

# Christian Guardian.

PUBLISHED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE WESLEYAN-METHODIST CHURCH IN CANADA.

Vol. XIII. No. 52.

TORONTO, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1842.

Whole No. 676.

## A FEW SHORT CHAPTERS UPON THE TRIUMPHAL ENTRY OF JESUS CHRIST INTO THE CITY OF JERUSALEM.

No. III.  
The visit of our Lord to the Metropolis of Jewry at this time, and in this manner, is essentially connected with the establishment of his exclusive claim to the character of Messiah, and the support of His assumption of supreme Divinity. In it will be found complete evidence of both these fundamental points. Jesus is the Messiah—He is God. With respect to His Messiahship, this entry, with all its attendant circumstances, was required, in order to the fulfilment of prophecy respecting Him in this character. St. Matthew says, "All this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, Tell ye the daughter of Zion, Behold thy king cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass; xxi. 4, 5. The principal prophecies referred to are Mal. iii. 1. and Zech. ix. 9. The former says, "Behold I will send my messenger and he shall prepare the way before me; and the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in; behold he shall come, saith the Lord of Hosts." The latter remarks, "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem; behold thy king cometh unto thee; he is just and having salvation; lowly and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass." The connexion existing between the Triumphal Visit of Jesus to the City and Temple of Jerusalem and the fulfilment of these prophecies is so obvious as to require scarcely a single remark. As the "Messenger" and the "Sent of God," He made a sudden, (and to the Jews an undesired) visit to the Temple, as His own; manifested His authority over it by extirpating the iniquitous traffic carried on; and, for the time being, converted it into the Temple of God indeed, by the instruction He communicated and the miracles He performed. The phrase "Daughter of Jerusalem," or "of Zion," is a poetic expression for the inhabitants of Jerusalem. These the prophet exhorts to "Rejoice greatly," and assigns the reason and details the circumstances—all of which find their accomplishment in the notable event in question. The prophetic utterances quoted above not only show the propriety of the visit itself, but the reason for all the circumstances connected with it, and also, why Jesus encouraged rather than otherwise the various demonstrations of joy which marked the occasion.

This public entry was necessary also that the Saviour might be known as that Lamb for sacrifice which the Patriarch Abraham, in an important hour had said, "The Lord will provide." That Lamb was typified by the Passover Lamb which was slain in that memorable night when God in mercy passed over the blood-be sprinkled houses of the Israelites, and "slew the first-born of Egypt." Of this notable annual sacrifice, commemorative of that great deliverance, Jesus was the grand antitype; and it will be readily perceived that various circumstances connected with this pompous visit of Jesus to the City and Temple combined to distinguish Him as the true Paschal Lamb.—From Exodus xii. 1, 2, it appears that the month in which the Jews went up out of Egypt was arbitrarily changed as to its position among the months so far as that hereafter it should be the first month, or the commencement of the year to them, probably because of the great event of their deliverance. And vs. 3 of the same chapter specifies that the Passover Lamb must be selected on the 10th day of this month: "Speak unto all the congregation of Israel saying, In the tenth day, &c. And on the 14th day it shall be slain—And ye shall keep it until the fourteenth day of the same month." &c. vs. 6. The Passover festival of the Jews, besides being a continual memorial of the important events of the destruction of the first-born of Egypt and of the deliverance of Israel, was principally designed to be an abiding type of Christ. Hence the Apostle to the Hebrews says—"Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us." In this Jewish festival the patriarchal doctrine was solemnly revived, that "without the shedding of blood there is no remission," because it was by means of the sprinkled blood upon the door-posts that the stroke of the destroying Angel was turned aside. The act of sprinkling that blood on those posts was an act of faith on the part of the saved Israelites, so that the Passover instituted shadowed forth quite intelligibly the three grand doctrines of the Gospel—the substitution of the innocent for the guilty, the shedding of vicarious blood, and faith as the means of interesting moral agents in the merit of such sacrifice. Now the Saviour entered Jerusalem during the Passover week, and on the tenth day of the month, and on the fourteenth day, he was "sacrificed for us," by being nailed to the accursed tree. A vast multitude of the Jews from all parts were present at this their highest festival. The "daughter of Zion," therefore, was eminently present to "rejoice" on account of her lowly King, and Jesus was on that account the more publicly recognized as the Lamb of God, and at the time appointed by the Law, in order to be sacrificed as an atonement for the sins of mankind. The entry of Jesus was then in fact the prelude to His Passion.

