

Correspondence.

BAPTIST BIBLE.\*

BY H. W. WARNER.

A friend has placed in my hand a pamphlet copy of John's Gospel, out of what is called the new Baptist Bible. It is conspicuously marked "Soldiers' Edition," as if intended for making military Baptists; not, I hope, to fight for immersion, but more probably to take service in the immersionist cause upon a peace establishment. It seems that great masses of men in the field, the majority of them in a state of religious uninstruction that exposes them to become easy dupes of misguidance, are to be made to read about John, "the immerser," and how Jesus "made and immersed more disciples than John," till they shall be brought insensibly to the conclusion that putting into water (and not simply baptizing with it) is the chief function of a sinner-saving ministry. Of course it will be naturally inferred that there is vital importance in the form and manner of the ceremonial, inasmuch that baptism by affusion or sprinkling will have to be regarded as an idle rite, and they who have nothing better to rely on must be *anabaptized*, that is, baptized again, and with a sufficiency of the liquid element to leave no sinful hairbreadth of their bodies dry. "Not my feet only," said misreasoning Peter, "but also my hands and my head."

Have our worthy friends, the Baptists, adopted the Romish and Episcopal conceit, that baptism is regeneration? I suppose not. I suppose they deem the water a mere symbol, just as we do. And if so, what possible difference can it make whether there be much or little of the element employed, and whether it be applied to the convert, or the convert to it? In the nature of things, a few drops, for any truly symbolical purpose, must be as good as an ocean. But they tell us, the question is settled by authority; for that *baptize*, the Gospel term, means *dip, plunge, immerse*. Well, if it does, why not retain the word? What need of a translation? The plausible answer is, to make the meaning plainer. Does not this answer mask another not so readily avowed? The Baptists are a party in the Church—a pretty zealous party; and immersion is their argument of proselytism. Would it not be a stroke of policy to proselyte the Bible itself, and send it forth propounding the argument to everybody, as if from the very battlements of heaven? A "Soldiers' edition" might then be expected to do something.

I admit that *baptizo* means immerse. On the other hand I aver, that like thousands of words in every language, it has one or more other meanings equally well established, and in particular, that of washing or cleansing by water. No scholar will deny this. Whether, therefore, dipping or washing, immersion or affusion, be the proper force of the term in reference to the water sacrament, is a fair question for debate. And it has been debated for centuries. Learned men on both sides have tried conclusions upon it, without definite result. Not that there was no preponderance of reason one way or the other, but because partisan predilections were too strong for reason. Nor is the controversy ended yet. Perhaps it never will be. And just in these circumstances the new-version Baptists have seen fit to beg the question, and to carry their snappish judgment into stereotype execution, making Scripture of it in the very face of the disputants.

Which seems to me a false step. It is not the true way of settling controversies in the Church of God. Snap-judgments seldom stand the test of review. And in the present case, Baptists themselves are not agreed as to the propriety of the proceeding, which is understood to have been the occasion of a serious division among them. In my opinion it is a proceeding which the rest of Protestant Christendom will not divide upon, but will condemn it universally.

Protestant Christians ought not to have two competitor versions of the Bible. It is a sad spectacle, and of ill omen. We could have gone on amicably enough with the established word *baptism*, for our common rite of Church initiation; a word as thoroughly English, and as perfectly comprehended by all, as any other that can be named. Its Greek origin is no objection to it. And it has the special advantage of being matured and ripe in sacramental import—an advantage of unspeakable importance, and to which no substituted word can pretend. Perhaps its equal adaptation to the use of all may have been the very thing that some could not abide.

Whether to conceal the precise object of the new version, or to give the enterprise a literary aspect, the changes introduced, instead of being limited to a particular subject, cover the whole field of Bible phraseology; not in general altering the sense, but making havoc with the style. *Ex pede Herculeum*, however; I judge only from the book of John, where amendment (or the conceit of it) rambles over everything with a license that is perfectly marvellous. Had the writers no settled love for Scripture language? No relish for its peculiar forms of diction? No aesthetic piety? They run their little ploughshare into all the green banks of the holy book;

and almost always without a motive which the mischief done does not condemn as inadequate. The smallest things are meddled with, and upon the smallest considerations. Grammatical conformity of English to Greek in the tenses of verbs, in the insertion or rejection of articles, in the use of prepositions, and even in the collocation of words, without the least allowance for notorious differences in the genius of the two languages, has been the apparent object of innumerable tamperings with the standard text. The result is consequently neither Greek nor English, but a mongrel intermediate between them.

