

THE CHRISTIAN VISITOR,

AND NEW BRUNSWICK BAPTIST.

SAINT JOHN, NEW BRUNSWICK, NOVEMBER 27, 1862.

DR. LEGGE ON THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT AND THE TAEPINGS.

No man, in the present day, can speak with more authority on Chinese matters than Dr. Legge. In a recent communication to the Secretary of the London Missionary Society, he thus expresses his opinion of the position of the British Government towards the Insurgents:—

"What *casus belli* have they given us? Possibly there may be a sufficient one stated in some despatch that the Government at home received, and which has been laid before Parliament. Mr. Bruce had some communication with them, and subsequently Admiral Hope paid a visit to them at Nanking. But it is possible, also, that our present difficulties have arisen as much from the unreasonableness of our own countrymen as from that of the insurgents. The kings are "Coolies," it is true, or rather they were Coolies; intercourse with them is different from intercourse with the barbaric pomp and tawdry shams of the Imperial Court. They profess many absurd and fanatical dogmas; their views as to theology are miserably degrading on those subjects which to us are most high and sacred. Their warfare against the Imperialists leads to indescribable misery among the people. All these things are true; but I fail to discover in them anything like a *casus belli*, as regards ourselves. Had the rebels outraged British property, and then refused to give satisfaction? Had they entered into engagements with us, and then wilfully and knowingly violated them? Did they threaten to stop our trade, or had they instituted any measures for that purpose? I have not heard any of the things involved in these questions alleged against the Taepings. It seems to me that we have heedlessly made war upon them. I contend that after holding the second city of the empire for nine years, and come forth victorious from five hundred conflicts with the Imperial forces, they ought to have been respected by us as belligerents. We had only to preserve a policy of neutrality, siding neither them nor the Imperialists in their protracted struggle, and the Taepings would not have molested us. It is vehemently asserted that the foreign settlement would not have been safe with Shanghai in the hands of the rebels. Such an assertion can only be met by another equally vehement on the opposite side. But I fully agree with many who hold that if we on our side had clearly professed our neutrality, and fully explained our views to the rebels, they would have kept aloof from every place where foreigners were located by treaty right.

"But it avails not to deplore the fact that we have taken the field against the Taepings, or to deplore it the more as needless and unjustifiable; it is a fact. We have defeated the enemy in every engagement, losing also valuable lives on our own side. But Admiral Hope undertook more than the forces available were equal to. We were obliged to retire and concentrate our troops in and around Shanghai. We handed over our conquests to the Imperialists, and when we had retired down came the Taepings and made short work of the "braves." The poor people are now in harder case than they had been before. They have been driven by thousands into Shanghai. There they are, nearly houseless and half fed. Cholera finds them an easy prey. More than 900 died last month within three days. These, it may be said, are unavoidable miseries of war. But the war is a fact, and it must be prosecuted. The British Government has approved Admiral Hope's measures. A large army must be concentrated again in China. Ten thousand allies—French and English—must be in the Yang-tze to annihilate the rebellion and give peace to the empire!

"It behoves the British Parliament—the British people—to look at this new complication of affairs in China, to look at it fairly in the face. If we are to pacify the empire we shall require 50,000 troops, and may then find again that we have undertaken more than we are equal to. But I ask in whose interest we are to put down the rebellion? Hitherto Admiral Hope has been acting in the interest of the Imperial Government. Of course, if we fight its battles it must pay all expenses. The British people cannot be expected to sacrifice the lives of its sons, and its treasure, to establish the Manchou rule, and all gratuitously. Now I protest against our putting down the rebellion on behalf of the Imperial Government, however that may pay for it, on two grounds. The first is the ground of cruelty. I have read harrowing accounts of the devastations of the rebels—how the country is blasted by their march. The accounts are no doubt true. But I have seen also the ways of the Imperial braves, and kept company with them for hours together. Their march over the country was like the progress of locusts and caterpillars. Their thirst for blood was quenchless; their outrages on young and old were indescribable. On the score of cruelty the case must be about even, inclining to the Imperialist side, if we may judge on the principle that the more cowardly are the more cruel. But the question is not about the masses, but about the officers of government. And to know what will be the consequences if we put down the rebels on behalf of the Imperial Government, we have only to think of Yeh and his doings in Canton, when in almost twelve months he beheaded 70,000. I have heard Sir John Bowring, when other arguments for the Arrow war were exhausted, enlarge graphically on Yeh's barbarities. If we put down the Taepings, we shall kill our thousands on the battle field, and the governors of provinces will kill their tens of thousands in the execution areas. We shall be installing

so many Yehs. Our high officers will be the ministers to so many butchers of human beings.

