



POETRY.

In Memoriam.

In tribute to the Memory of Sergeant Leroy S. Wadsworth, of Houghton, Luzerne county, Pa., who was fatally wounded at the Battle of Gettysburg.

By Mrs. Margaret L. T. Hartman.

The battle was fearfully raging around, The signs of treason outnumbered the brave; When the order was heard through our ranks to surround Onward, now, to the charge! no one to save.

That valor was proved, with layonet's rest, Each rushed on the foe determined to win; When the missiles of death every moment were met, As the foe was endeavoring our forces to thin.

Ah, see! there falls Wadsworth, the noble and brave; If left without care he surely must die; Say, may we not stop our loved comrade to save? We'd carry him back where in peace he might lie.

His voice in its fervor was quick to inspire, That onward they'd press and vanquish the foe— "Go forward brave comrades, never give over, 'Till the base heart of treason receives its death blow."

And onward they charge and leave him alone, Save others like him, who were wounded or slain; But struggle in vain, he fell and no more, Nor ever was heard of his fate to complain.

He thought them of home, of the cherished ones there, Of a father whose kindness and truth he had proved, And of his loved mother—a shade of despair Fitted over his mind as he chafed up the fold.

He knew that his sisters must long for him mourn, Those sisters that he had so often caressed; He knew that his body might to them be borne, To sleep with his kindred, and there calmly rest.

He thought of the prayers he was taught to repeat, Addressed to "Our Father," by loved ones at home; He prayed that all in heaven might meet, Where parting and death should nevermore come.

And of his loved country, the land of the free— Whose freedom to save had cost him his life; He asked that the friends he had left might soon see The Angel of peace bring an end to all strife.

And soon his Redeemer gave tokens of love, A love that is for a time of endless delight— Of infinite bliss in the mansions above, Where peace is eternal and sin can never blight.

His countenance beaming with calm, holy joy, And meekly submissive to Heaven's decree, The prospect of death no more could annoy— He patiently waited his Saviour to see.

His flag triumphant, he heard with delight The strains of victory borne on the air; "Now let me depart to the mansions of light; O God, I entreat, Thou hast answered my prayer."

We weep for the fallen, we miss him on earth And mourn for the good and noble and brave— Affection must ever remember his worth, And tears still bedew and honor his grave.

But not without hope, for faith guides the tomb, We find our support in the volume of Truth; Again he'll appear in an immortal bloom, All radiant with glory and undying youth.

BIBLE VIEW OF SLAVERY.

BY THE REV. JOHN HENRY HOPKINS, EPISCOPAL BISHOP OF VERMONT.

[The following view of slavery from the Biblical point, is from Bishop Hopkins' elaborate letter to George M. Wharton, Esq., and others, of Philadelphia, dated May 2, 1863.]

The word "slave" occurs but twice in our English Bible, but the term "servant," commonly employed by our translators, has the meaning of slave in the Hebrew and the Greek originals, as a general rule, wherever it stands alone. We read, however, in many places, of "hired servants," and of "bondmen and bondmaids." The first were not slaves, but the others were; the distinction being precisely the same which exists in our own day. Slavery, therefore, may be defined as servitude for life, descending to the offspring. And this kind of bondage appears to have existed as an established institution in all the ages of our world, by the universal evidence of history, whether sacred or profane.

This understood, I shall not oppose the prevalent idea that slavery is an evil in itself. A physical evil it may be, but this does not satisfy the judgment of its more zealous adversaries, since they contend that it is a moral evil—a positive sin to hold a human being in bondage, under any circumstances whatever, unless as a punishment inflicted on crimes, for the safety of the community.

Here, therefore, lies the true aspect of the controversy. And it is evident that it can only be settled by the Bible. For every Christian is bound to assent to the rule of the inspired Apostle, that "sin is the transgression of the law," namely, the law laid down in the Scriptures by the authority of God—the supreme Lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy." From his Word there can be no appeal. No rebellion can be so atrocious in his sight as that which dares to rise against his government. No blasphemy can be more unpardonable than that which imputes sin or moral evil to the decrees of the eternal Judge, who is alone perfect in wisdom, in knowledge, and in love.

