have not looked for them," said his mother.

"Yes, indeed, I have. I've looked all round everywhere, and I can't find them."

"You have looked as you usually do," said his mother. "You stand in the middle of the room and whirl round, looking everywhere in general and nowhere in particular. Now, begin at one end of the room and look into and around and under everything, and you will soon find them."

"But that will take so long," said the impatient child.

"Very well," was the quiet reply.

And so, seeing he was to have no help, the boy took the advice, and very soon bounded off to the snowdrift, with his mittens on his busy little hands.

This, methought, is very much the way many read the Bible. They take a chapter, read over the whole of it, "looking at everything in general and nothing in particular," and thus fail to find the nourishment, strength, and joy they are looking after.

This little circumstance was recalled to mind the other day while preparing a Sunday-school lesson. And by the way, if you wish to understand and enjoy the Bible, take a Sunday-school class, and prepare yourself thoroughly for each lesson. "Look into and around and under" each verse. But to return: the text was Gen. ix. 6, 7.

and part of verse 5. We had read it scores (perhaps hundreds) of times before, but now it seemed to embody the whole law and gospel. As we looked "into and under and around it," we thought, why did these men offer sacrifice at all? Was it because they knew they were sinners? But how could a sacrifice mend the matter? Neither Abel's lamb nor Cain's sheaf had done anything wrong. Why should they be punished? Or would God accept such inferior things for substitutes, unless himself had commanded it for wise reasons? Reasons those men well understood, or else God could not have appealed to Cain's knowledge of right and wrong, as He did in the first part of the seventh verse. Cain knew very well wherein he had done wrong; and now what was it? Paul says, "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain." Faith in what? There could have been no faith about it if he had not been previously told of something to believe, nor would Cain have been in fault if he had not known that one thing was not as good as another for an offering. They both knew the truth, that by sin they had forfeited life. God told their father so in Eden—that their own blood must be demanded unless they could provide a substitute; that the life of an innocent animal could not make amends for the sin of a man; and that therefore these sacrifices were but types of a future sacrifice which could in reality be an atonement; that they must be of a kind which would represent their future sacrifice, and be offered as a sign of their faith in it, whatever or whoever it might be. This much of knowledge was absolutely necessary, or there was nothing definite to be believed, no foundation for faith, and no guilt for the want of it. And herein lay the "excellence" of Abel's offering. It gave life for life—it shed innocent blood. Not that his faith made his offering more acceptable, but that the thing which he offered showed his faith in an atonement by blood, which his offering typified. The law being thus fulfilled by taking the life, and yet the sinner saved by an accepted atonement; the whole law and the whole gospel.

So did not Cain. He had no faith in the atonement. He believed in a God, or he would not have offered a sacrifice; but he would not acknowledge that his sins claimed his death. He would bring his own good works, bring his property, be as obedient outwardly as his brother; but away with an atonement for him! And so it is now. Men will do anything and everything to get to heaven, except exercise full faith in the atonement of Christ. Like Cain and Herod they will "do many things gladly," but not the things required.

We might "look into, and around, and under," many more of these texts, and see how full they are—how "much in a little," but for the present we forbear.—*Sunday School World*.

### DELIGHT IN GOD.

The experience of Edwards, whose labors were so greatly blessed in the revival of the churches, has often been made precious to the hearts of believers, as it finds more or less a confirmation in the exercises of their own minds. The following as expressive of his delight in God and divine things, so simply and sweetly given, is deserving of special consideration.

The first instance that I remember of that sort of inward, sweet delight in God and divine things that I have lived much in since, was on reading the words, 1 Tim. i. 17: 'Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory for ever and ever, Amen.' As I read the words, there came into my soul, and as it were, diffused through it, a sense of the glory of the Divine Being; a new sense, quite different from anything I had experienced before. Never any words of Scripture seemed to me as these words did. I thought with myself, how excellent a being that was, and how happy I should be if I might enjoy that God, and be rapt up to him in heaven, and be as it were swallowed up in him forever. I kept saying, and as it were, singing over these words of Scripture to myself; and went to pray to God that I might enjoy him, and prayed in a manner quite different from what I used to do, with a new sort of affection.

From about that time I began to have a new kind of apprehensions and ideas of Christ, and the way of redemption, and the glorious way of salvation by him. An inward, sweet sense of these things at times came into my heart, and my soul was led away in pleasant views and contemplations of them. And my mind was greatly engaged to spend my time in reading and meditating on Christ, on the beauty and excellency of his person, and the lovely way of salvation by his grace to him. I found no books so pleasant as those that treated of these subjects. . . . The sense I had of divine things would often of a sudden kindle up as it were, a sweet burning in my heart, an ardor of soul that I know not how to express.

Not long after I first began to experience these things, I gave an account to my father of some things that had passed in my mind. I was much affected by the discourse we had together, and when the discourse ended, I walked abroad alone, in a solitary place in my father's pasture, for contemplation. And as I was walking there, and looking upon the clouds, there came into my mind as sweet a sense of the majesty and grace of God, that I know not how to express. I seemed to see them both in sweet conjunction, majesty and meekness joined together, it was a sweet, and gentle and holy majesty, and also a majestic meekness; an awful sweetness; a high, and great, and holy gentleness.

After this my sense of divine things gradually increased, and became more lively, and had more inward sweetness. The appearance of everything was altered; there seemed to be, as it were, a calm, sweet cast, or appearance of divine glory, in almost everything. God's excellency, his wisdom, his purity and love, seemed to appear in everything—in the sun, moon, and stars; in the clouds and blue sky; in the grass, flowers, trees; in the water, and all nature—which used greatly to fix my mind.

