

Correspondence.

Editorial Correspondence.

St. John, Sept. 15th, 1853.

DEAR BRETHREN AND FRIENDS.—An Education commenced in a public School, and prosecuted in a literary establishment, of a higher order, the writer frankly confesses, left him with acquisitions in knowledge as limited as his notions of imparting them to others were vague and indistinct.

Sensible of the disadvantages under which he had labored, in his own case; and of his consequent deficiencies, he has spared neither pains nor expense in the pursuit of a more efficient mode of tuition. With this object continually in view, he has attentively read, whatever he could meet with, written on the subject of education; he has made himself intimately acquainted with the practice of the great *Academic institutions of the old country*; and he has obtained some knowledge of the principles on which those of others on the continent and in the States also are conducted.

To these pretensions he is now enabled to add the results of more than 20 years' experience in the tuition of youth; in the course of which time, he feels no hesitation to acknowledge, that he has been led to abandon most of the methods with which he first entered on the duties of his important profession; and to substitute such as appeared to him more rational and efficient.—*With what labour his object has been sought, can be felt only by himself; with what success, must be appreciated by others.*

The conduct of mankind is not under the influence of the understanding alone; it receives a variety of other impulses. Many impressions, formed on established prejudices and rooted habits, possess an influence equally strong, and far more extensively diffused. There is no law in nature so powerful as the law of *habit*. Hence the principles which youth has imbibed, and years have strengthened, frequently acquire such an ascendancy in the mind as no subsequent efforts of reason can subdue.

Education, in the comprehensive import of the term, is that series of means, which tends to promote the improvement of the *body*, of the *mind*, and of the *heart*. In reference to the first, it is *PHYSICAL*—to the second, *INTELLECTUAL*—and to the last, *MORAL* and *RELIGIOUS*.

Contemplated as a power which impels towards intellectual and moral excellence, education is intimately connected with the best interests of the world. Its influence pervades the whole period of life: it is the *basis* of all social order in the intercourse of mankind; and it embraces the *future*, as well as the *present* state of being. It is not, therefore, too much to say, that "*on the instruction of youth depends the fate of nations.*" But the work of education includes the cultivation of the *heart*, as well as of the *mind*. Whatever height may be attained in the scale of intellectual excellence, it is the *moral* and *religious* culture of mankind that is to be kept constantly in view, as the great end of every institution formed for the diffusion of knowledge.

Perfection in the art of tuition may be defined, *the power of communicating the greatest possible sum of information, in the least possible space of time.* This can only be done where there is much *oral* instruction given. To perfect knowledge in an agreeable and intelligible manner, the Tutor's communications should be in language, assimilated as nearly as possible to colloquial intercourse. The utility of every attachment must be made immediately apparent; and all rules and definitions must be taught at the precise moment they become necessary. To find these difficulties explained on the emergency, and thus to be enabled to perceive clearly their own progress, cannot fail to afford great pleasure to the youthful students. If the first principles of science can be communicated in an agreeable manner, much of the difficulty of subsequent instruction will be avoided. A great part of the success of early tuition depends on taking the happy moment when knowledge appears to interest the mind. It is an erroneous notion, that early instruction should be directed *wholly*, or *chiefly*, to the *memory*. The bare retention of facts, without the power to recall them on the emergency, can be of little service. It appears highly desirable, therefore, that the *recollective* faculties should be chiefly exercised.

Exercising, animation, habits of activity, and

the foundation of a healthy constitution, should be objects of particular attention. Too early and too close an application to learning, is undoubtedly injurious to the pupil. It destroys the finest emotions of love, pity and gratitude, of which our natures are susceptible; it blunts the natural keenness of the mental powers; and it renders that *hateful*, which is highly desirable should be *loving*. It should be the great object of the Teacher to blend *amusement* with *instruction*.

"To make amusement and instruction friends, Some lessons in the guise of play she sends."

It should be the constant aim to connect *habit* and *principle*. In fine—the great objects of early instruction then are—to regulate the disposition; to stimulate, and direct the desire of knowledge; to give a correct bias to the moral feelings; to form virtuous habits; and to instil religious (*not sectarian*) principles into the mind. Under such management, we may indulge a hope that the seeds of future excellence will take root in the understanding and the heart, and yield a rich harvest of knowledge and virtue—to the benefits of mankind, and the glory of God.

The writer begs to say that this is an outline of what will be attempted in his daughter's school, in this city. The pupils will be select and only two classes of day pupils will be taken, consisting of twelve in each. A few boarders also will be received. No pains will be spared to give the best possible substitute for the loss of home attentions and home affections. The pupils will associate with the family on terms the most intimate and social, and the efforts of all will be entirely devoted to the preparation of Young Ladies for a prominent position in cultivated, intelligent social life. Should we be needed in the city, we shall be employed—should we not, we shall leave for the States or Canada, in both which places we are offered employment. Please see Advertisement in another part of the paper, as neither class is filled up.