If I am wrong in this opinion, a few examples will show it. In John iii. 26, for the phrase, "thou barest witness," (imperfect tense), we are required to read, "thou hast borne witness," (in the perfect), as grammatically truer to the original; the writer seemingly taking for granted, first, that the two languages are alike in their economy of tenses, and secondly, that tense for tense is an imperative law of correct translation; both which assumptions are wide of the truth. Sense and not technicalities is the translator's law. And as for the affinities of Greek and English grammar, they are less in nothing than in verb-inflections. The Greek perfect in particular is often well rendered by our imperfect.

Again, (v. 23,) "ye sent unto John, and he bear witness to the truth." In place of which the new version gives us, "ye have sent to John, and he has borne witness," &c. A similar painstaking after tense exactness, and a similar failure to improve the text. Indeed it is plainly a change for the worse, aggravated by an affectation of superior accuracy.

Again it is written, (vi. 5,) that Jesus "lifted up his eyes and saw a great company come unto him." For which the immersionists have substituted this: "Jesus thereupon lifting up his eyes, and seeing that a great multitude is coming to him," &c. But here the elder text is palpably the more correct even in their own technical point of view; for the tense of the Greek is first aorist, to which our imperfect answers well, while their present does not. The whole passage in their version is a metamorphosis, but I confine myself just now to one class of changes.

In verse 32 of this chapter we read: "Moses gave you not that bread from heaven." The new-version gentlemen prefer to say, "Moses has not given you the bread from heaven." Why? School-boy accuracy again in the matter of tenses. And yet, as often happens to that sort of accuracy, it is a blunder on its face. We do not apply the perfect tense of verbs to persons a thousand years dead. *Has given* implies the present existence of the giver, however completely past the donation. Suppose the Saviour had said, "Moses smote the rock;" would it do to substitute "*has smitten*?"

In verse 62 we have this declaration, "the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit." The new-versionists say, "the words which I have spoken," &c. And here, for a wonder, they are the violators of the schoolboy rule; for the Greek verb is *lalo*. Did they mistake it? Again, (xvii. 4,) "I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do," is our reading; whereas the new version has it, "*I finished*,"—equivalent to "*I did finish*,"—in fancied obedience to the supposed law of tenses; and yet without conforming to that law, the tense of the original verb being, not imperfect past, but first aorist, a very different thing. And that the style is murdered by the innovation every one must feel.

I might go on indefinitely in this line of trivialities, but will pass to another. "Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan," are words (iii. 23,) addressed to John the Baptist. The new version inserts an article—"beyond the Jordan;" probably because the Greek original does the like; as if the use of articles in Greek were a fit rule for our practice, which it certainly is not. We have two articles, the Greek but one. And even as regards the article common to us and it, there is no manner of agreement between its idioms and ours. Idioms are almost never alike in any two languages. They are, therefore, for the most part intranslatable. The Latin has no article at all. What would new-version Baptists do with our articles in a translation from the Vulgate? The ancient Greeks prefixed their article habitually to a variety of words which our idioms do not allow us to distinguish in that way. They used it constantly before proper names. The Paul, the Barnabas, the Christ, the God, the Jordan, are all alike regular in Greek. But in English it requires a special context, either in word or thought to make any of them regular. We may say, the God who made us, the Paul who was converted on his way to Damascus, the Jordan river, or the Jordan, with river understood. All this is well enough. But to proper names independently used, it is false English to prefix the article. At all events, whether we shall prefix it or not is a point to be settled by our own usages exclusively. "Beyond Jordan" is as good English as "beyond the Jordan," with river understood. So that the innovation referred to is without reason, and, of course, as touching sacred things, against reason.

"I receive not testimony from man," said Jesus (John v., 34.) The new version twists it thus: "I receive the witness not from man." There is here a difference of collocation clearly for the

worse; a difference of word-fancy in putting "witness" for "testimony" as if in pure caprice; and a difference of article-using, that gives a definitive turn to the meaning, and so perverts it. I have a right to ask, what "witness" in particular? And as this cannot be shown, the perversion is manifest.