"The second ground on which I object to the putting down of the rebellion on behalf of the Imperial Government, is the utter inefficiency of that Government. Apart from rebel districts, the people everywhere set it at defiance. It is unable to fulfil its treaty obligations. Its soldiers are often uncivil and rude; the gentry are everywhere sullen and insolent; the mob is often riotous and violent; but against soldiers, gentry, and the mob, the authorities can hardly give any protection. Treaties stipulate for the toleration of Chinese Christians, and for liberty to missionaries to preach, and teach, and build chapels. Chinese Christians are openly spoiled; the native missionary is stoned and murdered, his chapels are plundered and profaned—and Government does nothing. The Government at Peking, sends out a magniloquent edict; the provincial government issues letters and proclamations. Each is powerless. Christian blood is spilt, Christian property is plundered, Christian progress is stopped. All this under the government for which we are to spend our money, and pour out the blood of our soldiers! This must not be.

"I dare say those who advocate the carrying out Admiral Hope's initiatory measures, and the carrying on war against the rebels on a great scale, would tell us that they do not mean to do so on behalf of the Imperial Government without insisting on securities from that Government that it will fulfil all its treaty stipulations, and securing from it also greater privileges. This is to me a vain dream. The Imperialists had an easier task to make bricks without straw than we are setting to ourselves in undertaking to pacify China in harmony with the Manchou Government. The Manchous have had their time in China, as the Stuarts had in Britain, and the Bourbons had in France. It is not ours to hasten their downfall by interfering against them in the struggle between them and the Taepings, but neither are they worthy that we should interfere in their behalf. And whereas it is affirmed that we interfere on behalf of our own commerce, it has not been shown that the rebels have ever tried to check our commerce. Our green tea and our silk have come for eighteen months from districts in their hands. Where they are, it is said all is desolation; but where the Imperial authority exists there you have the people. True; because we have not been in any places where their possession of the country was uncontested. In no country where war is raging can we expect to find a crowded and industrious population. I have tried, and tried in vain, to find some grounds on which I could justify in my own mind our commencement of hostilities against the Taepings. There was one fair course for us to pursue—a real, impartial neutrality. We have departed from it without good reason, and launched upon a stormy sea, not knowing clearly whither we are bound, and not prepared for what may befall us.

"It is in vain, I suppose, to hope that there will be an honest return to a policy of neutrality. We cannot help, it will be said, following up the course which Admiral Hope has initiated. But the British Parliament should lay down certain limits, which neither ambition nor caprice on the part of conductors of affairs here may overpass. Let the severity of our dealings with the Taepings be tempered with mercy; it should not be ours to co-operate in their extermination. If we subdue them so as to place them at the mercy of the Government, we should insist on it and see to it that its dealings be also tempered with mercy. We should see to it also that the privileges which we have fought for and won, and which are now treaty rights, actually take effect. While I thus write, I confess that I think we shall find a conflict with the Taepings a very painful, tedious, and expensive affair; and that the attempt to bolster up the Manchou dynasty will be found a very thankless and uncertain undertaking. Let it be granted that we can put the rebellion down, and that the present boy Emperor comes in our time to take the reins of government in his own hand—after all, what shall we have done for the millions of the Chinese people? The French and we together may support a Tartar Emperor in Peking, as the French maintain the Pope in Rome, and the Chinese may not be a bit more grateful to us than the people of the States of the Church are to Louis Napoleon.

"I will venture to say that at this crisis in Chinese history the hope of the Emperor lay in one of two things—a native revolution or a foreign occupancy. For hundreds of years since the Christian era there have been in China anarchy and civil strife. The nation has groaned in pain for centuries, until at last the ruler, to bind up its distracted state, has appeared. If foreigners stood aloof, some man equal to the difficulties of the position might in our time come forth, and a new dynasty be inaugurated, under which the millions would enjoy repose. At present the French and ourselves are in arms together; the French, whose avowed object is to defend the claims of Popery; and we, whose avowed object is to defend and extend our commerce, and whose representatives, some of them at least, are annoyed by the presence and operations of Protestant missionaries.

"Our policy should be to abstain from interference in the internal business of the empire. If the government *de facto* accepts of foreign aid in the management of its customs, that is well. If it encourage foreigners to enter its service in other departments, that also is well. But let not us call those rebels whom it calls rebels. Let us not lend our armies and fleets to do for it what it cannot do for itself. If

we only did what was right, China would, by and by, in God's providence, come to a better state than it is in at present. Whatever betide, a nation is no more justifiable than an individual in doing evil that good may come.

