PRESBYTERIAN BANNER & ADVOCATE.

Presbyterian Banner, Vol. V, No. 51.
Presbyterian Advocate, Vol. XIX, No. 46.

"ONE THING IS NEEDFUL:" "ONE THING HAVE I DESIRED OF THE LORD:" "THIS ONE THING I DO."

WHOLE NO. 259

DAVID McKINNEY, Editor and Proprietor.

PUBLICATION OFFICE, GAZETTE BUILDING, FIFTH STREET, ABOVE SMITHFIELD, PITTSBURGH, PA.

Philadelphia, 111 South Tenth Street, below Chestnu

TERMS.—IN ADVANCE.

FOR THE WEEK ENDING SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1857.

By Mail, or at the Office, $1.50 per Year. } SEE PROSPECTUS.
Delivered in the City, 1.75 " " }

Original Poetry.

I Knew Not the Way.

Through trials and dangers, in doubts and distress,
I still will press onward to full happiness.:
The Lord, he hath help'd me, Ebenezer, I cry,
In him is my trust, on him I rely.
As I look o'er the past, I still must exclaim,
Hitherto hath he helped me, oh bless ye his name!
Without him, I'd wandered and gone far astray,
T is God that hath led me, I knew not the way.

When 'mid darkness and sorrows I travel'd along,
How oft' hath he cheer'd me and made this my song!
He 's before me, he leads me, the pathway is bright,
My sun hath arisen and vanish'd the night."
And now when I look back, again I exclaim,
The Lord, he hath helped me, oh bless ye his name!
Without him, I 'd wandered and gone far astray,
T is God that hath led me, I knew not the way.

When my journey is ended, and death cometh nigh,
He 'll bid all my doubts, all my terrors to fly;
Thy Saviour is with thee, to give thee his aid—
T is I, thy Redemer, then be not afraid."
His voice thus shall cheer me, and I will exclaim,
Thou hast known me, oh Saviour, and call'd me by name;
Without thee, I'd wander and go far astray,
Bless'd Jesus, still lead me, I know not the way."

And in heaven, at last, I shall fall at his feet;
In him I'll be safe, in him be complete;
All the ways of my life, before me he 'll place,
The way he hath led me, with joy I will trace.
Oh then, as I look back, with shouts I'll exclaim,
"Thou *always* hath help'd me, I bless thy dear name;
Without thee, my Saviour, I 'd gone far astray,
T is *thou* that hast led me, I knew not the way."

S L.C.

For the Presbyterian Banner and Advocate.

Infant Baptism.—No. 9.

We have not yet noticed a remarkable passage of Scripture which the Baptist brethren have never yet been able to explain in any way conformable to their scheme. Says the Apostle Paul, "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else were your children unclean; but now are they holy."—1. Cor. vii: 14.

In this passage the appellatives *unclean* and *holy* are placed in contrast one with the other, so that the meaning of the one determines the meaning of the other. The word translated *unclean* (AKATHARTOS) occurs just thirty times in the New Testament. In connexion with the history of the conversion of Cornelius, it is three times used to signify ceremonial uncleanness; but in no less than twenty-three other instances it is applied to impure spirits, or devils. According to Tertullian, the children of heathen parents were, from their birth, devoted to the idol gods; and were hence regarded by the Christians as *consecrated* to impure demons, and therefore *unclean*. And this we apprehend is the sense in which the word is used in the passage under consideration. If both parents were heathen, the children were reckoned among the adherents of the heathen deities.

THE CHILDREN OF BELIEVERS, HOLY.

