

## TERMS AND NOTICES.

The *Religious Intelligencer* is published weekly, at the Office of Messrs. BARNES & CO., St. John, N. B.

TERMS—\$2.00 per annum.

PAYMENT IN ALL CASES BY ADVANCE.

JOSEPH McLEOD, Editor.

Rev. G. A. HASTLEY, EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTOR, over the letter.

All communications for insertion, should be addressed, JOSEPH McLEOD, Fredericton.

Remittances may be sent to either Messrs. BARNES & CO., St. John, N. B., or to the Editor, at Fredericton.

## Religious Intelligencer.

SAINT JOHN, N. B., DECEMBER 27, 1867.

## THE CLOSING YEAR.

Another year is drawing to a close; and even before all our readers shall have received this number of the *Intelligencer*, the clock of 1867 will have struck its last hour. The seasons, the months, the weeks, the days, the hours and the moments composing this year will have passed, and another chapter in the life history of all the living will have been complete. While everything in our circumstances are well calculated to cause reflection, what season more fitting for the deepest meditation than the close of the year? It is a time when we should make some special acknowledgment of God, returning to the past, dwelling upon the present, and anticipating the future. The year just closing has been, in no inconsiderable degree, an eventful one. Changes, religious and political, have taken place; much good has been accomplished, and not a little evil.

We would not, however, write a homily upon the year just expiring. We would simply endeavor to provoke reflection, believing that no other period is so well calculated to lead us to recall the past, and review our course. Associated with the last days of the year, there is always a feeling of sadness, not, however, unmingled with pleasure. Though no year brings uninterrupted pleasure, and some very little, its close seems like parting with an old friend—bidding adieu to something which has made itself familiar and beloved by associations if not by the happiness we anticipated enjoying, and which we have been disappointed in receiving. As we now linger on the threshold of 1868, and as its last hours recede from us, we feel that it is the closing of a period rendered hallowed and sacred by its joys and sorrows, and it is with a melancholy reluctance that we bid it farewell.

The history of a year, could it all be written, would be a remarkable history. Tens of thousands of events are recorded and transmitted to future generations; but it is only the briefest epitome of the whole that the human pen can record.

Each succeeding year brings some changes to all. Some are for the better, and some are otherwise. Amid all the changes which take place, one fact, perhaps more evident than any other, is that death finds his spoil every year. Stopping not in his course, he seizes the aged, the infirm, the young, the healthy, the vigorous, and the gay. It is his delight to reveal where beauty and affection dwell, to enter the houses of happiness and love and snatch away with relentless hand the dearest object of the family circle. How numerous are the relations of mankind! They are dear, dear and tender; but the sweetest ties of kindred, the weightiest responsibilities, and the most extensive usefulness are unbudded; they must all be severed. The year just closing has not been unlike its predecessors. Many young and light hearts that launched out with high hopes on the tide of this year have been stilled in death. Many prospects bright for the future have been blasted by the chilly winds of the by-gone year, and the wreck of expectation is all that remains of the brightest earthly hopes. How many houses have been made sad, and how many hearts have been made to bleed at the loss of loved ones. Every year does its work, and carries away its many victims; and sad have been the bereavements of many households to which we pay our weekly visits. The bereavement of the *Intelligencer* has not been the least severe that has marked the course of 1867. The pen that chronicled in these columns the close of the last year, and the advent of the present, is now held by another hand. Death has been here too! He has done his work! But while his ravages in the houses of many of our readers have caused a wall of sorrow to break forth from bleeding hearts, how pleasing, how blessed is the reflection when friends die, and loved ones are forced away to meet their God, that they have loved Him in life. This can sweeten the cup of sorrow—can dry up the fountain of bitterness, and pour consolation into the deeply wounded heart.