But this important visit to the City and Temple was also necessary in order that the unassuming conduct of Jesus might not hereafter become a stumbling block to the Jews, and perhaps the Gentiles too. It might otherwise have been said that, whatever He had done in a more private way, He had never publicly claimed to be the Messiah; had never in an official manner applied to Himself the prophecies relating to the Messiah. Here would be ground on which to attempt to justify, with at least a degree of plausibility, the rejection of His claims, and the denial of the merit ascribed to His death. But in this His last visit to Jerusalem we see Jesus fulfilling to the letter the ancient prophecies concerning Himself—and seemingly determined, at every hazard, of present and personal inconvenience and danger, to transmit to future ages the fullest evidence of the sincerity of His pretensions to be the Messiah—the King of Israel. Accordingly He, for the time being, assumed the garb and equipage of a King; He publicly vindicated the Hosannas of old and young in His praise, and He fearlessly asserted His authority over the Temple and universal nature by the significant acts of purgation and healing. No wonder that "all the city was moved." Some knew Christ and some did not—not part believed in Him and part did not—but the Jews in general knew full well the significance of all the parade and glory which they beheld. Hence the inquiry—the result of ignorance, of curiosity, of contempt or of scepticism—"Who is this?" The events—the circumstances, combine to answer—He is the Messiah—He is the Christ of God—He is the "Messenger of the Covenant."

"Commissioned from the Father's throne,  
To make His grace to mortals known."

Kingston, Oct. 3, 1842.

VERI AMATOR.

The noted Puseyite Sermon on "Hear the Church," by Dr. Hook, the Vicar of Leeds, England, is assiduously circulated in Canada, and has a baneful influence; we, therefore, publish below, the Rev. THOMAS POWELL'S unimpeachable Review of it, under the hope it will act as an antidote. He is a Wesleyan Minister, and his popular and powerful "Essay on Apostolical Succession," is a bomb-shell thrown into the camp of High-Churchmen who would annihilate all Churches except their own.—Ed.

## POWELL'S REVIEW OF DR. HOOK'S SERMON

ON "HEAR THE CHURCH."

Preached before the Queen, at the Chapel Royal, St. James's Palace, June 17, 1838.

Dr. Hook is the Apostle and High Priest of the high-church scheme of the present times. If assertions were proofs, his writings would contain convincing evidence of the authority of his Mission. I doubt his assertions; and I controvert his scheme. His doctrine of the succession has been sufficiently refuted in the "Essay on Apostolical Succession;" indeed the arguments in the Essay do, in their consequence, demolish his whole high-church building.

But there is one topic upon which he evidently delights to dwell; for he speaks and preaches it everywhere; it is this—That the present Church of England was founded by the Apostles, and has come down to the present day, with no greater difference, at any time, from that Apostolic Church, than the difference caused in the same man by having his face washed or unwashed; see page 13th of his sermon.—This is his favourite illustration. Speaking of the church of this country before the Reformation, when sworn to Popery, the Pope acknowledged as his head by all its authorities, when governed by Bishops who preached the doctrines, and were sworn to the government of Popery, when the church itself was filled with idols and abominations; with perfect and full grown Popery,—and comparing that church with the church after the Reformation, he says, "The church remained the same after it was reformed as it was before, just as a man remains the same man after he has washed his face as he was before," p. 12. The conclusion he draws from this argument, is,—that the Church of England "maintains those peculiar doctrines, and that peculiar discipline, which have always marked, and do still continue to mark, the distinction between the Church of Christ, administered under the superintendence of Chief Pastors or Bishops who have regularly succeeded to the Apostles, from those sects of Christianity which exist under self-appointed Teachers;"—that this church is the only church of Christ in this kingdom;—that "it possesses its original endowments, which were never, as ignorant persons foolishly suppose, taken from one church and given to another," (p. 12);—that her Bishops have regularly succeeded to the Apostles; and that her ministers are the only duly commissioned Ministers in this kingdom; all other denominations are SECTARIANS, SCHISMATICS, and left to the UNCONSECRATED mercies of God, as the heathen are! On this ground he has the intolerable arrogance thus to insult the Christian Churches in general in America: "When the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA were English Colonies, the English Church was there established; at the Revolution, the State was destroyed." Monarchy has there ceased to exist; but the Church, though depressed for a time,