With entire correctness, therefore, your letter refers the question to the only infallible criterion—the Word of God. If it were a matter to be determined by my personal sympathies, tastes, or feelings, I should be as ready as any man to condemn the institution of slavery, for all my prejudices of education, habit, and social position stand entirely opposed to it. But as a Christian, I am solemnly warned not to be "wise in my own conceit," and not to "lean to my own understanding." As a

Christian, I am compelled to submit my weak and erring intellect to the authority of the Almighty. For then only can I be safe in my conclusions, when I know that they are in accordance with the will of Him, before whose tribunal I must render a strict account in the last great day.

I proceed, accordingly, to the evidence of the sacred Scriptures, which, long ago, produced complete conviction in my own mind, and must, as I regard it, be equally conclusive to every candid and sincere inquirer. When the array of positive proof is exhibited, I shall consider the objections, and examine their validity with all the fairness in my power.

The first appearance of slavery in the Bible is the wonderful prediction of the patriarch Noah: "Cursed be Canaan, a servant of servants shall he be to his brethren. Blessed be the Lord God of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant. God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant." (Gen. 9: 25.)

The heartless irreverence which Ham, the father of Canaan, displayed toward his eminent parent, whose piety had just saved him from the deluge, presented the immediate occasion for this remarkable prophecy; but the actual fulfillment was reserved for his posterity, after they had lost the knowledge of God, and become utterly polluted by the abominations of heathen idolatry. The Almighty, foreseeing this total degradation of the race, ordained them to servitude or slavery under the descendants of Shem and Japheth, doubtless because he judged it to be their fittest condition. And all history proves how accurately the prediction has been accomplished, even to the present day.

We come next to the proof that slavery was sanctioned by the Deity in the case of Abraham, whose three hundred and eighty bond servants, born in his own house, (Gen. 14: 14) are mentioned along with those who were bought with his money, as proper subjects for circumcision. (Gen. 17: 12) His wife Sarah had also an Egyptian slave, named Hagar, who fled from her severity. And "the angel of the Lord" commanded the fugitive to return to her mistress and submit herself. (Gen. 16: 9.) If the philanthropists of our age, who profess to believe the Bible, had been willing to take the counsel of that angel for their guide, it would have preserved the welfare of the Union.

The third proof that slavery was authorized by the Almighty occurs in the last of the Ten Commandments, delivered from Mount Sinai, and universally acknowledged by Jews and Christians as THE MORAL LAW; "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbor's." (Exod. 20: 17.) Here it is evident that the principle of property—"anything that is thy neighbor's"—runs through the whole. I am quite aware, indeed, of the prejudice which many good people entertain against the idea of property in a human being, and shall consider it, in due time amongst the objections. I am equally aware that the wives of our day may take umbrage at the law which places them in the same sentence with the slave, and even with the house and the cattle. But the truth is none the less certain. The husband has a real property in the wife, because she is bound, for life, to serve and obey him. The wife has a real property in her husband, because he is bound for life to cherish and maintain her. The character of property is doubtless modified by its design. But whatever, whether person or thing, the law appropriates to an individual, becomes of necessity his property.

The fourth proof, however is yet more express, as it is derived from the direct rule established by the wisdom of God for his chosen people, Israel, on the very point in question, namely:

"If thou buy a Hebrew servant, six years shall he serve, and in the seventh year he shall go out free for nothing. If he came in by himself, he shall go out by himself. If his master have given him a wife, and she have borne him sons or daughters, the wife and the children shall be her master's and he shall go out by himself." (Exod. 21: 2-4.) Here we see that the separation of husband and wife is positively directed by the divine command in order to secure the property of the master bond-maid and offspring. But the husband had an alternative, if he preferred slavery to separation. For thus the law of God proceeds: "If the servant shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife and my children; I will not go out free; then his master, shall bring him un-

to the judges; he shall also bring him to the door or unto the door-post; and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl, and he shall serve him forever."—(Exod. 21: 5, 6.) With this law before his eyes, what Christian can believe that the Almighty attached immorality or sin to the condition of slavery?