But what of the living? How grateful we should be that we live! and yet we should remember that the golden sands of human life have run out another solar season, and we are as much nearer that existence, the duration of which is not measured by time. Many have not only been spared, but have had many blessings. What account can you give of the improvement of your privileges? How much have you done in the Master's service? Have you alleviated any suffering—have you gladdened crushed hearts? Have you been faithful to the charge committed to you? How many have been sufficiently Christ-like to have been continually doing good?

Among our readers are those over whose conversion angels have not yet rejoiced. Still coldly indifferent, they stand all unconcerned of their danger. Reader, are you one of this class? Are you at the close of this another year, still out of Christ? Be persuaded of the importance of an immediate interest in the Saviour. Another year may be your last; indeed another month—a week—even another day may be your last on earth. Come to Christ now, and give the heavenly host cause to rejoice that another soul is saved from death.

But we must bid adieu to 1867. Well, we shall never forget it. We have had joys the world knows not—we have had crushing sorrow too. And now, farewell, time past—we shall not soon forget thy trials, nor thine unmeasured joys. We launch out in the tide of 1868. The future is now before us. How long? That is only known to God. But the present is here, and the future will soon be consumed, and the past added to by the present moments. The present only is ours. This, dear reader, is all we have! Shall we not improve it? Are we Christians?—let us diffuse our Christianity wherever we go—let us strive to accomplish the great purpose of life, in making the world happier and better. Can it be that any can bear the Christian name, and not labor for Christ? Away with the thought! Is that Christianity that refuses to aid the wretched—that in this world of more than ten hundred millions of human beings, can find nothing to do? Surely not! As well might we expect a day without light, or a heaven without joy, as a heart in which is the element of true religion, without seeking some object upon which to expend its benevolence. Then, Christians, during the year we are about commencing, let us seek deeper sympathy with Christ, and labor more earnestly in his cause. To you who are yet in your sins, we say, rest not—another year may write over your heads cherished earthly joys—“Gone”; and O! to go with no ray of Christian light to illumine the dark path of the future, will be dreadful indeed!

For ourselves, we wish to live and labor another year for God! We feel our work is not done, (we now not how soon it will be) and we only pray that

the Holy Spirit may strengthen and guide us in our labour, so that when the hour of our departure comes, we shall have nothing to do

“But gather up our feet  
And die, our Father's God to meet.”

## Week of Prayer.

We transfer to our columns from the *Visitor* the following concerning the week of prayer:

The Evangelical Alliance again calls upon the people of God of every name, and in all parts of the world, to remember the week of prayer. The circular sent out by the Alliance reads thus:—

“Our gracious God sends an attentive ear to the supplications of His people. The records of individual, family, and church life abundantly prove that believing prayer is followed by results that call forth gratitude and praise, and encourage renewed requests at the Throne of Grace.

In every land, and in most of the leading cities, the annual invitation of the Evangelical Alliance to observe the week of prayer at the commencement of the year has been largely and increasingly responded to. Multitudes have united with one accord to implore, in the name and relying on the merits and mediation of our Divine Lord, that the New Year may be crowned with the goodness of God, and special blessings conferred both upon the church and the world.

The Evangelical Alliance, by its British and foreign organizations, renew their invitation for the opening of the year 1868. In doing so, they express their profound conviction that passing events are more than ever furnishing motives for a closer union among the followers of Christ, and for the offering of faithful, importunate prayer for things pertaining to the spirituality and spread of the Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ.

“The Christians of every land and language:—In the prospect of the weighty interests and great responsibilities of the new year, let us again draw near to the Heavenly Throne, that common centre for universal prayer, and prove the Lord of Hosts according to His own word, wherein it is written:—“See if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it.”

We are glad to know that the Sabbath School Union has again taken this matter in charge. They called a meeting of the city pastors at the committee room of the Leicester street Baptist Church on Monday evening last, and after a free interchange of thought on the subject, a committee was appointed—consisting of Rev. Mr. Hill, and Messrs. Moran and Musters—to obtain a suitable place in which to observe the week of prayer, in accordance with the suggestion of the Alliance as given above. The Lord grant great success to this movement.