remained uninjured; so that there—among the American republicans—under the superintendence of no fewer than sixteen bishops, you will find her sacraments and ordinances administered, and all her ritual and liturgical services celebrated, with no less of piety, zeal, and solemnity, than here in England; there you may see the Church, like an oasis in the desert, blessed by the dew of heaven, and shedding heavenly blessings around her, in a land where, because no religion is established, if it were not for her, nothing but the EXTREMES of INFIDELITY OF FANATICISM WOULD PREVAIL," p. 7, 8. The reader sees at once that this is the succession scheme a little modified. That scheme has been sufficiently refuted in the Essay. We intend, in this Review of the Sermon, to expose the sophistry of this modification. Here, "The Church" is the topic—Bishops were the former topic.

If Dr. Hook be the man he is said to be, it is hard to suppose that he is not conscious of the sophistry of his own argument; in which case he would be a public deceiver; if his reasoning powers be weak, he may possibly be entangled in his own net. Be these things as they may, his argument is a tissue of sophistry—we shall endeavour to untie it, and break its force of deceiving.

THE GREAT FALLACY, of delusion of the whole argument, lies in using the expression "The Church," in DIFFERENT SENSES, in different parts of the argument; that is, as Logicians would say, in CHANGING THE TERMS. The way in which he manages this, is, by giving only a GENERAL and IMPERFECT definition of the terms in the BEGINNING of his sermon; and then, introducing particulars into it in the progress, as is the most convenient for deception. So, at pages 5 and 8, he says, "Now, at the very outset, I must state that I refer to the Church, not as a mere National Establishment of Religion; but as the Church, a religious community, intrinsically independent of the state; that is, I am about to treat the Church, not in its political, but simply and solely in its religious character.—And so you may perceive what is meant, when we say, that we wish to speak of the Church, not as an establishment, but as the Church, a religious society, a PARTICULAR SOCIETY OF CHRISTIANS." Then, this "particular society of Christians" becomes "our Church;"—"The Church of England;"—"The Church;" and, at the last, on the last page, this "particular society of Christians" becomes DISTINGUISHED from all other "religious societies" BY THESE SPECIFIC PROPERTIES, as "maintaining those PECULIAR DOCTRINES, and that peculiar discipline, which have ALWAYS MARKED, and do still continue to mark, the distinction between the Church of Christ, administered under the superintendence of chief Pastors or Bishops who REGULARLY succeeded to the Apostles, from those SECTS of Christianity under SELF-APPOINTED teachers." Well, thanks be to the Dr. for giving us, at last, a complete definition of the Church of England. This definition, as perfected by himself, is, "That, the Church of England is a particular society of Christians, distinguished from all other particular religious societies, by its PECULIAR DOCTRINES, and its PECULIAR DISCIPLINE." By discipline, he tells us, he means its Church Government, as administered by its Bishops: their Succession is another question, and has been fully treated in the Essay.

Now let us try his main position. "THE PRESENT CHURCH of England is the OLD CATHOLIC Church of England, reformed in the reigns of Henry, Edward, and Elizabeth, of certain superstitious errors; it is the same Church, which came down from our British and Saxon ancestors." THE CHURCH REMAINED THE SAME AFTER IT WAS REFORMED, just as a man remains the same man after he has washed his face as he was before," p. 11, 12.

Here, then, let us examine the matter. The Church before the Reformation was "a particular religious society;" and the Church after the Reformation was "a particular religious society." There is, then, this GENERAL agreement, that each was "a religious society." So a Harlot is a woman, and a Virgin is a woman. There is this general agreement between them, that each is a woman. Now if we wish to know the DIFFERENCE that distinguishes the Harlot from the Virgin, we should be told that it would be the regular principles, manners, and conduct of each. If, then, we wish to know the difference that distinguishes the Church before the Reformation, from the Church after the Reformation, the answer would be, "The PECULIAR DOCTRINES and the PECULIAR DISCIPLINE of each Church." Each is a Church, i.e., "a religious society;" as each of the above persons is a woman; but where those churches the same? This will be answered by another question—Are a Harlot and a Virgin the same? Yes, according to Dr. Hook, if the Harlot washes her face!

Let us look at the face of the Church before the Reformation, and at the face of the Church after the Reformation—at their PECULIAR DOCTRINES, and their PECULIAR DISCIPLINE.