The treatment of slaves, especially as it regarded the degree of correction which the master might administer, occurs in the same chapter, as follows: "If a man smite his servant or his maid with a rod, and he die under his hand, he shall be surely punished. Notwithstanding if he continue a day or two he shall not be punished; for he is his money." (Exod. 21: 20, 21.) And again, "If a man smite the eye of his servant or the eye of his maid, that it perish, he shall let him go free for his eye's sake. And if he smite out his man servant's tooth, or his maid servant's tooth, he shall let him go free for his tooth's sake."—(Exod. 21: 26, 27.) Here we see that the master was authorized to use corporal correction toward his slaves, within certain limits. When immediate death ensued, he was to be punished as the judges might determine. But for all that came short of this, the loss of his property was held to be a sufficient penalty.

The next evidence furnished by the divine law appears in the peculiar and admirable appointment of the Jubilee.

"Ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land to all the inhabitants thereof: it shall be a Jubilee unto you, and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man to his family." (Lev. 25: 10.) This enactment, however, did not affect the slaves, because it only extended to the Israelites who had "a possession and a family," according to the original distribution of the land among the tribes. The distinction is plainly set forth in the same chapter, namely:

"If thy brother that dwelleth by thee be waxen poor, and be sold unto thee, thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bond servant, but as a hired servant and as a sojourner he shall be with thee, and shall serve thee unto the year of Jubilee, and then shall he depart from thee, both he and his children with him, and shall return unto his own family, and unto the possession of his fathers shall he return. For they are my servants which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt; they shall not be sold as bondmen. But thy bondmen and bondmaids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are round about you: of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids. Moreover, of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land, and they shall be your possession. And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession: they shall be your bondmen for ever; but over your brethren, the children of Israel, ye shall not rule one over another with rigor. For unto me the children of Israel are servants; they are my servants whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt: I am the Lord your God." (Lev. 25: 40-46, with v. 55.)

The distinction here made between the temporary servitude of the Israelite and the perpetual bondage of the heathen race, is too plain for controversy. And this express and positive law furnishes the true meaning of another passage which the ultra abolitionists is very fond of repeating: "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee: he shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose, in one of thy gates where it liketh him best: thou shalt not oppress him." (Deut. 23: 15, 16.) This evidence must be referred to the case of a slave who had escaped from a foreign heathen master, and can not, with any sound reason, be applied to the slaves of the Israelites themselves. For it is manifest that if it were so applied, it would nullify the other enactments of the divine Lawgiver, and it would have been an absurdity to all the people that they should "buy bondmen and bondmaids of the heathen and the stranger to be their possession and the inheritance of their children for ever," while, nevertheless, the slaves should be at liberty to run away and become freemen when they please. It is the well known maxim, in the interpretation of all laws, that each sentence shall be so construed as to give a consistent meaning to the whole. And assuredly, if we are bound to follow this rule in the legislation of earth, we can not be less bound to follow it in the legislation of the Almighty.

The meaning that I have adopted is the only one which agrees with the established principle of legal construction, and it has invariably been sanctioned by the doctors of the Jewish law, and every respectable Christian commentator.

Such, then is the institution of slavery, laid down by the Lord God of Israel for his chosen people, and continued for fifteen centuries, until the new dispensation of the Gospel. What change did this produce? I grant, of course, that we, as Christians, are bound by the precepts and example of the Saviour and his apostles. Let us now, therefore, proceed to the all-important inquiry, whether we are authorized by these to presume that the Mosaic system was done away.

First, then, we ask what the divine Redeemer said in reference to slavery. And the answer is perfectly undeniable: HE DID NOT ALLUDE TO IT AT ALL. Not one word upon the subject is recorded by any of the four Evangelists who gave His life and doctrines to the world. Yet slavery was in full existence at the time, throughout Judea; and the Roman empire, according to the historian Gibbon, contained sixty millions of slaves, on the lowest probable computation! How prosperous and united would our glorious republic be at this hour, if the eloquent and pertinacious declaimers against slavery had been willing to follow their Saviour's example!

But did not our Lord substantially repeal the old law, by the mere fact that he established a new dispensation? Certainly not, unless they were incompatible.—And that he did not consider them in that light is clearly proved by his own express declaration. "Think not," saith he, "that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets. I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." (Matt. 5: 17.) On that point, therefore, this single passage is perfectly conclusive.