The following programme has been issued by the “Evangelical Alliance:

Sunday, January 5.—*Sermons*. Subject: The Person, Work, and Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. Monday, January 6.—*Thanksgiving* for special and general mercies during the past year to Nations, Churches and Families; and Confession of Sin. Tuesday, January 7.—*Prayer for Nations*: for Kings and all in authority; for the observance of the Lord's Day; for the removal of obstacles in the way of Moral and Religious Progress; and for Internal and International Peace.

Wednesday, January 8.—*Prayer for Families*: for Schools, Colleges and Universities; and for Sons and Daughters in Foreign Countries.

Thursday, January 9.—*Prayer for Christian Ministers*, and all engaged in Christ's Service; for God's ancient Israel, and for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Friday, January 10.—*Prayer for the sick and afflicted*: for Widows and Orphans; and for the Persecuted for Righteousness' sake.

Saturday, January 11.—*Prayer for the Christian Church*: for increase of holiness and activity, fidelity and love; and for grace equal to the duties and dangers of the times.

Sunday, January 12.—*Sermons*. Subject: Christian Charity.—1 Cor. 13.

## CULTIVATE THE FIELD.

Cherries are like farms. To be productive they must be worked well. A farmer who spends his time idling never has good crops, is always poor, in debt, perplexed, discouraged. The pastor who is idle, or follows secular business during the week, will have little prosperity and a poor salary. Many churches are slow to do their duty in supporting pastors. Some are stingy, mean, cruel, in this respect. And quite as many pastors fail in their duty to the churches. They do not study, visit, watch for the interests of the churches as for their own families, nor give their whole souls to them. They often say, “We would do it if the churches would pay.” But the farmer demand a harvest before he plows and sows? Must he not first dig, enrich, cultivate? So must the pastor. Is the church run down, lifeless, covetous, neglectful? Treat it as the good farmer treats exhausted land. Bestow fertility and the crop will come.

Many of our ministers are abandoning the field because they cannot get a support, and churches are running down because they have no pastors. This is distressing. Is there no remedy? Revivals will cure. But how can we secure revivals? By consecrated labor. If the ministers who are secularized would renew their consecration, get filled with the Spirit and go to work, they would soon make fields that would support them. And many who are now preaching most speedily do the same thing, or they will be forced into secular life. Churches divide on their hands, salaries grow less and less; they move from place to place for relief; the end will soon come, churches abandoned, and ministers digging. Oh, when will this thing cease?

What class of ministers are best paid? The most talented? No. The most consecrated. What class build up the churches? The most consecrated. Very few fail from lack of talent. Faith, industry, and spirituality decide the case. The lack of these makes churches decline, leaves the young unconvinced, decreases salaries, starves ministers and drives them from the field.

The fault is not all with ministers. They are often driven to desperation. They suffer untold agonies over the condition of things, and see no way of escape. They have fallen into a rut and cannot get out. The wolf is at the door, children cry for bread, what can they do? We would not wound but help such men. They need and deserve sympathy. But we know of only one sure remedy; faith, consecration, more earnest effort to save souls. Just as sure as they relax spiritual labor for secular they will lose in salary more than they will make in traffic or toil. Has it not been tried? Does not experience prove that those who do most for the churches generally receive most? Is it not safe to fling ourselves out upon Christ and His people? If we are kept poor, if we have hard work, and hard fare, is it not better than to abandon the cause to which the Lord has called us? We were not called to the ministry to get rich, to fare sumptuously, to enjoy ease, leisure nor luxury. Poverty may be necessary to our usefulness, can we endure it for Christ's sake? We preach sacrifice for the good of souls, let us practice it. What if we could get rich in other employments, is wealth the chief goal of life? Was Paul wise in counting all things lost for Christ?