1. PECULIAR DOCTRINES.—The church, before the Reformation, maintained the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and COMMITTED HUNDREDS TO THE FLAMES for disputing it; but

The Church, after the Reformation, declares it "repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, that it overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions." Article 28th of the Church of England.

Messes.—The Church, before the Reformation, maintained that the Priests did offer Christ for the quick and dead to have remission of pain and guilt:—The Church, after the Reformation, declares these positions to be "blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits." Art. 31st of the Church of England.

Images.—The Church, before the Reformation, maintained the worship of IMAGES, and the Churches were full of Images:—The Church, after the Reformation, declares this to be IDOLATRY; see Homily on Idolatry. Thus also the 22nd Article: "The Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping, and ADORATION, as well of IMAGES as of RELIQUES, and also Invocation of Saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God."

Justification.—The Church, before the Reformation, maintained that a man was justified through the grace of God by works, and not by faith only:—The Church, after the Reformation, maintained that the doctrine "that we are justified by faith ONLY, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the homily of Justification." Art. 11. These points of doctrine may suffice—many more might be added.

2. PECULIAR DISCIPLINE.—The Church, before the Reformation, acknowledged the Pope as Supreme Head of the Church, as Christ's Vicar, and that all were heretics who rejected him. A few passages from the Canon Law, as collected by Abp. Cramer, and given in the Collection of Records by Bishop Burnet, in his History of the Reformation, Book 3, No. 27, will illustrate this point:

"If he acknowledged not himself to be under the Bishop of Rome, and that the Bishop of Rome is ordained by God to have Primacy over all the World, is an Heretic, and cannot be saved, nor is not of the flock of Christ."

"All the Decrees of the Bishop of Rome ought to be kept perpetually of every Man, without any repugnance, as God's Word spoken by the mouth of Peter; and whosoever doth not receive them, neither availeth them the Catholic Faith, nor the four Evangelists; but they blaspheme the Holy Ghost, and shall have no forgiveness."

"The See of Rome hath neither spot nor wrinkle in it, nor can err. The Bishop of Rome may excommunicate Emperors and Princes, and DEPOSE THEM from their States, and Assail their subjects from their Oath and Obedience to them, and so constrain them to rebellion."

At the Bishops in England, before the Reformation, swore obedience to the Pope of Rome: see p. 129 of the Essay; But

The Church, after the Reformation, declared the Pope to be Anti-Christ, the Son of Perdition; and the Church of Rome, to be an Idolatrous Church:—See Essay, p. 113, 114. And every Bishop of the Church of England is bound to reject the authority of the Pope and the Court of Rome, under the penalty of excommunication.

Thus we see that the "peculiar doctrines and the peculiar discipline" of the Church before the Reformation, and those of the Church after the Reformation, EXPRESSLY CONTRADICT EACH OTHER: The Church, after the Reformation, charging IDOLATRY and Blasphemy upon the Church before the Reformation. Yet, says Dr. Hook, "They are the same." And Dr. Hook can prove it—yes more—he can prove, by his principles, that black is white, and that two and two are five. Thus, two and two are numbers; and five is a number; ergo, two and two are the same as five, i.e., they are both numbers:—black is a colour; and white is a colour; ergo, black and white are the same, i.e., they are both colours. Yes, replies the reader, but it was supposed you meant that two and two were the same in amount as five; and that black was the same colour as white. True! but this is leaving the general nature of the things, and coming to the specific differences; and I only spoke in generals. Dr. Hook only shows you the general nature of the thing at first: in the Church, before the Reformation is a religious society, and the Church, after the Reformation, is a religious society; ergo, they are the same, i.e., they are both religious societies; as black and white are both colours. True, says the reader, but we supposed he meant that they had the same distinguishing properties or qualities. Whether Dr. Hook meant it himself or not, I cannot say, but he doubtless meant his readers to think they had the same distinguishing properties, i.e., the same peculiar doctrines, and the same peculiar discipline (see page 23 of his sermon, as quoted above.) However, it was neither convenient for him to say so "at the outset" of his sermon, nor was it agreeable to him to exhibit this "their identity afterwards: black would have been seen to be black, and white would have been white still: the Virgin would have appeared a Virgin, and the Harlot would have appeared a Harlot, after the Doctor's preparation in washing her face."