With much respect and affection,

I am, yours faithfully,
R. THOMSON, A. M.

[FOR THE CHRISTIAN VISITOR.]

St. John, Sept. 6th, 1853.

MESSRS. EDITORS.—Will you at your convenience give us your opinion in the *Visitor*, of Slavery—and oblige yours,

A CONSTANT READER.

REPLY TO "A CONSTANT READER."

This subject has been handled so often and so lucidly, that we shall say but little, and that so far as we can in the Words of Holy Writ. Only observing that in the true sense of the word "He is a *freeman* whom the TRUTH makes free, and all are *slaves* besides."

SLAVERY is among the multitudes of proofs that it is not in man to love his neighbour as himself: for there is nothing perhaps that the human mind so *naturally* revolts against as servitude. Man was originally given dominion over *every living thing*, but not over his *FELLOW*. After the fall, the husband was to rule over his wife—Gen. iii. 16—and the elder over the younger—Gen. iv. 7. The intention of this kind of rule was *blessing*, the stronger being more fitted to rule the weaker. But in the first mention of *slavery*, we find it to be the *consequence* of a *curse* on account of sin—Gen. ix. 25. Canaan had sinned, and was to be the servant, or slave of his brethren. Israel, as the peculiar people of God, the holy nation, were permitted to buy bondmen and bondmaids of the heathen. And whilst they walked faithfully as God's people, their *service* was a privilege and not a hardship; and their *slaves* were brought into circumstances of *peculiar blessing*. The permission, therefore, given to Israel, to buy slaves of the heathen, can no more be taken as a general authority for man to *enslave his fellow*, than the wars of Israel, as God's righteous executioners, can be taken as an argument for the lawfulness of war.

It is to be remembered that when the Epistles in the New Testament were written, all *servants* were *slaves*—their master's property, and not free to serve them only so long as they pleased. But this, which to the natural mind appears so great an evil, and which was considered among the ROMANS such a disgrace, that the first object of the *slave* was to get *free*—this state of bondage might become a matter of indifference to one who was called in the Lord. The *Christian slave* was exhorted not to care for his earthly calling, but

rather to use it to the glory of God, considering his *heavenly calling* as the Lord's *FREE-MAN*. He was also to be subject to his master (Greek *despot*) with all fear, whether he were good or gentle, or the reverse. See I Peter ii. 18. The SPIRIT of God never leads those in whom he dwells to assert that *right* to freedom, or any other blessing, which the natural spirit so strongly maintains; he rather leads them to abide in their place.

It is very needful to remember this in the present day, when so much is said about "the rights of man," &c. &c. Let us add, that the *bondman* and the *free* are *all one* in CHRIST JESUS: therefore Paul could say to Philemon, when he asked him to receive back his former slave, Onesimus, "not now as a servant, but above a servant, a beloved brother." See Philemon i. 16. And yet in the wisdom of the SPIRIT, lest there should be any mistake with regard to this new relationship between the believing MASTER and *slave*, the Apostle again writes—"And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort."—I Tim. vi. 2.

With respect to the *abuses* of slavery my heart sickens, and I dare not trust my pen to write on them. Any one wishing to have his feelings harrowed up can read "Uncle Tom's Cabin."

R. T.

[FOR THE CHRISTIAN VISITOR.]

In looking over your paper of the 12th inst. I noticed a communication by the Rev. Mr. Casewell, on conversation at a tea-table, and being interested in the party, I take the liberty of asking a few more questions through your valuable paper.

The question was, "did not the children under the Jewish Church enjoy more privileges, than children under the Christian, if they are now excluded from Baptism?" The Rev. Mr. C. took a very easy way to get over the question by saying, "what was the design of Circumcision. Did it give to any of the males who received it any other advantage than the indelible proof that they were the descendants of Abraham, and by consequence an integral and genuine part of the Jewish nation?"

According to this way of explaining the scripture, all the promise that Abraham had, for him and his seed was, that they would be called Jews, a mere shadow without a substance, Mr. Casewell says again "did the absence of it cut off the Females from any moral or religious advantage?" We say, when there was no command given to circumcise females, there was nothing to lose on that ground. But by depriving the males of that rite what would the consequence be. We refer to Genesis xvii. 14. And the uncircumcised man child, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant. Now we see, by the neglect of this duty, how very small it may seem, it cut off the males from the Jewish nation or Church. I would now ask Mr. C., when the males are all cut off by the neglect of that duty, which undoubtedly they they would have been; where would he find the females? We may then ask, what had we lost? One of the greatest nations under Heaven, nay, more, we would have lost the oracles of God? See Romans iii. 1, 2. By obedience to that command the covenant was sealed, and the promise was to Abraham and his seed; therefore, we must allow, that females were included in the promise.