The word rendered *holy* (HAGIOS) occurs two hundred and twenty-seven times in the New Testament; and though often used to express moral purity, it is very frequently employed to signify *consecration to the Lord*. Thus, the temple and its precincts are styled the "holy place," (*hagios topos*) because dedicated to the service of God. And it is remarkable that this is the word which is used more frequently than any other, to designate the members of the Christian Church. It is employed for this purpose no less than thirty-eight times, in the Epistles and Acts of the Apostles. Thus how often do we meet with such phrases as these: "All the churches of the saints (*hagion*); "The saints (*hagioi*) at Lydda;" "To all the saints (*hagiois*) that are in Achaia;" "To the saints (*hagiois*) that are in Ephesus;" "All the saints (*hagioi*) salute you;" "Ministering to the saints" (*hagiois*); "Salute—all the saints" (*hagious*). In these and a great multitude of other places, the word is applied indiscriminately to all members of the Christian Church, of whatever description. Nor is there a single instance in which the appellative is bestowed upon a person not belonging to the Church. The propriety of this application of the term is apparent, because all who are embraced in the visible Church, are externally *consecrated* unto the Lord. In this sense we believe the word is applied to the children of believing parents. They are born in the Church, belong to the Lord, and are therefore "holy" (*hagia*). The words of the Apostle in the passage under discussion, may therefore be paraphrased thus: "Otherwise your children would be accounted adherents of the heathen idols; but now they belong to the Lord as members of his visible Church." Those who would have the Apostle to mean, "Else were your children *illegitimate*, now are they *legitimate*," make him to reason most absurdly; for they represent him as proving the lawfulness of the marriage, by the legitimacy of the children! Worse than this, they make him to say that if neither parent is a believer, the children are illegitimate!!

It is worthy of notice that Tertullian, whom our opponents, without reason, claim as a Baptist, in commenting on the above passage, observes, "that every soul is accounted in Adam until it is enrolled in Christ, and till then is *unclean*." And this he says is "according to the sentence of our Lord, 'Unless any one is born of water,'" &c.—*De anima, c.* 39.

RECAPITULATION.

Having now touched upon the principal arguments in support of infant baptism, it will not be amiss to bring together the results of our examination.

1. We have seen the groundlessness of the calumny that infant baptism is a relic of Popery, and have recognized the fact that it was constantly practiced by all the ancient sects, even those who were most hostile to Rome. Then, turning to the early history of the Church, we traced the baptism of infants up to the apostolic age.

2. We examined the inspired history of the Apostles' doings; and found that of the eight individual baptisms they have recorded, no fewer than five were attended with the baptism of the whole family. This remarkable proportion could not have been the result of accident. Moreover, so far as the record goes, the Apostles never, in a single instance, baptized the head of a family, without admitting the whole family to that ordinance. Facts like these were found irreconcileable with the supposition that the Apostles were Baptists.

3. In designating the families they baptized, the Apostles uniformly made use of a word which was commonly understood to mean *the children* of a family, and was actually so understood by the Christians of early times.

4. The Lord Jesus, when preparing his disciples to fulfill their great commission, instructed them that little children or infants belonged to his visible Church, or kingdom; and he so worded his last command to baptize, as to include persons of all ages. Accordingly the Apostles, on the day of Pentecost, when they fully opened the Gospel dispensation, in their exhortations to baptism, joined parents and children together as alike sharers in the precious promise made to their fathers.

5. The Apostles regarded the Christian Church as a simple continuation of the Jewish, and therefore set up no new organization; the Christian Church being nothing more nor less than the Jewish, purged of its Apostate members. They also clearly taught that the Church is the same under both dispensations, possessing the same religion and sustaining the same relation to God. Infant membership having been originally established by the authority of God, and never revoked, remained in full force under the new dispensation. Consequently, the right of infants must still be recognized by admitting them to baptism. It was seen moreover, that the principle adopted by our opponents, will go to exclude females from the communion, and infants from salvation.