The Doctor's position, then, is a mere FALLACY, involving the real absurdity, that two religious societies, distinguished as societies, by their "peculiar doctrines, and their peculiar discipline," and whose peculiar doctrines and peculiar discipline "flatly contradict each other," are yet one and the same

society, i.e., that CONTRADICTORY PROPOSITIONS ARE IDENTICAL PROPOSITIONS!—They are,—just as much so as black and white are the same, and as two and two are five!

The absurdity of the Dr.'s positions being thus manifest, all his conclusions fall to the ground; and the following opposite conclusions become established: Conclusion 1st.—The Church, before the Reformation, and the Church, after the Reformation, are two different Churches, distinguished by directly opposite peculiar doctrines, and peculiar discipline or Church Government.

Conclusion 2nd.—The Church, after the Reformation, as distinguished by its peculiar doctrine and peculiar discipline, was founded at the Reformation, as much so as the Scotch Church, the Lutheran Church, or any of those other Sects towards which the Dr. manifests such scorn.

As to the succession of the Bishops of the Church of England, through the Church of Rome, or through the Church before the Reformation, we have shown in the Essay, that they have no more claim, ON THAT GROUND, than barbers have to the inheritance of legitimate children.

Conclusion 3rd.—The Church, and the Bishops of the Church of England, have no more just affinity to the British or Saxon Churches, than any other Church that equally resembles them in peculiar doctrine and discipline. The Doctor's assertion at page 9, that "the Church, as at the period of the Reformation, had existed, as all parties admit, from the first planting of Christianity in England," is one of his accustomed, hardly, fallacious, and baseless statements. Had that Church, as distinguished at the period of the Reformation, by such "peculiar doctrines and peculiar discipline" as we have seen above, existed as "always marked" (p. 23) by those "peculiar doctrines and that peculiar discipline" from the first planting of Christianity in England? Yes! the Dr. says, "All parties admit" this! Then all parties admit that FULL-GROWN POPERY existed in England from the first PLANTING OF CHRISTIANITY in this country!! The reader who believes this is worthy to be a disciple of Dr. Hook.

Conclusion 4th.—The right of the present Church of England to those Church Endowments, which existed before the Reformation, is merely Statute Right. The Parliament has as much power to alienate as to appropriate. If the Church of England has a righteous claim to those endowments, any other Church might, by another Statute, have an equally righteous claim to them. The sum of the whole is, then, that the Church of England, as a religious society, must establish its claim to affinity with Apostolical Churches, with the British and Saxon Churches, and the Church before the Reformation, by the resemblance of its peculiar doctrines and its peculiar discipline to the peculiar doctrines and the peculiar discipline of those Churches. Her Bishops, and her other Ministers, must prove their claim to Apostolicity by their likeness to the Apostles in personal piety, a desire akin to the Ministry, and by the preaching of the Faith as the apostles preached it. Whatever they possess besides, is but as the chaff to the wheat. All other Churches do the same. Here is the Divine Rule: Here let all strive to excel: let all covet the best gifts. Above all, let them keep in mind the more excellent way. What is true individually, is true of Churches collectively: "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal," &c. 1 Cor. xii.

This attack upon the religious bodies of the United States, he mixes up with a political Philippic. The writer is an advocate for a republic; indeed he leaves poles in general to others. Yet there is a sentiment, on the page adjoining, in the last quotation, which deserves remark. He says, "were all connection between Church and State to cease, we may be sure the monarchy would be destroyed." This was telling the Queen that none are loyal to her, as the Queen, except she pays them for it; and that same to kings in general. Dr. Hook, and such as he, may speak from their own feelings, as to what they would do for the Queen if NOT PAID BY HER; but to affirm it of Christians in general, as a VICE-ROY, and to be elevated to displace the mind of the Queen towards all her Christian subjects who are not of the Establishment. All real Christians receive the Bible as the rule of their faith and practice. From the Bible they learn to "submit to the powers that be," equally as much under a Monarchy as under a Republic.—The Wesleyan Methodists, for instance, yield not to the members of the Establishment in loyalty to the Queen. But further—Has the Christian Church connected with the State for the first time been destroyed? Did not the State persecute the Church, every where? The Roman Republic had ceased to be when the Christian Church began to exist. The Emperor was more absolute than the king of England. Now, did the PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANS rise to destroy the throne? Hear Tertullian: "IN ALL OUR PRAYERS, we are ever-mindful of all our EMPERORS and KINGS WHERESOEVER we LIVE, beseeching God for every one of them, without distinction that he would bless them with length of days, and a quiet reign, a well-established family, a stout army, a faithful senate, an honest people, and a peaceful world, and whatsoever else either Princes or people can wish for."—For Dr. Hook to go before the Queen to propitiate his libel upon all her Christian subjects, and upon Christianity in general, deserves the severest rebuke. Such a man can cast "firebrands, arrows, and death, and say, Am I not in sport?"