Again we are told, (vi. 3,) that Jesus having passed over the sea of Galilee, "went up into a mountain." Which, however, the reformers render, "went up into the mountain," in servile copy from the Greek. I wonder they stopped there. John's words, exactly metaphrased, run thus: "The Jesus went up into the mountain." Why not copy both articles? As reasonably both as one. Besides, our "*the*" is always a definite or definitive article, and never fitly used without a defining purpose, that is, to indicate some object in particular, which is not the case with the Greek article. As, then, there are more mountains than one beyond the sea of Galilee, and close by it, the definite article in English cannot be properly applied till it is known to which.

A like mistake occurs in verse 4 of this chapter. "The passover, a feast of the Jews, was nigh." So runs the standard text. But the new version calls it "*the feast of the Jews*;" as if there was but one. A blunder, certainly, and like many others, a Greek-idiom blunder.

Verse 31 gives yet a further instance. "Our fathers did eat manna in the desert," is exchanged for "our fathers ate the manna in the desert." Good enough Greek, but not good English translation.

So, in vii. 24, instead of "judge righteous judgment," the new Bible-makers hellenize very awkwardly, "judge the righteous judgment."

And in verse 42 of this chapter, for "Hath not the scripture said that Christ cometh of the seed of David?" they give us "Did not the scripture say?" (our imperfect for second aorist Greek,) "that the Christ comes of the seed of David?"

Again, viii. 12, our Saviour's promise, "He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness," seems to have suggested to these critics some particular darkness, and they thrust in a "the" to point it out; misguided doubtless by their skill in Greek.

In v. 35, however, they depart from the analogy of the original language, substituting our indefinite article for the Greek definite so called. Which is worthy of note as a virtual acknowledgment that the Greek article has not always a defining office.

But enough also of this class of bauls. I proceed to prepositional peculiarities.

John v., 25, has the expression, "is passed from death unto life." The reformers say, "*out of death into life*." I know not why, unless they deem this close conformity to "*ex*" and "*in*" in the original. Which however is contradicted by their own practice in other cases. Thus, in i. 11, "they say of Christ that he 'came to his own,'" although "*ex*" is there the Greek preposition; and in many places they give us "*from*" for "*ex*," as in iii. 31 and vi. 32, for instances. It seems, therefore, that "*out of death into life*" is but a caprice, and an affectation of variance from the standard text.

Again, in vi. 50, the substitution of "*out of heaven*" in place of "*from heaven*" is a variance of like character. And there are numerous other cases of the sort.

The preposition "*ev*" ministers also to their love of singularity. Christ is said to have baptized with the Holy Ghost. They write, "*in the Holy Ghost*." Perhaps they are constrained to this by their word "immerse," which takes the place of "baptize." But again our version runs, (xvii. 17,) "sanctify them through thy truth." The same preposition in the original, and the same dative case after it. Yet here the reformers persist in putting "*in*" for "*ev*." And what is surprising, they drop the pronoun "thy," which is an authentic portion of the passage. So that their version is, "sanctify them in the truth." Do they suppose that "*ev*" never means with or through? How will they render "*ev* *ev* *proσωπι* *hai* *σφραγια*," in Matt. xvii. 21, "*ev* *δολω*," in Mark xiv. 1, "*ev* *δix* *αδελφω*," in Acts xi. 14? In short, they are mistaken. And pity if they were not; for "sanctification in the truth," if it mean anything, means sanctification in scripture, which is not quite intelligible.

(To be Concluded.)

LETTER FROM EAST TENNESSEE.

Meeting of Kingston Presbytery.—A Retrogressive Member—Holston Presbytery—One of the "Disjecta Membra" Provided For—Contrasts in Nine Years—Union Presbytery—New Colored Presbyterian Church Organized—Maryville College—Hymn and Tune Book—Northern Ministers Welcome—New State Convention.

MARYVILLE, E. TENN., April, 1866. MR. EDITOR.—Since I wrote to you, Kingston, Holston, and Union Presbyteries have held their spring sessions. Kingston Presbytery met at Cleveland, Wm. B. Brown, Moderator. A craw-fish motion was made to reinstate the rebel preachers, which was promptly voted down. From some cause, few of the churches were represented. Rev. Thos. Brown, one of our staunchest loyal men, who held his ground all through the rebellion, was chosen Commissioner to the General Assembly. He always speaks on the side of liberty and truth. Holston Presbytery met at Jonesboro, and selected Rev. F. A. McCorkle Moderator. Rev. Mr. Griffith, of Rogers-