"I have written much more than I intended; you will, however, take the trouble to read my remarks as they stand. Information on the state of things in China is sadly wanted at home. You may think the whole, or a portion of what I have said, not unworthy to be given to the public."

These opinions, written with so much calmness and judgment, deserve serious consideration. The Taepings, Dr. Legge says, would probably have kept away from our ports had we attempted to negotiate with them; whereas now we may be soon plunged into a foolish and interminable war, in favor of a Government too weak to hold what we put in its hands, and in concert with an ally whom we cannot trust.

A PARABLE.

Upon reading his text—2 Cor. iii. 18—one of our ministers rather surprised his hearers on last Sabbath evening by relating the following parable. We beg to present it for the special benefit of all to whom it applies; for until we have some power to prevent it raining on Sabbath, we can only speak to the people in the way of admonition. Probably some will enjoy the parable, but do as before:—

"I am induced to relate a parable of the experience of a traveller who alighted on a certain place where there were certain religionists, who thought that God did not rule in the skies when the rain fell. When clouds obscured the sun too they thought the deity was about to suffer eclipse, and on the day devoted to worship they knew it was of no use to worship, as their God did not hear them—so if clouds were seen, or if there was the smallest sign of rain, they were content to be without religious exercises. Only a few fantastic, rational, old-fashioned people, held to the belief that they should pray when it rained just the same as when the sun shone. Joined with this also was the idea that on the holy day, when it rained and their God was of course unable to help them, the smallest shower would destroy them. Indeed they were a kind of monomaniacs, who supposed that on that day they were descendants of Lot's wife, mere pillars of salt, and that they would suffer great detriment, though on other days they were quite sane, and went about their business as usual, though the god of showers was in the ascendant. I leave you to judge whether this people had any relation to St. John, or to wet Sundays. I dare say you will feel that it has very little relation to the text which I have just read; neither has it, save that I preached a discourse upon it last Sabbath morning, to a wet Sunday audience, and as I do not wish the dry Sunday people to lose the benefit of the discourse, I have determined to repeat it this evening."—*Col. Pres.*

BIBLE THOUGHTS.—Acts ix. 26. "This woman was full of good works and alms-deeds, which she did."—It is here that the character of Dorcas (the woman spoken of in the above passage) appears to the best advantage as a Christian. She was "full of good works and alms-deeds which she did." She had not a mere reputation for benevolence, but she actually did something for the needy. She worked with her own hands for them. We read of the coats and garments which Dorcas made. She did not get them made, but she made them herself. Perhaps some rich ladies gave her money to buy the cloth, and that was a gift to the Lord, and a good one too; but Dorcas made them, and that was a deed or did. Many have only gifts to present to God, while the few have deeds to offer. The wealthy ladies of Joppa gave their money for the poor, and Dorcas did the work. She went out into the by-ways and lanes of the city, to find the needy, and clothe them with the garments she had made. The poor might have fared severely without these self-denying labours of Dorcas; for the rich women would not have soiled their costly garments by threading the dirty lanes on errands of mercy. If some one who had deeds instead of gifts for God, had interest enough to solicit their aid, it was well; and otherwise the poor might have lacked food and clothing.

It is proper to make this distinction between gifts for the Lord and deeds, and to consider the self-denial there is in earth. We shall thereby learn that many, who have no money to bestow upon objects of charity, may do what is equally, and in some circumstances, more acceptable—perform deeds for Christ. The poorest cannot be excused from responsibility here, for, if they have nothing to give, they have strength and opportunity to do. In the great day of account, that some will be known by the Judge for what they gave, and others for what they did.

DON'T BE TOO POSITIVE.—Always allow other people their opinions, and do not be too sure you are right. Remember, if you are right in one particular, you may be wrong in others. Do not be defiant, or boldly contradict; but calmly express your reasons, and patiently bear with those whose understanding is less clear, or whose reason is disturbed by passion. Rather than "It is," and "It is not," "You did," and "You did not," say "It seems to me," "I think it is," or "If I mistake not." Avoid all rude and ill-natured expressions—as calling one foolish, obstinate, or provokingly stupid. Our aim should be to advance the truth, not ourselves. It often happens that much time is wasted and temper lost in matters of no great consequence. One says the lesson is hard, another says it is not—and there is a fuss. Jane saw Susan go down the street; but Mary declares it was somebody else, and then a difference ensues. All this shows a wrong spirit, and causes much bitterness, both in words and feelings. While in all cases concerning duty and happiness we are faithful to the right, let us remember to hold to the truth in meekness.

THE GREAT COMING.