In conclusion, we must notice an objection or two.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

1. It is asserted by our opponents, that baptism, considered in its Scriptural import, cannot apply to infants. That ordinance, say they, supposes that the subject of it is a believer in Christ, has obtained remission of sins, and been regenerated by the Holy Spirit; none of which things can be affirmed with certainty of an infant. But do they not see that this objection bears with equal force against the propriety of infant circumcision, and is, therefore, an indirect impeachment of the wisdom of God? Circumcision, the Apostle tells us, was "a seal of the righteousness of faith;" (Rom. iv: 11) that it was a sign of inward holiness; "circumcision is that of the heart," (Rom. ii: 29) and that it imposes obligations of obedience, binding the subject "to do the whole law."—Gal. v: 3. Let us ask our good brethren, how could any of these things apply to an infant of eight days old? The proper answer to this question will satisfactorily explain the applicability of baptism to infants.

2. "What good can it do to baptize an infant?" In turn I ask, what good can it do to baptize an adult? If it be urged that adults can comprehend the nature of the ordinance, and the obligations they incur; I reply, so can parents understand the responsibilities they assume in giving up their children to God in baptism. And so can the children themselves in due season be made sensible of the privilege and the duty, arising out of their early dedication to the Lord. An inspired apostle proposes the question, "What profit is there of circumcision"—(Rom. iii: 1). His own answer is "*Much every way*." And this is our reply to those who hold up to ridicule what they style *infant sprinkling*, and in tones of defiance exclaim, "What good can it do?" MUCH EVERY WAY; quite as much as infant circumcision did. To believing parents who present their children to God in baptism, that ordinance seals, confirms, ratifies that gracious covenant in which God promises to take a special interest in the welfare of the children of his believing people; to take them to himself if they die in infancy, or, if he spare them to riper years, displays his readiness to bestow on them all the blessings of salvation. It imposes corresponding obligations upon the parents in regard to the religious instruction of their children, who are thus introduced into the school of Christ to be trained for his service. It stimulates them to the performance of duty, by holding out the pleasing expectation that through the promised blessing of God upon their labors, their beloved offspring may be partakers of those rich blessings of which baptism is a sign. To the children themselves, so soon as they are able to understand anything, their own early baptism represents the necessity of remission of sins, of faith, repentance, and new obedience in order to eternal life, blessings which can be enjoyed only through the blood of Christ, and the operation of his Spirit. Moreover, as they have had the seal of the covenant placed upon them, they are bound by peculiarly solemn obligations, to seek for and possess the rich blessings held out in that covenant. Just as circumcision formerly bound its infant subjects to obey the law, so under the present dispensation, baptism binds its infant subjects to obey the Gospel. Nor is the obligation weakened by the circumstance that they were too young to yield their assent at the time of baptism. It is a principle adopted in all enlightened governments, that children owe obedience to laws to which they have never given their consent; and surely no one can be too young to be brought under the most solemn obligations to love, serve, and glorify the Lord his God.

L. N. D.

P. S.—In the first line of the last No., instead of "the ancient Corinthians," read, "the ancient Cerinthians."

In taking leave of the subject with which he has so long occupied the columns of the *Banner and Advocate*, the writer desires gratefully to acknowledge the almost perfect accuracy with which his communications have been printed.

THE WILBERFORCE UNIVERSITY for colored people, in Ohio, has concluded its last term with about fifty students. This is unexpectedly successful; the prospect is now favorable for a large increase the next term.

For the Presbyterian Banner and Advocate.

Evidences of Regeneration.

Letter V.—The Unpardonable Sin.

Light is sown for the righteous, and gladness for the upright in heart.—Ps xcvii: 11.

MY DEAR FRIEND:—The promises of God are sure; and though his people may be in occasional darkness, they shall have light and gladness. Their faith may be tried, but God is true, and his Word can not fail. Now, faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.—Heb. xi: 1. But if men had their way, there would be no room for faith; they would walk all the way to heaven by sight or by feeling, and give up their hope whenever their nerves are deranged, or the East wind blows; just as if God changes with our varying health, or with the wind. God changes not; and when he begins a work of grace, he will carry it on to its completion. He will perfect that which concerneth his people.—Ps. cxxxviii: 8. The new creature, which is his own workmanship, is immortal; it will live for ever, because God will keep the renewed soul by his own power; and the union between it and Christ, as it was legally formed in the Divine purpose from eternity, and spiritually consummated here in time, in the execution of that purpose, shall never be dissolved; I say the union between Christ and his people shall never be dissolved; the members shall abide in the Head, and rest with him for ever. Then let them trust in him here, under all circumstances; in sickness and in health; in trial, in life, and in death. All things shall work together for their good. Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.—1. Pet. i: 3—5; Rom. viii: 28—39.