ville, Rev. Samuel McCorkle, of Greenville, Rev. C. Waterbury, of Jonesboro, and Rev. David F. Palmer, late of New River Presbytery, were received, and their names added to our roll. Rev. Mr. Turbutt, of Timber Ridge, was invited to sit as corresponding member. Rev. E. P. Wells was dismissed to an association in Massachusetts. An appropriate minute was adopted with reference to the death of Rev. Samuel A. Rhea, missionary to Persia. Rev. David Palmer enters upon the work of Bible distribution, with his headquarters at Greenville. He is an earnest Christian man, and claims that his sympathies are with our General Assembly. Several churches were added to those under the care of Presbytery. The Assembly's plan of raising Commissioners' Fund was agreed to, and Rev. Mr. Waterbury and Gen. S. Milligan were chosen delegates. Mr. Milligan is a ruling elder of the Greenville Church—one of the Supreme Judges of Tennessee—a most excellent man, and loyal to the core.

Dr. McCorkle and Mr. Rogers neither have a charge. Rev. Samuel McCorkle is preaching to two loyal Old School churches. Mr. Griffith is doing a good work at Rogersville, and is likely to be well sustained. Rev. N. Bachman has been much blessed in his labors in and around Kingsport. Rev. Mr. Waterbury has been elected pastor of the Jonesboro church, and the Presbytery made appointments with reference to his installation. Considerable attention was given to the subject of Christian education. The free conversation on the state of religion was profitable to all. Sabbath-schools and prayer-meetings have generally been revived, and there is a prevailing disposition to contribute more liberally to the support of the Gospel than in former years.

In 1857, scarcely nine years ago, Holston Presbytery met in Jonesboro, to see what action should be taken with reference to the Ross Presbytery Convention to assemble at Richmond. They then adopted the following resolutions:—

Resolved, 1. That slavery is not a permanent or desirable institution, and is to be continued no longer than the good of the master and slave require it.

Resolved, 2. That the Gospel is the remedy for it, and Christians should strive for its removal in the spirit of the Gospel.

Resolved, 3. That during its continuance, masters ought to instruct their slaves so far as the laws of the State will permit, and aim at their moral and religious elevation.

In the spirit of these resolutions, I was sent as a delegate, with instructions to vote against a sectional organization; but the pro-slavery wing carried the day, and the United Synod was thrown upon the world. Its disunion and treasonable record, and its final amalgamation with the Macon Assembly, are matters of history. Slavery is gone, and the glorious Civil Rights bill secures freedom in perpetuity to every American citizen throughout our wide domain.

Union Presbytery met at Maryville, and Rev. Wm. Lyle was chosen Moderator. There was a good representation of the churches, and the meeting was spoken of as one of uncommon interest. Rev. J. Griffies and Elder Jos. Eckol were elected Commissioners to the General Assembly. Rev. P. J. H. Myers, of Dandridge, and Rev. Mr. Le Vere, of the colored church of Knoxville, were received, and enrolled as members of Presbytery. Four Sabbath-schools among the freedmen were reported. During the meeting Rev. Mr. Le Vere preached an effective sermon, and organized a colored Presbyterian church of twenty odd members at Maryville. Resolutions were passed promising a hearty co-operation with the Assembly's Committee in the work of Home Missions. Rev. T. J. Lamar made an interesting report of his agency in behalf of Maryville College, and the friends of the institution determined to do what they could to revive it, and to secure for it a permanent endowment, so that our young men need not go so far from home to acquire a thorough education. Rev. P. M. Bartlett, of Massachusetts, is at present hearing the young men recite, and in the fall session the trustees and faculty will be prepared to accommodate fifty additional students. The library, scattered by the war, is being gathered up again, and, as the railroad connecting us with Knoxville is soon to be built, the friends of the college believe that a bright future is before it.

Rev. F. A. Griswold, of Strawberry Plains, Sunday-school Missionary, preached for us on Sabbath morning, a most excellent sermon. Having known this brother well during years of faithful service in the army, I can confidently commend him and his work to all our churches. Mr. A. Mathes, Presbyterian Colporteur, was also with us, and brought a fine lot of our Committee's publications. The books are beautiful, and excellent as they are beautiful, and he will find the demand for them constantly increasing.

I had furnished the Maryville Church with twenty-five copies of our Hymn and Tune Book, and the brethren were so delighted with the singing that many of them went home determined to have their churches supply themselves with it. The Stated Clerk of Synod reports to the General Assembly twenty-three ministers and forty churches composing the Synod of Tennessee, which exhibits a most encouraging advance since May, 1865. Rev. Mr. Turbutt and Rev. P. M. Bartlett are each preaching to two churches, but they have not yet attached themselves by letter to us.