It is said by some, however, that the great principle of the Gospel, love to God and love to man, necessarily involved the condemnation of slavery. Yet how should it have any such result, when we remember that this was no new principle, but, on the contrary, was laid down by the Deity to his own chosen people, and was quoted from the Old Testament by the Saviour himself? And why should slavery be thought inconsistent with it? In the relation of master and slave, we are assured by our Southern brethren that there is incomparably more mutual love than can ever be found between the employer and the hiredling. And I can readily believe it, for the very reason that it is a relation for life, and the parties, when rightly disposed, must therefore feel a far stronger and deeper interest in each other.

The next evidence which proves that the Mosaic law was not held to be inconsistent with the Gospel occurs in the statement of the apostles to St. Paul, made some twenty years, at least, after the establishment of the first Christian church in Jerusalem. "Thou seest, brother," said they, "how many thousands of Jews there are who believe and they are all zealous of the law." (Acts 21: 20.) How could this have been possible, if the law was supposed to be abolished by the new dispensation?

But the precepts and the conduct of St. Paul himself, the great apostle of the Gentiles, are all sufficient, because he meets the very point, and settles the whole question. Thus he saith to the Ephesian: "Servants, [in the original Greek bond servants or slaves] be obedient to them that are your masters, according to the flesh with fear and trembling, in singleness of your hearts, as unto Christ. Not with eye service, as men pleasers, but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart with good will doing service, as to the Lord, and not unto men, knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free. And ye masters, do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening, knowing that your Master also is in heaven, neither is there any respect of persons with him." [Eph. 6: 5-9.]

Again to the Colossians, St. Paul repeats the same commandments "Servants, [that is, bond servants or slaves] obey in all things your masters according to the flesh not with eye service, as men pleasers, but in singleness of heart, fearing God." [Col. 3: 22.] "Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal, knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven." [Col. 4: 1.]

Again, the same inspired teacher lays down the law in very strong terms, to Timothy, the first Bishop of Ephesus:—"Let as many servants as are under the yoke," (that is, the yoke of bondage), "count their own masters worthy of all

honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them because they are brethren, but rather do them service because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort. If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness, he is proud, knowing nothing, but dotting about questions and strife of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmises, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness. From such withdraw thyself. But godliness with contentment is great gain. For we brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out, and having food and raiment, let us be therewith content." (1 Tim. 6: 1-8.)

Lastly, St. Paul, in his Epistle to Philemon, informs him that he had sent back his fugitive slave, whom the apostle had converted to the Christian faith during his imprisonment, asking the master to forgive and receive his penitent disciple. "I beseech thee for my son Onesimus," saith he, "whom I have begotten in my bonds, which in time past was to thee unprofitable, but now profitable to thee and to me, whom I have sent again: thou therefore receive him that is mine own bowels, whom I would have retained with me, that in thy stead he might have ministered unto me in the bonds of the gospel. But without thy mind would I do nothing, that thy benefit should not be as it were of necessity, but willingly. For perhaps he therefore departed for a season, that thou shouldst receive him forever, not now as a servant, but above a servant, a brother beloved, specially to me, but how much more to thee, both in the flesh and in the Lord. If thou countest me therefore a partner, receive him as myself. If he hath wronged thee or oweth thee ought, put that on mine account. I Paul have written it with mine own hand. I will repay it; albeit I do not say to thee how thou owest unto me, mine own soul besides."—(Ep. to Philemon 5: 10, 19.)