From the N. Y. Christian Advocate and Journal.

## FAMILY VISITING.

It is objected, some will not submit to it. If some will not, others will, and I have thought, that those who most object to it are often the most benefited by it. At least, it has been so in several instances during the period in which I have been engaged in the work of the ministry.

In the summer of 1833 I was called out, by the direction of the presiding elder, to assist a brother whose health was considerably impaired. I had not been on the circuit but a few weeks before the protracted meeting was commenced in the neighborhood of R—. The Lord was pleased to pour out his Spirit on us, and a number were seeking the Saviour. Among the number was a certain lady, whose husband was bitterly opposed to religion.—This lady came forward to the altar one or two evenings, and was earnestly engaged in seeking the salvation of her soul. But her husband, ascertaining that this was the case, threatened to leave her, and even went so far (if I am not mistaken) as to threaten her life. As soon as I heard this I determined to call and see her, and encourage her to seek the Saviour until she found him. Accordingly I went, entered the house, engaged in conversation with her on the subject of religion, and found that the Lord had touched her heart. She "wanted religion," she said, but the opposition she met with almost discouraged her. I exhorted her to seek the Lord, assuring her, not only that she would be saved, but that God would take care of her, and probably would also convert her husband. We knelt to pray; but at that moment the husband, who worked opposite the house, ascertaining that I was there, immediately ran to a neighbor's to borrow a gun. "What are you going to do with it?" asked the neighbor. "I am going to shoot that Methodist preacher who is praying in my house." His neighbor refused to let him have it. Being the more enraged at the refusal, he came to the house, and paused a moment at the door, until we had done praying.—As I arose from my knees, the first object that arrested my attention was, the husband standing in the door. He immediately came in, trembling with rage, shook his trembling fist at me, and said, "Now you must go out of my house; go, go." I said to him, My friend, I came here to do you good, and I would like to talk with you a little while about your soul. "I won't hear a word you have got to say," he replied; "you are going around the neighborhood, disturbing the peace of families, heaping coils of fire on my head, and you make me feel as if I had the devil in me." I told him I was glad to learn that he felt as if the devil was in him, and hoped he would seek to have him cast out. He again uttered his command for me to go out of the house, and was about to use violence, when I quietly retired to the door yard, in front of the house. I again endeavored to talk with him, to show him the folly and wickedness of his course, and what would be the result, unless he was converted to God. For a moment he appeared to be somewhat cooled down; but he again, with a loud, angry tone, exclaimed, "Now, if you don't go out of the neighborhood in a few days, I'll send you to hell." I then left him; and as I went my way I prayed that God would either convert him in a few days, or take him out of the world. That same night he was working in his mill until a very late hour, and he thought that while the mill was going he would endeavor to sleep a little. He had just fallen asleep, when a voice seemed to come from the wheel, saying, "Turn to the Lord; seek the Lord." It awoke him instantly. His eyes, especially the transaction of the past day, passed in vivid colors before him. He felt as if he should die, and go to hell, before the morning light appeared. He stopped the mill, and went over to his house; thinking to find rest there; but he had no sooner entered the room than he heard the same voice from every corner of the room. He spent a sleepless, sorrowful night; and when he arose in the morning he asked his wife to pray for him; but no gleam of light pierced the darkness of his soul. Hearing that my colleague, and myself were at the next neighbor's, he came there; but O, how changed! The lion was already turned to a lamb. In the most humble and affecting manner he asked me to forgive him, and said, "O how could I do so!" We prayed for him, but it was that he might drink deep of the cup of penitential sorrow. No peace was given to his troubled breast. That night he came out to church the first time, I understood, for many years. He was the first one to come to the altar; and though sorrow continued for a night, joy came in the morning. His soul was set at liberty, and his wife also embraced religion. They were both received into the Church and baptized at one time; and I trust, if they are still living, they are on their way to heaven; for certainly he especially should "love much," for he had much forgiven.

Rockaway, N. J.

YOUNG ITINERANT.