The brethren who have come to us from the North, find the churches generally ready to co-operate very heartily with them. They are faithful workers, and are building up the kingdom of Christ in our midst. Occasionally a disappointed rebel amuses our people by writing differently to the *Christian Observer*; but that paper has long since lost its welcome among the loyal people of East Tennessee. It is read sometimes, as men read Volney's Ruins, to see how far truth can be misrepresented, but as a disturbing element its power is almost wholly gone. In the last number I read, Rev. N. Hood—an odd if not a feeble brother for the last thirty years—speaks of his touching persecutions from ministers and elders in Union Presbytery, who took no action in his case whatever, notwithstanding his confederate heading. The editor shrewdly enough withheld the name, fearing, perhaps, the record would be against him.

The new State movement appears to be gathering strength. A convention to take action in the premises is called to meet at Knoxville the first Thursday of May. By the time I write you again, matters may take a definite shape. Praying that Congress may stand firm so as to secure the national safety, the overwhelming majority of our loyal people are fixed in their purpose to keep East Tennessee, at least, from falling under rebel control. Let our Christian friends everywhere think of us when they come to the Hearer and Answerer of prayer.

Yours, very truly,  
SAMUEL SAWYER.

ALONE; OR, THE SPECIAL PROVIDENCE OF IMPRESSIONS.\*

BY MRS. SARAH F. HERBERT.

"Did you know Aunt Huldah was sick again with her everlasting influenza cold, as she calls it?"

This question was carelessly addressed by a caller to Mrs. M., the minister's wife, on a certain Saturday afternoon. Now, that same Saturday afternoon found Mrs. M. almost overwhelmed with care and work, being just then without "help," and having two young children on her hands, in addition to all the household labor; the teething baby having also very unceremoniously intruded upon the morning hours, heaping their tasks upon those of the afternoon. Under these circumstances, Mrs. M. was not a little surprised to find herself beset with a strong impression that she ought at once to visit "Aunt Huldah" (so called by everybody), who was an aged and eccentric member of the church, living all alone in an old tumble-down house, on a solitary road, more than a mile from the parsonage. She put the thought decidedly away, at first, feeling that her obvious duty lay directly before her in her own house. But the thought would linger; and when at last the baby went to sleep, with every prospect of a long nap, and the baking was taken from the oven, the impression returned again with fresh power.

"I could go now, only I must sit up till midnight in consequence. It seems as if God were bidding me go; yet I have been taught to be guided by judgment, and not by impressions." So thought the perplexed wife as she went to her husband's study to seek advice. "I think it would be my duty to go, rather than to let you, who are already so overburdened," replied Mr. M. to his wife's statement of the facts; "yet I do not think the case one which would justify me in leaving my unfinished sermon. You know Aunt Huldah is always having her ups and downs, and we have no reason to suppose she is worse than usual. You ought to rest while the baby sleeps; I think, decidedly, you ought not to go."

"I will stay, then," said Mrs. M., turning somewhat sadly to leave the room. "Nay, my love, I would have you guided by your own good judgment," said Mr. M., calling her back. "My judgment, this strange impression aside, tells me not to go to-day; whence then, if not from God, comes this irresistible feeling that I ought and must?" "If you feel so, go by all means," replied Mr. M. "I will have the horse harnessed in ten minutes." "Eddie will sleep till I get home; that is part of my impression," said Mrs. M., smiling, as she took her seat in the chaise, with her older little one at her side.

"Well, go ahead," was the incredulous rejoinder, "and if that fractious baby sleeps two hours, and you find Aunt Huldah dying with her 'influenza cold,' I will believe in 'impressions' as long as I live."

"Has the baby slept?" was the mother's first question, on her return, more than two hours afterward. "Yes, strange to relate, he has fulfilled his part of the contract," replied Mr. M. "How is Aunt Huldah?" "I think she is really very sick this time. I found her up, however; she had just crawled out of bed and kindled a little fire, over which she was shivering this mild day, thinking that she must, and yet could not, go up those old, rickety stairs, into that garret, that isn't safe for a cat to step in, to get meal to make herself some gruel. I keep feeling, in spite of myself, that if I had not gone over she would have fallen up there, and perhaps died alone. She

\* This simple record of facts was suggested by an article entitled "Special Providences," in the *Sunday Magazine*, by Dr. Guthrie, in which he relates several instances, from his own history, of similar providential impressions.

coughs dreadfully, and is so weak it took all my strength to go her into bed."