Now is the time for ministers to work. The harvest is plenteous. Who will hesitate to sacrifice that they may give their undivided strength to gather in the sheaves? If we desire prosperous churches, we must strive to make them such. God has called ministers for leaders and teachers. They should go before the people and call them to duty. If they do it, the reward is sure. Those who go forth weeping, bearing precious seed, shall doubtless return again, bringing their sheaves with them.—*Morning Star*.

The examination of the City Grammar School came off on Thursday last, and gave excellent satisfaction.

For the Religious Intelligencer.

## VIOLATED LAW.

A Reminiscence—A Fireside Talk—Thoughts Outflowing therefrom.

Some poet says, “Night is the time to sleep, to rest when labour is o'er”; and it may be that he was one of those who lead regular lives: whose life is ruled like a school-boy's copy book, from top to bottom, in lines straight and equidistant, whose morning witnessed the commencement of the day's parallel duties, and whose evening not only called for the requisite retirement and rest from busy care, but which call was responded to. Poets write many things which run as parallel with their lives, as the calm, sweet poetry of summer evening, by the side of a lovely Scotch loch does to the wild glee of a Highland storm upon the mountains; as parallel as Burns' Cotter's Saturday night, with its splendid home scene of cotter, family, and Bible, and his erratic midnight revels genuine and true. This sentiment is true enough, however, taken as we find it.

The Sabbath day was doubtless intended for respite from labour to man and beast, as the darkness of a portion of every twenty-four hours of our present existence was intended for bodily rest; but it seems as if society was so constituted in this era, whether as the result of violation of natural laws in our forefathers, or ourselves, or both, that a portion of the time allotted for every man's rest is fractured by imperative calls of suffering, which disturb the equipoise and equilibrium of the party called upon; as the London cabman's Sabbath is as much a nonentity as he is, as far as his higher nature is concerned.

Violation of law brings in its train violation of law, and hence he who requires his sleep as much as the weary Great Physician required it, when he made the hammock of a Galilean fishing smack his couch, is often called from a sound somnolence to listen to the great cry of human woe.

The question might be asked, what connection the poor Sabbath-bereft cabman of the world's metropolis has to do with the sleep-bereft physician of John Wesley's parish? In both instances there is violation of law. All the aggregate of evils which burden the world to-day are the direct or indirect result of violated law. Did this man sin or his parents, was the question propounded long ago, which has been and is being answered now. A midnight drive on the St. John river in mid-winter, hastening to answer the call of duty, Macedonia in its rating and urgency for physical relief, occasions this review, and is further deepened by an upward glance upon the principle of the power of contrast and compassion. This upward glance reveals a great deal, not only to the body's eye, but as well to the mind's eye. I do not wonder at some preachers loving to direct the minds of their hearers from the proxy details of a subsidiary state to the silent world of the planets in their course, anticipating their own ascent above the stars to the unseen, yet real heaven, which faith reveals. I do not wonder some astronomers have made such a statement as this: “Were we to take a stand upon the surface of Sirius with the most powerful telescope ever made, and raise a telescopic vision to the heavens as seen from that basis, worlds upon worlds would be revealed of which we know naught, and the mind itself unlimited in its grasp, should fail of discovering an iota of the myriads of the heavenly hosts far, far beyond even the reach of the supposition,” from sheer lack of basis. I have the thought, I think, if not the words; and as I shiver in the buffaloes, on earthly transit, I dwell amid the immensity of my God's creation, and wonder and adore and worship.

This reverie is interrupted as the bells cease their jingling at the door of suffering, and into the immediate presence of a groaning, moaning, sighing misery that falls upon the ear of sympathy like a dark pall, are we ushered. Violated law calls the physician to the bedside. Ignorance or willfulness is the parent of suffering. Anodynes are used, and the still comfort which is made still by the contrast with previous unrest, is found for the seeker. Another room, by a good fire, finds a talkative backwoodsman detailing an incident striking in its manifestations of the direct infliction of the Divine penalty upon a breaker of another species of violated law, which is embodied in the code written on the stone tablets.