ONLY BELIEVE!—How simple the direction! how comprehensive the summary of a Christian's religion! It is too simple to be credible to most men, whose self-righteous notions would lead them to expect and to wish something more. Like Naaman they wish the prophets of the Lord to require of them some great thing; but a simple washing in Jordan to cure a natural leprosy, or a simple act of faith to cure a spiritual one, are means too simple to be efficacious. Yet so it is. The whole New Testament is full of this—"only believe." The highest gifts of God are suspended on

this, and salvation with all its unspeakable and eternal blessings comes only to him who believes. It is the simple act of faith which saves the soul, and they who, pretending to know more than God, add works to faith to make salvation more sure, stumble and halt to their ruin.

A self-righteous man labours to make himself acceptable to God by his own works, and although he may thus blind his own conscience, he cannot enter into the kingdom.—The heathen have invented a thousand ceremonies to help them on their way to heaven, and some nominally Christian bodies have done the same for the purpose, we suppose, of making the simple doctrine of faith more imposing and more efficacious; but these are miserable and perishable devices. Only believe, says the Gospel.—Presbyterian.

## The Youth's Friend.

### LOVE YOUR PARENTS.

BY SUMMERFIELD.

As a specimen of the interesting manner in which he addressed children, the following passage is selected from his sermon on 1 Chron. xxviii. 9.

O! if you only knew how much they [your parents] love you, you would love them yet more and more. Some of them are poor, and obliged to toil almost day and night to preserve you in a little decency, and to give you a little useful learning. Perhaps, when you are asleep in bed, your anxious mother is yet sitting by her little fire consulting with her husband about your welfare. You are their last concern at night, their first care in the morning; and it's very hard work to make their little pittance afford you a plentiful meal! Perhaps they are very often obliged to deny themselves of their scanty store that you may have enough, and that you may be clothed as well as their little will allow. When you go home to-night, my poor little ones, whose parents' lot appears so hard, look up into your father's face, and see the furrows which his daily labor has made upon his wasting frame! Take hold of his hand! feel how hard, how rough it is; more like horn than human flesh. See there the effects of his daily toil, in the sweat of his brow earning his daily fare; and while you hold his hand, again look into his face, which perhaps betrays the decline of his natural health and strength, and ask him, "Father, for what have you toiled so hard? Father, what have you laid up for your later years after so much hardship? What is to support you when these hands are no longer able to perform your daily task?" Ask him these questions; and when the feelings of his heart will permit him, I doubt not but he will give you this reply: "It is true, my child, I toil hard, but it is not for myself! My own wants could be easily supplied. I want but little, not that little long; but I labour for my boy, I weary myself for my girl, that they may be comfortable, and that I may give them some useful learning to fit them for their future walk through life. This has always been my care, and it was not possible for your mother or me to make any reserves for that time when the infirmities of age should lay us aside. Your wants have always swallowed up our little earnings; and the only dependence we look to for these few remaining days or years is the love of our little ones! That is all the treasure we have been endeavouring to lay up in store, and we have spared no pains to increase it."

O, my poor little ones, would not your heart swell at hearing these words, and could you be blundered from clasping your parent's neck, mingling your tears with his, and saying, "Father, you shall have my love!"

But some of you have not a father.

The commandment is beautifully expressive: "Honour thy father and thy mother." The mother is the weaker vessel, and she requires more of your love; her tender heart is more susceptible than a father's, and that would her delicate spirit which would only grieve your father. If she be your only parent, you owe her double love! The father's and the mother's should be offered to her! And O! what is a mother's love! Ask a mother! nay, she cannot tell you, but you may read it in her actions. You forget the time when you were a little loathsome creature, covered from head to foot with the small pox—one mass of putrefaction, disgusting spectacle to every one. Your nearest friends would scarcely touch you. Who but a mother would press the loathsome object to her bosom? Who but a mother could gaze on the spectacle without a feeling of abhorrence? she with increasing love. The more you suffered, the more she loved! the more disgusting you became to others, the nearer she pressed you to her heart. "She could not forget her sickening child." Or when your body was filled with deadly fever, and your very breath tainted the air with impurity and filled the house with infection; when all forsook you, who but a mother would hang over you and breathe the putrid atmosphere, regardless of her own life in the preservation of yours?—O! the love of a mother! Grieve her not! the least token of disregard to her mild restraints will wound her tender frame; will you, then, instead of joy, give her sorrow? You will only know her full worth when you know her want, as I do. For nine long years that sweetest word in human speech could never hang on my lips—"my mother!" O! the true remembrance of the slightest provocation will wound you in the tenderest part, when she is removed! and I do think that such a remembrance would be the angry ghost of me!