It is not the privilege of all believers to have a like blessed experience? We believe so, because it is in harmony with the gospel of Christ, which makes no arbitrary distinctions, forms no exclusive classes. God is the father of all the faithful, Christ the Saviour of all true believers; and it is our privilege to realize and enjoy spiritual and heavenly things. It is our duty also, for our hap-

piness and usefulness very much depend upon it. The more we love and honor God, the more he will bless us and our labors.—*Morning Star*.

THE CONFESSOR OF ALLAHABAD.—In the Indian revolt, the sepoy at Allahabad rose upon their officers, and slew them. An ensign, sixteen years of age, was left for dead among the rest; but in the night he escaped to a spot outside the city. Here the water of a stream was his only support of life for four days and nights. Who can tell what were the thoughts and feelings and prayers of this poor youth during these long hours of pain and peril? On the fifth day he was discovered, and dragged into the city to have the little of life left in him destroyed. There he found a native Christian, formerly a Mohammedan, whom the sepoy was trying, by torment to compel to deny Christ. The firmness of the man was ready to give way, when the young ensign bravely cried out, "Oh, my friend, come what may, do not deny the Lord Jesus." Just at this moment the sudden alarm of an attack by the English caused the immediate flight of the murderers. The native Christian's life was spared. He turned to bless the youth whose faith had given strength to his failing heart. But the martyr had sunk under his sufferings—he was dead.

"Whoever shall confess me before men," says our Lord Jesus Christ, "him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. But whoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven." Matt. 10:32, 33.

Few in these days are called to such a trial of their faith. Yet all may deny Christ in their principles and conduct. "Come what may," believe in Christ, in the divinity of his person, his humiliation in our nature, his works of mercy, his teachings of truth, and his crucifixion as the atonement for sin: receive these truths into your heart and show their influence in a holy life; and thus will you confess Christ before men.

THE SAILOR AND HIS PRAYING MOTHER.—A chaplain to seamen, at an American port, was called, in the course of his duty, to visit a sailor who appeared to be near death. He spoke kindly to the man upon the state of his soul, and directed him to cast himself on Jesus Christ, the Saviour of sinners. With an oath, the sick man bade him begone. The chaplain then told him that he must be faithful to him, for if he died impotent his soul would be lost forever. The man was now sullen and silent, and pretended to fall asleep. The visit was repeated more than once, with similar ill-success. A length the chaplain, suspecting that the sailor was a native of North Britain, repeated a verse of the old version of the Psalm still in use in Scotland:

Such pity as a father hath  
Unto his children dear;  
Like pity shows the Lord to such  
As worship him in fear.

Tears started into the sailor's eyes as he listened to these words. The chaplain asked him if he had not had a pious mother. The man broke into tears of grief. Yes, his mother had been pious, but by taught him these words, and had also knelt by his side in prayer to God. Since then he had been a wanderer by sea and land; but the memory of her faith and love moved his heart. The appeals now made to him were blessed by the Spirit of God in bringing this prodigal to Christ with sincere faith, and with true penitence for his sins. His life was spared, and he lived to prove the reality of his conversion.

Mothers, fathers, what recollections will your children have of your example and instructions, when you have been long laid in the grave! Sons and daughters of pious parents, does the case of this sailor awaken the memory of former days? If conscience accuse you, turn to God without delay, and seek forgiveness through Jesus Christ, that you may meet your father and mother in heaven.

THE HOUR OF PRAYER.—The Jews had stated hours both for public and private prayer. It was Daniel's custom to pray "three times a day." (Dan. vi. 10.) and this was also the practice of David (Psalm iv. 17). From hence we learn not only how frequently, but at what times of the day, that duty was commonly performed. It is generally supposed that the "morning," and "evening" prayers were at the time of offering the morning and evening sacrifices, that is, at the third and ninth hour; and the "noon" prayer was at the sixth hour, or twelve o'clock. We find in Scripture no express institution of the stated hours of prayer. The Jews say they received them from the patriarchs: the first hour from Abraham, the second from Isaac, and the third from Jacob.

From the Jews the Mohammedans have borrowed their hours of prayer, enlarging the number of them from three to five, which all Mussulmans are bound to observe. The first is in the morning before sunrise; the second when noon is past, and the sun begins to decline from the meridian; the third, in the afternoon, before sunset; the fourth, in the evening, after sunset, and before the day is shut in; the fifth, after the day is shut in, and before the first watch of the night. To these some of their devotees add two more: the first an hour and a half after the day is shut in, and the other at midnight; but these are looked upon as voluntary services, practiced in imitation of Mohammed's example, but not enjoined by his law.

CHRIST'S TWOFOOLD WORK.—Few truths are more frequently or beautifully taught us in the sacred Scriptures than this double work of Christ in our behalf. In the old Levitical economy—which was "a shadow of good things to come"—there were two kinds of offerings which were always to go together. The first, or burnt-offering, was a bloody sacrifice, and a holocaust; the second, or meat offering, a bloodless oblation, and only partly consumed by fire. One was propitiatory, the other eucharistic. In the one we beheld penitence laying its hand on the head of the innocent sufferer, and praying to be spared for that sufferer's sake; in the other, gratitude making its return for the unspeakable gift, by the dedication to God of the offerer's person or property.

The burnt-offering was a kind of fact picture of that divine sacrifice by which alone sin could be pardoned; the meat offering a beautiful symbol of the forgiven sinners willing and cheerful presentation of himself to God's service.—*Darling's Closer Walk*.

Warn your meeting houses. You will lose in pew rents what you save in the coal bill, to say nothing of the impossibility of having a glowing soul in a shivering body.