It may not be uninteresting, and will certainly lead any who read, to think of the depth of meaning there is in every expression of revelation.

A party of lumbermen had collected in the woods of Maine, during the winter of 19—, under the direction of a man who had been extensively engaged in lumbering operations for several years, employing many men and teams. The choppers surrounded a large pine tree, intending to cut it down, when they discovered away up into its bushy top a large branch of another tree, which had become lodged therein, a circumstance acknowledged by all experienced woodmen, to be fraught with danger. The chopping commenced, however, but was discontinued at this time, for fear of the result, and the old pine was left in this state, partially cut through, during the remaining part of that winter and the following summer. It stood, holding in its grasp, the branch. No wind was high enough or strong enough to wreathe it; and it remained, as the sequel proved, to administer justice to a violator of law. It chanced that one of the party of the preceding year, who had surrounded the old pine, a man notorious for his profligacy,—whose blasphemy was shocking even to the profane men, who, in a general way, received every thing with inspiration in the lumber woods (unless it is satanic inspiration) even these men were appalled to hear the name of the Redeemer of mankind so foully mouthed. Another time a party gathered around the tree, and stood looking up.

Imagine an awful pause, ere this daring wretch, whose feet rest upon the brink of an eternity of misery, before he opens his lips once more, and for the last time, to use the organs of speech his Creator had given him—think, dear reader, and well you may, that you feel the solemnity of the last judgment resting upon you, as you in thought look at the result—taking an awful oath, and looking upward one toward the tree top and God's blue heavens, he swore he would cut it down if it struck him dead upon the spot. The words were spoken, and now the tree unclasps its hand, and at the bidding of that God who is at the last a consuming fire, down it fell, and a lost soul was ushered into hopeless, enduring horror.

Dr. Holland says: “A lost life! What is it?—Theologians stickle about words in describing the future of the vicious; but if any theologian can tell me how a man can live the life of a wicked sinner, subjecting his soul, with all its pure aspirations and inspirations, to the service of lust, and throw away his life upon this miserable perversion, and be able to look back upon it from the other side of the dark river with any thing but remorse, he will explain to me the strangest anomaly of the moral universe.”

Reader, fear to profane the name of God. Sir Matthew Hale gave the following rules, among many others, for his son's conduct:—Avoid swearing, profanity, oaths, blasphemy, imprecations; such phrases as, “My stars!” “The deuce!” “By Jesus!” “God heavens!” &c. No one of wisdom will believe you the sooner for any thing of this kind. The violator of law is punished here and hereafter.

News.—Rev. Thomas Vanwart purposes (n.v.) using at Newtown on Sabbath, the 29th inst. He will probably remain a short time. A good interest was awakened in this place during Bro. Babcock's recent visit; and we trust much good may result from Bro. V.'s labours as well.

## THE FIBLE IN THE NAVY.

During the late war with Russia, an officer procured a supply of Bibles, and distributed half a dozen with some hymn books, &c., to each mess on the lower deck of a ship of the line. A few Sundays afterwards, the inspecting officers found the messes looking as usual scrupulously tidy, but on the end of each mess-table was a well pipe-clayed canvas bag, stuffed up with the numbers of rolled up daily printed upon it. On inquiry, it appeared that the seamen, anxious for the creditable appearance of their messes and solicitous for the good keeping of the Bibles, thought the best way of securing both objects was to sew them carefully up in a bundle as described.

This incident is a very fair representation of the religious condition of the Royal Navy until within a very recent period. Bibles were always supplied to each ship of war, but they were not, as a rule, taken out of the box in which they were conveyed on board, lest they should be lost or receive injury on the lower deck, and they were accordingly returned to store, at the end of three or four years, in the same condition as when they were supplied. The idea of seamen reading Bibles openly at their mess-tables was never contemplated, and no religion was heard of on the lower decks only as an object of scoffing and derision. True, God always had his hidden ones “who bowed not knee to Baal,” but these were so timid that they feared to avow themselves on the Lord's side. The devil's agents were active, and the work of the devil was evident, but the Lord's servants were cowed, and “the Word of God was not manifested” on the lower deck, to destroy these evil deeds.