"What does the doctor say of her case this time?" asked Mr. M.

"She has cried 'Wolf! wolf!' so many times, when there was no danger, that he won't come now that there is," replied Mrs. M. "What word do you think he sent her some days ago, and hasn't been there since?"

"O, I know," replied Mr. M. "The doctor thinks she sends needlessly, and he says no excuse will ever pacify her, but to send her word he is about used up himself with the 'influenza cold,' but will try and get round in a day or two."

"It is too bad," cried Mrs. M., vehemently; "I know her lungs are almost gone. He must be informed how sick she really is. I have made her as comfortable as possible for to-day, and Mrs. W. has agreed to go in every night and morning to see her, and Mrs. N. every day, to prepare her food and attend to her wants, till my help comes, when I mean to make her my special charge; for even now, she is so odd she won't have a nurse, or even let a neighbor watch with her a night. With all her eccentricity, I do believe she is a true Christian. I read those blessed chapters in John to her, and prayed with her, and when I got through, she took my hand in both hers, and said, 'God bless you forever, you dear child, for letting me hear them words, and the voice of prayer, once more before I die.' I said, 'I can't bear to leave you alone.' She replied, 'Not alone deary; didn't you read how he said, I will come unto you? Never think you left me alone.' So I left her."

"I am glad you went," said the minister, "and I will call myself, Monday morning."

When Monday morning came, it brought an imperative call for the pastor to go out of town, for the day, and his wife was left alone with her children. About nine o'clock, while in the midst of her household tasks, she suddenly felt an almost irresistible impulse to go at once and see Aunt Huldah. She put the thought decidedly away, thinking, "It is impossible for me to go this time, for Mr. M. is gone with the horse, so I could neither take, nor leave the children, to say nothing of the work." Still the thought returned with unaccountable urgency, and with it the suggestion to leave the children with a kind neighbor, who was always glad thus to oblige. But pride suggested how strangely such a course would appear, on a busy Monday morning; the conviction was smothered, and Mrs. M. stayed at home with a troubled conscience and a heavy heart.

A few hours went by, and a neighbor called to say that Aunt Huldah had been found dead that forenoon, lying on the floor, beside her bed. "What time do they think she died?" asked Mrs. M., with a choking voice.

"Nobody knows, of course," replied the neighbor, "but she had not been long dead when she was found, towards eleven o'clock. Most likely she died sometime between nine and ten o'clock." Was there not a special Providence in those strange, unconquerable impressions? Should they have been so reluctantly heeded in the one instance, so persistently crushed in the other? If Mrs. M. had sought counsel of her Heavenly Father, instead of her own judgment, would the aged saint have died alone?

Alone? Was it not too a Providence of special mercy, which left these words of healing for the broken heart of Mrs. M. "Did you not read how He said, I will come unto you? Never think you left me alone."

THE CONVICTED JUROR.

In the conversion of sinners God often displays his sovereignty. The most unlikely means are sometimes used to awaken the soul to a sense of its guilt and danger, and to lead it to Christ. During the recent gracious revival in Newark, a gentleman about fifty years of age came forward with his whole household for baptism. His experience before the church was peculiarly interesting and affecting. He stated that he was attending court as a juror, when the Spirit of God touched the springs of thought, and aroused his slumbering conscience. While sitting in the jury-box hour after hour, trying those charged with crime, weighing the evidence, and listening to the appeals of the lawyers, deciding on a verdict, and hearing the sentence pronounced by the judge, the solemn scenes of the judgment came flashing upon his mind. He thought of the hour when he should stand before the bar of God—when his actions would be tried by an impartial Judge, and there would be no possibility of escape through the defect of the law or the eloquence and ingenuity of counsel. So deeply impressed was he with this view of the judgment to come, that when the court adjourned, he went home weeping and in great distress of mind, and calling his wife to her chamber, he fell upon his knees, and cried for mercy. The prayer was heard, and both himself and companion were soon rejoicing in the pardoning love of God. Then followed in succession the conversion of his daughter, son-in-law, and niece.

If a seaman should put about every time he encounters a head-wind, he certainly would be a long time in making a voyage. So he who permits himself to be baffled by adverse circumstances, will never make headway in life. A sailor uses every wind to propel; so should the young man learn to trim his sails and guide his bark, that even the adverse gales should fill its belling canvas, and send it forward on its onward course.

\* Article written shortly before the close of the late war.