From the London Missionary Magazine.

## A CHILD'S SACRIFICE.

FROM A FEMALE MISSIONARY.

In Dr. Leifchild's interesting speech at Exeter Hall, in February last, he proposed a plan, which I could not but at once approve and admire. It was, to form an Auxiliary Society, in which the names of children, as soon as they could understand, were to be enrolled, and to continue until they arrived at their majority. He said, "I believe there are thousands of little ones, throughout the country, of both sexes, who would be glad to be enrolled for some amount." Now, I could not help thinking at the time I read it, that in this respect the poor devoted idolaters here afford a striking example, worthy of the imitation of Christians. I scarcely ever remember meeting a procession for idolatrous worship, that there was not a number of children bearing some part in it. On one occasion I met a man and a woman, with three children, on their way to Anoo's Temple. I asked them where they were going?—They said, "To make pojin," or worship. I asked "Why?" They said, "One child had been sick; they did make vow, and were going to pray." I said, "Why, for such a little child?" They smiled, and said, "Why not?" The man carried in one hand a fowl, for sacrifice; and with the other led a little boy about six years old, who had in his hand three sweet potatoes.—On his shoulder the man carried a little girl, about three years old, who had in her hand a cocoa nut. The woman carried a brass plate, with a little rice, some saffron, a little sugar, and some flowers. She had an infant about twelve months old; and O, ye Christian mothers, think with compassion on this little one, who also had his sacrifice for the devil. In his little hand it carried a plantain. I asked, "What it was for?" They replied, "It is for sacrifice" (p. 108.) They looked satisfied with themselves. They thought, by doing this, they should so far secure the favour of the demon, that no evil should befall them. Oh, how I longed to lead them to Him who is the friend, and not the foe, of our little ones; who, though the mighty God, has said, "Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." Christian mothers, will you not teach your little ones to do something for the cause of Him who has died for them? If it is worth no more than a plantain, you may teach them, as did this heathen mother,—"It is for sacrifice." Endeavor to sow in their young warm hearts the seeds of benevolence, and teach them, as one of their earliest lessons, "that it is more blessed to give than to receive."

And oh, my beloved children and young friends, will you allow me to appeal to your benevolent feelings on behalf of these poor, neglected, and destitute little girls and boys, whose souls, you know, are worth more than a world! Perhaps you will say, "Well, but I cannot save their souls." No more can I; but we can direct them to Him who can, and will, if they seek Him. Many of these poor children have been rescued from scenes of the greatest misery and distress. Great are the cruelties and sufferings that some of them have endured. Many were brought to us during the famine, almost dead; it was some time before they recovered, but now most of them are tolerably well. We have a large school-room for them, in which they are taught, and sleep, for in this country they do not require beds, as they do in England, but they sleep upon a little mat. They take their meals in the verandah, without knives or forks, which curry and rice do not require.—They eat out of a little earthen catty, or dish, and if you could see some of their little merry faces, you would say they were quite as happy as many young ladies in a boarding-school in England.

From the New York Observer.

## PARTING LESSON, FROM A TEACHER TO HIS PUPIL.

Obey the gospel, as follows:

1. Know thyself a sinner.
2. Confess all thy sins before God.
3. Pray for pardon in the Saviour's name.
4. Pray for grace to forsake all sin.
5. Forsake it as fast as possible.
6. Do every thing commanded by God your Father, and Christ your Saviour.
7. Remember "the chief end of man," viz: "To glorify God, and enjoy him forever."
8. Read the Bible often; pray always, in private; and regularly attend church.
9. "Do unto others as ye would that they should do unto you."
10. Walk always toward heaven.

C. S. A.

West Vincent, Chester co., Pa., May 3.











## THE COBOURG FEMALE ACADEMY

of the *Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada*, for making up the deficiencies of our  
Circuits which are unable to support their Preachers, &c., and to the general spread  
of the Gospel.

☞ Books, Pamphlets, Cards, Circulars, Blanks, Handbills, Placards,  
Labels, &c. &c., currently, neatly, and expeditiously Printed at this Office.

J. H. LAWRENCE, PRINTER.