Mr. C. says again, that it was an emblem of the change of heart. We allow, that circumcision of the heart is always necessary for a true Israelite. He then enquires, what relation is there then between this rite, and the mere human one of Infant Sprinkling? We did not say it had, we only asked what church privileges children of believers now had, if they were excluded from Baptism.

The Jewish Children enjoyed all, or most all the privileges of the adults; they became members when they were eight days old, they were admitted to eat of the passover; and when the covenant was renewed by Moses, their wives and their little ones were included in the covenant. Now this question is, what privilege do children enjoy in Mr. C.'s church? He again, says—"Show us the passage in God's word that tells us so, &c." We ask him to show us a direct passage in God's word for women to come to the Lord's table,

for the change of the Sabbath and for family worship? By this way of getting over the scriptures our privileges are small. He goes on and says, "does it cut them off from the duty to bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, &c." We say that this is a parental privilege belonging to every Christian family, whether connected with a Church or not. He goes on, "would all the sprinkling in the world, even were they administered by his grace, the Archbishop of Canterbury himself, avail to salvation, &c." We would ask him if Baptism was administered even to adults by himself in the river St. John would it avail apart from the inward renewing grace of the Holy Spirit, which is imparted in regeneration? "As for annihilation of infancy I never heard it advanced by any Christian Church." On the last of the subject he is like a driving rain, or sweeping hail, on which I will make no comment. But as the *Visitor* has found its way into many a Presbyterian's fire-side, I think that Mr. C. ought to have weighed the subject carefully and prayerfully, before he put it to the press, lest he should hurt its influence, and stop its progress, and wound the feelings of many a well disposed Presbyterian. I esteem Mr. Casewell highly for his works sake—I thank him kindly for his visit to the back settlement, and should we differ a little about the *outward* forms of church government, I think we shall agree on the great point—the necessity of the inward renewing of the Holy Spirit, and a personal interest in the all atoning Blood of Christ.

ALEX. MOODY.

Prince William, Aug. 30, 1853.

☞ We are sorry that any occasion was given for these remarks, and we will not trifle with God's word to enquire if women have a right to go to the *Lord's table*, &c. We know the love that Christ bore to holy women, and how faithfully they served him. We rejoice moreover to know what is written. See Gal. iii. 26-28. We assert, however, that BAPTISM DID NOT COME IN THE PLACE OF CIRCUMCISION.

MALES only were the subjects of circumcision. All females were excluded. We argue that there were no spiritual blessings in circumcision, or else females had not been excluded. The God of Abraham never would, by a covenant seal, exclude them from spiritual blessings—from anything tending to their sanctification and salvation. Baptism certainly has not come in the room of circumcision in this particular.

Infant males were to be circumcised the eighth day. Do they baptize infants on the eighth day?

Infants were circumcised by either parent, as the case might be. You remember the case of Zipporah. Why, then, employ ministers to baptize, if these are both seals of the same spiritual church covenant, and if the churches, Jewish and Christian, be identical?

Abraham's servants were circumcised. Three hundred and eighteen warriors belonged at one time to his household. Why do not the *Pedo-Baptists* baptize all a man's servants, when he joins the church, on the principle of *identity*?

Circumcision was not the door into any church or religious institution. It was no initiatory rite of any moral institution. The Ishmaelites, and Edomites, and many other nations descended from Keturah, were circumcised. Into what church did they enter? The Jews were members of the politico-ecclesiastical church by natural birth. Circumcision was no initiatory rite or door to them. *But none can enter Christ's church unless born again—born from above.* How, then, are the two cases identical?

Circumcision was not a dedicatory rite. *Pedo-Baptists* talk much and often about dedicating their infant offspring to the Lord.—Now, under the law, females were never dedicated, and of males none but the *first-born*. *Pedo-baptist* dedication is only formal and nominal. Among the Jews it was a real *bona fide* dedication. Jesus Christ being the first-born, was dedicated; he was also circumcised and baptized—circumcised the eighth day at home, dedicated the fortieth day in the temple, and baptized when thirty years old in the Jordan. Are the cases identical here?

Circumcision, requiring no moral qualification, communicated no spiritual blessings. Ishmael, Esau, and all the servants of the Jewish nation, were circumcised on the faith of their Master.