Within the last seven years, a change has commenced, and now the Bibles are not only issued to the messes but they are sought by the seamen and read openly on that lower deck where it was heretofore declared that “religion was out of place.”—*English Paper*.

## INEBRIETY.

Dr. Day, the superintendent of the Binghampton, N. Y., Inebriate Asylum, in a published letter, says that he has treated two thousand five hundred cases of inebriety during the past ten years, and that when he began to practice he found the inebriate liquor could not with safety be entirely withdrawn from the habitual drinker. He soon found this a great error, and abandoned it *in toto*. He says: “Since I have been connected with the institution (about five months) I do not think I have given one drop of alcohol in any shape to a patient. I do not keep it here, because it is seldom if ever needed, and more than this I consider it dangerous to continue its use in these cases even in small doses. Permit me to state one fact. A man may habitually drink his quart or more of liquor daily, as he does, and when he is confined to a man in a separate place, and put him upon abstinence of one half his usual quantity, and he will suffer more than he will to cut him off entirely. I have tried this in a large number of cases, and have satisfied myself from actual observation. Of course, the man is in all our reformatory and correctional institutions, as well as in private practice. They are usually found in a deplorable condition when medical aid is sought. They should be treated in the most skillful manner and faithfully nursed. Their blood is poisoned, which, no doubt, is the cause of the almost fatal and dangerous symptoms we find in the debauched drunkard.”

The symptoms in the advanced stages of such cases are not unlike those of narcotic poisoning from opium, conium, cannabis, indica, and other such poisonous drugs. They do not need the same drug to cure when poisonous drugs have been taken, even though administered in infinitesimal doses. But it is not my intention to discuss this question here. I can only state briefly and hastily the result of my observation on this simple point of “tapering off” the drunkard, we hear so much about these days. Abstinence will cure the inebriate; nothing short of it will keep him cured after he is raised up from a life of inebriety and degradation.

## ABYSSINIA.

The following from a contemporary will give our readers some idea of the country with which the British Government is at war:

“First let us see what sort of a country it is with which we are at war. Abyssinia is in East Africa, bordering on the Red Sea, and the Straits of Bab-el-Mandeb. Near the coast is a belt of barren, unhealthy flat land; but the interior rises into splendid mountain ranges, fertile and salubrious, and of table land. Some of the mountains are 5,000 feet high, while the table lands on which most of the people live are from 7,000 to 10,000 feet in elevation. It is from these hills and highlands that the Blue Nile rushes down with its fertilizing floods to refresh Egypt. Abyssinia is about 600 miles long by 500 broad.

The people are Asiatic, and bear close resemblance to the Arabs. The negro negroes in the country are slaves. The Abyssinians embraced Christianity in the fourth century, and they are remarkable as the only African nation that was able to resist the triumphant march of Mohammedanism. The history of the Empire is full of remarkable vicissitudes. In the tenth century a Jewish prince overthrew the reigning dynasty. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries the Portuguese entered into close relationship, political and religious with Abyssinia, and the latter is amazingly fertile, and yields at least two crops annually. The cities are small, none numbering more than 10,000. The trade of the country is in its infancy. No doubt the present war will do much toward its development. Slavery and the slave trade exist in all their horrible atrocity.

We have said that Christianity was introduced into Abyssinia in the fourth century. It was the *Ethiopia* of which we read in the Acts of the Apostles (viii. 27). Egypt had long held the country in subjection, and shortly before the birth of our Saviour a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of Candace, ruled the country and successfully resisted the Roman arms. Josephus tells us that Moses made war against the “Ethiopia”—the very same people against whom General Napier is now leading his army. If the British slave trade were to be a native dynasty of women, holding the official title of