"Behold, He cometh!" Yes, He has received His commission from the father for the glorifying of His people and the judgment of the world. He is, by His Spirit, His angels, and His ministers on earth, preparing that world for the reception of His presence. He hath mounted the chariot of final redemption. Its wheels are moving round. The faint and feeble sound of them may be heard afar. Enlarge your vision, and gaze with the intensity of heavenly wisdom into the mysteries of futurity—"Behold, He cometh."

It is added, "with clouds." Clouds, in the Bible, are often employed as an appropriate symbol of glorious majesty. And in glorious majesty the Lord Jesus will appear when he comes. Probably the symbol alludes to the manner in which the Redeemer descended on Mount Sinai at the giving of the law. There, "clouds and darkness were round about Him," and He appeared in terrible majesty, so that even Moses, his chosen one, trembled at the sight.

The same "God of glory" is coming again—coming with clouds—coming to vindicate his law, by the infliction of its tremendous penalty on all the inhabitants of the earth who refuse His offer of mercy,—an offer given in virtue of the atonement which He Himself hath made. And even now, and ever since His apostle wrote, the clouds of His majesty—the indications of His vengeance and displeasure with those who scorn His Gospel, have been advancing and accumulating over the world; and in due time the muttering storm will burst forth in awful splendour, and the immediate presence of our exalted Redeemer will be fully realized.

"Where is the promise of His coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were!" is the cry of a Christless or Christ-hating world. The cry is false, but let us take it as it is. Ah! who knows not, that often, when the might of heaven is about to be revealed in the sky, for a time before the bursting of the thunder every element is still? The wind is a breath. The rustling of the leaves is heard no more, and the rippling of the waves is changed into a calm. But is this stillness a pledge of continued repose? Nay, rather, while it lasts, do we not feel as if the attention of Him by whom all things are upheld were absorbed in the mustering of the gathering storm? In like manner, O ye scornors of the coming Redeemer, the present quiescence of the highest heaven, is no indication of abiding repose. An era is drawing nigh when the divine stillness which prevails will give place to wrath, proportioned to the greatness and length of the deepening gloom. Oh, already the Christian sees the clouds of the advent covering the sky, and anon the world shall be lighted up with the glory of the Lord. Say not, "Where is the promise of His coming?"—"Behold, He cometh with clouds."

"Every eye shall see Him." The nature of the advent here referred to, necessarily determines the character of this vision. Hence the plain import of this announcement is, that men shall recognise the footsteps of the Saviour's mediatory providence in the leading events of the world's history; and ever as these events roll onward, more evident to all will be the doings of the Redeemer, till at last, when the consummation comes, and that Redeemer is openly seen interposing His omnipotent arm in the climax of the world's career, the conviction will force itself upon every mind, that all along the same omnipotent arm has been swaying the destinies of mankind. Thus, "every eye shall see him."

Meanwhile, the providence of the world is rolling rapidly on. The men of the world recognise no mediatory sway, and the smile of an impious infidelity sits upon their countenance, as they hear us declare, on the authority of God, that our Redeemer is "at the right hand of power," and that all the astonishing vicissitudes of the earth are only indications that He is more speedily than heretofore converging the interests of the world to its predicted crisis. "Be not ye like unto them." They cannot look beyond material things. They cannot see with the eye of faith, as we do, the Divine Redeemer "making bare His holy arm in the sight of all nations." Pity they cannot! But, there is a time coming when they will find it impossible to resist the overwhelming evidence of the Redeemer's providential sway,—a time coming when not merely His omnipotent arm, but His whole mediatory glory, shall stand disclosed before a trembling world. And then literally "every eye shall see Him."

It is further said, "and they also who pierced Him." And who has not pierced the Redeemer? Every one of us—every individual upon the face of the wide earth, has pierced Him. "He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities." Yes, the guilt of the Redeemer's crucifixion may, with propriety, be charged home upon the conscience of every sinner.

But the inhabitants of Jerusalem are expressly mentioned in the prophecies of Zechariah as having "pierced" the Redeemer. And the same crime was charged upon them and their fellow countrymen by the apostles of our Lord: "Him ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain;" "Ye killed the Prince of Life." These, and expressions such as these, are used in reference to the Jews collectively. And to that guilty nation appertains, in all probability, the highest application of the phrase.