The evidence of the New Testament is thus complete, plainly proving that the institution of slavery was not abolished by the Gospel. Compare now the course of the ultra abolitionist with that of Christ and his inspired apostle. The divine Redeemer openly rebukes the sanctimonious Pharisees, "who made void the law of God by their traditions." He spares not the wealthy, infidel Sadducees. He denounces the hypocritical Scribes, who "loved the uppermost rooms at feasts and to be called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi." He calls the royal Herod "that fox," entirely regardless of the king's displeasure.—He censures severely the Jewish practice of divorcing their wives for the slightest cause, and vindicates the original sanctity of marriage. He tells the deluded crowd of his enemies that they are "the children of the devil, and that the lusts of their fathers they would do." He makes a scourge of small cords, and drives the buyers and sellers out of the temple. And while he thus rebukes the sins of all around him, and speaks with divine authority, he proclaims himself the special friend and patron of the poor—preaches to them his blessed doctrine, on the mountain, by the seaside, or in the public streets, under the open canopy of heaven—heals their diseases, partakes of their humble fare, and, passing by the rich and the great, chooses his apostles from the ranks of the publicans and the fisherman of Galilee. Yet he lived in the midst of slavery, maintained over the old heathen race, in accordance with the Mosaic law, and uttered not one word against it! What proof can be stronger than this, that he did not regard it as a sin or a moral evil? And what contrast can be more manifest than this example of Christ on the one hand, and the loud and bitter denunciations of our anti-slavery preachers and politicians, calling themselves Christians, on the other? For they not only set themselves against the Word of God in this matter, condemning slavery as the "monster sin," the "sum of all villainies," but—strange to say—they do it in the very name of that Saviour whose whole line of conduct was the very opposite of their own!

Look next at the contrast afforded by the inspired Apostle of the Gentiles. He preaches to the slave, and tells him to be obedient to his master for Christ's sake, faithful and submissive, as a main branch of religious duty. He preaches to the master and tells him to be just and equal to his slave, knowing that his Master is

in heaven. He finds a fugitive slave, and converts him to the Gospel, and then sends him back again to his old home, with a letter of kind recommendation. Why does St. Paul act thus? Why does he not counsel the fugitive to claim his right to freedom, and defend that right, if necessary, by the strong hand of violence, even unto death? Why does he not write to his disciple, Philemon, and rebuke him for the awful sin of holding a fellow-man in bondage, and charge it upon him, as a solemn duty, to emancipate his slaves, at the peril of his soul.

The answer is very plain. St. Paul was inspired, and knew the will of the Lord Jesus Christ, and was only intent on obeying it. And who are we, that in our modern wisdom presume to set aside the Word of God, and scorn the example of the divine Redeemer, and spurn the preaching and the conduct of the apostles, and invent for ourselves a "higher law" than those holy Scriptures which are given to us as "a light to our feet and a lamp to our paths," in the darkness of a sinful and polluted world? Who are we, that virtually blot out the language of the sacred record, and dictate to the Majesty of heaven what he shall regard as sin, and reward as duty? Who are we, that are ready to trample on the doctrine of the Bible, and tear to shreds the Constitution of our country, and even plunge the land into the untold horrors of civil war, and yet boldly pry to the God of Israel to bless our very acts of rebellion against his own sovereign authority? Woe to our Union when the blind become the leaders of the blind! Woe to the man who dares to "strive against his Maker!"

Yet I do not mean to charge the numerous and respectable friends of this popular delusion with a willful or conscious opposition to the truth. They are seduced, doubtless, in the great majority of cases, by the feelings of a false philanthropy, which palliates, if it can not excuse, their dangerous error. Living far away from the Southern States, with no practical experience of the institution, and accustomed, from their childhood, to attach an inordinate value of their personal liberty, they are naturally disposed to compassionate the negro race, and to believe that the slave must be supremely wretched in his bondage. They are under no special inducement to "search the Scriptures" on this particular subject, nor are they in general, I am sorry to say, accustomed to study the Bible half as much as they read the newspapers, the novel and the magazine. There they find many revolting pictures of slavery, and they do not pause to ask the question whether they are just and faithful. Perhaps a fugitive comes along, who has fled from his master, and who, in justification of himself, will usually give a very distorted statement of the facts, even if he does not invent them altogether. And these good and kind-hearted people believe it all implicitly, without ever remembering the rule about hearing both sides before we form our opinion. Of course, they sympathize warmly with the poor, oppressed African, and are generously excited to hate the system of slavery with all their heart. Then the eloquent preacher chooses it for the favorite topic of his oratory. The theme is well adapted to rouse the feelings, and it is usually by no means difficult to interest and gratify the audience, when the supposed sins of others, which they are under no temptation to commit, are made the object of censure. In due time, when the public mind is sufficiently heated, the politician lays hold of the subject, and makes the anti-slavery movement the watchword of party. And finally the Press follows in the wake of the leaders, and the fire is industriously fanned until it becomes a perfect blaze; while the admiring throng surround it with exultation, and fancy its lurid light to be from heaven, until the flames begin to threaten their own security.

Such has been the perilous course of our Northern sentiment on the subject of slavery. The great majority, in every community, are the creatures of habit, of association and of impulse, and every allowance should be made for those errors which are committed in ignorance, under a generous sympathy for what they suppose to be the rights of man. I can not, however, make the same apology for those who are professionally pledged to understand and inculcate the doctrines of the Bible. On that class of our public instructors, the present perilous crisis of the nation casts a fearful responsibility. Solemnly bound by their sacred office to preach the Word of God, and to follow Christ and his apostles, as the heralds of

"peace and good-will to men," they seem to me strangely regardless, on this important subject, of their highest obligations.—But it is not for me to judge them. To their own Master, let them stand or fall.

Thus, then, I have examined the various topics embraced in your inquiry, and the conclusion which I have been compelled to adopt must be sufficiently manifest.—The slavery of the negro race, as maintained in the Southern States, appears to me fully authorized both in the Old and New Testament, which, as the written Word of God, afford the only infallible standard of moral rights and obligations. That very slavery, in my humble judgment, has raised the negro incomparably higher in the scale of humanity, and seems, in fact, to be the only instrumentality through which the heathen posterity of Ham have been raised at all. Out of that slavery has arisen the interesting colony of Liberia, planted by slave holders, to be a place of refuge for their emancipated bondmen, and destined, as I hope, to be a rich benefit, in its future growth and influence, to Africa and to the world. I do not forget, and I trust that I do not undervalue, the missionary work of England and our own land, in that benighted continent. But I believe that the number of negroes Christianized and civilized at the South, through the system of slavery, exceeds the product of those missionary labors, in a proportion of thousands to one. And thus the wisdom and goodness of God are vindicated in the sanction which his word has given, and the sentence originally pronounced on Canaan as a curse has been converted into a blessing.

I have now gone over the whole ground covered by your kind application, and would only here repeat that on the question of slavery, which lies at the root of all our present difficulties, I have obeyed the rule of conscience and of duty, in opposition to my habits, my prejudices, and my sympathies, all of which would tend strongly to the other side. I need hardly say that I am no politician. More than forty years have elapsed since I ceased even to attend the polls. But as a Christian, I am bound to accept the doctrine of the apostles for my guide. And as a citizen, I am bound to sustain the Constitution of the United States, and defend those principles of law, and order, and friendly comity, which every State should faithfully regard in its relations to the rest.

In conclusion, I would only say, that I am perfectly aware how distasteful my sentiments must be, on this very serious question, to the great majority of my respected fellow-citizens, in the region where divine Providence has cast my lot. It would assuredly be far more agreeable if I could conscientiously conform to the opinions of my friends, to whose ability, sincerity, and zeal I am ready to give all just commendation. But it would be mere moral cowardice in me to suppress what I believe to be the truth, for the sake of popularity. It can not be long before I shall stand at the tribunal of that Almighty and unerring Judge, who has given us the inspired Scriptures to be our supreme directory in every moral and religious duty. My gray hairs admonish me that I may soon be called to give an account of my stewardship. And I have no fear of the sentence which He will pronounce upon an honest though humble effort to sustain the authority of His Word, in just alliance with the Constitution, the peace, and the public welfare of my country.

With the fervent prayer that the Spirit of Wisdom, unity, and fraternal kindness may guide our National Congress, the Legislatures of the several States, and the sovereign will of our whole people, to a happy accommodation of every existing difficulty.

I remain, with great regard,  
Your faithful servant in Christ,  
JOHN H. HOPKINS,  
Bishop of the Diocese of Vermont.

HUMAN NATURE.—Some wise man singly remarked, "there is a good deal of human nature in man." It crops out occasionally in boys. One of the urchins in the schoolship Massachusetts, who was quite sick, was visited by a kind lady.—The little fellow was suffering acutely, and his visitor asked him if she could do anything for him. "Yes" replied patient, "read to me." "Will you have a story?" asked the lady. "No" answered the boy, "read the Bible; read about Lazarus;" and the lady complied. The next day the visit was repeated, and again the boy asked the lady to read. "Shall I read from the Bible," she inquired. "Oh no," was the reply, "I'm better to-day; read me a love story.—New Bedford Standard,