Long, long have the Jews, as a nation, resisted the evidence of the Messiah's advent in the fullness of the time. They have poured the contempt of ages upon the glorious doctrines that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah promised to the fathers; that His sufferings and death were an atonement for sin; that, hav-

ing arisen from the dead, He is now at the right hand of God, and there sways the sceptre of mediatory King. But there is an epoch with an era coming, when the "Jews shall be brought in with the fullness of the Gentiles." Yes, there is a time drawing nigh when these venerable apostates will lay aside their hatred to the Redeemer, will see in those desolations of Jerusalem that have for ages made them outcasts and vagabonds upon the earth, plain indications of their ancient criminality, and will recognise, in the peculiar lot awaiting them, the magnificent guidance of Him who said to them of old, "Come unto Me, all ye, that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Delightful thought! Sooner or later the conversion of Israel shall come. And then these long-blinded enemies of Christ, looking back, will acknowledge that for nearly two thousand years the Redeemer, whom they crucified, has been sitting at the helm of the world's destiny; and, "lifting up their eyes," like the ancient king of Babylon when his reason returned, they will shout, "Now we praise, and extol, and honour the King of heaven"—"Hosanna to the Son of God! Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord."

"And all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of Him. Even so, Amen." In apostolic times little was known of what we now call the heathen world. And hence "the nations of the earth" was an expression employed to indicate the Roman empire. It is thus chiefly, that the reference is to be understood in the passage before us. All the "kindreds," tribes or nations occupying the earth, or sphere of the ancient Roman empire,—nations which, at the present day, are for the most part subject to the sway of Antichrist, or the Church of Rome,—these kindreds of the earth shall wail at the approach of the Redeemer.

Dreadful will be "the wrath of the Lamb" when He ariseth to judge. Then He will be seen, beyond the possibility of a doubt, coming in His terrible array—"coming in the clouds of heaven" to smite every foe, and emphatically to inflict the predicted doom upon "the mystery of iniquity," "the man of sin," "whom (we are told) He shall consume with the spirit of His mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of His coming." Ah! then, if not before, "all kindreds shall wail because of Him."

EVIL COMPANY.—It is said that Sophronius, a wise teacher of the people, did not allow his sons and daughters, even when they were grown up, to associate with persons whose lives were not quite moral and pure.

"Father," said the gentle Eulalia one day, when he refused to permit her to go, in company with her brother, to visit the frivolous Lucinda, "you must think we are very weak and childish, since you are afraid that it would be dangerous for us to visit Lucinda."

Without saying a word, the father took a coal from the hearth, and handed it to his daughter. "It will not burn you, my child," said he, "only take it."

Eulalia took the coal, and beheld her tender white hand was black; and without thinking she touched her white dress, and it was blackened. "See," said Eulalia, somewhat displeased, as she looked at her hands and dress, "one cannot be careful enough when handling coal."

"Yes, truly," said her father; "you see, my child, that the coal, even though it did not burn you, has nevertheless blackened you! So is the company of immoral persons."

CONSANGUINEOUS MARRIAGES.—The following statistics in regard to the effect upon offspring of marriages between blood relations, have been prepared with the hope of calling attention to and discouraging such marriages. There is a law of nature which forbids such a union of kindred, although the penalty falls more severely upon the children than upon the parents.

Dr. Millingen, of Dublin, ascertained the situation of 154 families, the heads of which were related in the degrees of first, second and third cousins, and in which there were 109 children who were deaf and dumb. In 84 families there were two in each; in 14 families three in each; in 8 families four in each; in one family six; and in one family of 13 children, 7 of them were deaf and dumb. He says nothing of other defects.

Dr. Burton of Liverpool, states that he found 170 cases where the parents were related as above. In 109 of them there were in each family one child deaf and dumb; in 38, two children; in 17, three children; in 3, four children; in 1, six; in 1, seven; and in another, eight. He omits to state the whole number of children in those 109 families, or whether any other defects existed, but here are 269 who are deaf and dumb.

The first number of the *Social Science Review* contains a paper on the statistics of the birth of deaf and dumb children. According to M. Boudin, the result is a very considerable per centage of deaf mutes. M. Boudin finds that consanguineous marriages take place in France in the ratio of 2 per cent. of the population; and that of the issues of such marriages the proportion of deaf and dumb children is 28 per cent. in Paris, 25 at Lyons, and 30 at Bordeaux. At Berlin he has discovered that the number of deaf and dumb children born of Christian parents is 0 per cent., while that of the children of Jewish parents is 27 per cent.; a result which he attributes to the fact that Jews intermarry with blood relations more frequently than Christians.

In New England, a distinguished gentleman ascertained that in 17 families where the parents were blood relations, there were 93 children, 44 of whom were idiotic, 12 acrobatics and puny, and 1 deaf. In one of these families, of 8 children 5 were idiotic.

Dr. Bemis of Kentucky reports, as the results of careful researches by reliable gentlemen throughout the United States, in the relationship above named, 768 families, in which were 3,588 children, and 3,931 of them were defective; among 154 children, where the parents were double cousins, 133 of them were defective.—*N. Y. Observer.*