Yet some tender consciences are distressed with the fear that they have committed the unpardonable sin; and they ask with deep anxiety, What is it to commit the unpardonable sin? or what is that sin which shall never be forgiven? A few words on this point may not be out of place here. There is a Bible Dictionary in your Sabbath School Library, and this says: "The sin unpardonable probably consists in a deep and malignant opposition to God; in attributing the operations of the Holy Spirit to Satan's influences; in a settled and fixed hatred to the teachings and restraints of religion; and all this made manifest by perseverance in this reprobate condition. While there is reason to believe that many now commit the unpardonable sin, yet it is not likely to be chargeable on those who are painfully apprehensive that they have committed it." See Bible Dictionary, published by the Presbyterian Board.

Where this sin is spoken of in Matthew, twelfth chapter, you will see that the enemies of Christ attributed his works to Satanic influence. This was a great sin, yet it might be forgiven. In this connexion the Saviour speaks of the sin against the Holy Ghost, which he declares shall not be forgiven.—Matt. xii: 22—37. Hence it would seem that this sin is treating the Holy Ghost as the Jews treated Christ, so far as is possible, or as the differences of circumstances will allow. As they attributed the works of Christ to Satan, so the sin against the Holy Ghost is attributing his works to Satanic influence; and the reason why this sin is never forgiven is, because the Holy Ghost is thus resisted and grieved away, and leaves the guilty ones to hardness of heart and blindness of mind forever—2. Cor. iv: 3, 4. It is unpardonable, because never repented of; no sin, truly repented of is unpardonable; and any sin unrepented of must for ever be unpardoned. Where the unpardonable sin is, there is no repentance, for repentance is the fruit of the Spirit, and he is grieved away by the sin against the Holy Ghost, which attributes his works to Satanic influence, just as the Jews attributed Christ's works to Satan.

If this view is correct, then this sin involves a denial of the inspiration of the Scriptures, and of all experimental and practical religion; and just attributes the whole to the devil. Besides, the Saviour calls it blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, and speaking against the Holy Ghost; hence it is not only entertaining such sentiments in our hearts, but uttering them, reviling and blaspheming; and persevering in this course against light and admonitions, and without remorse. Now, I have known professors of religion to live without the Bible in their house; but very seldom, indeed, are the members of our churches so lost to propriety and to shame as to blaspheme the Holy Ghost, and attribute his works to Satanic influence; and especially those whose consciences are so tender and whose lives are so exemplary as are those of the ones who so earnestly propose this question, and who are exercised with this fear. Far from it. Nor are anxious inquirers after salvation likely to be those who are guilty of the unpardonable sin. For they who commit this sin never repent of it; they are never sorry for it; their consciences does not trouble them; they are not agitated about it; they never feel condemned; they have no anxiety; they are given up of God and are lost. The Spirit, resisted, grieved, blasphemed, and all his works attributed to the Evil One, has taken his final departure; and there is henceforward no fear, no anxiety, and, of course, no hope. The miserable soul is lost forever. The fact, therefore, that one fears he has committed this sin, and is distressed about it, is a very good evidence that he has not committed it.

The mind sympathizes with the body, as well as the body with the mind. As mental trouble may affect the health, so a little derangement of the physical system may fill the mind with gloom; and often what is needed is not religious instruction, so much as a little rest, and perhaps a little medicine. Get the body right, and the mind in healthy action, and then religious truth may have its appropriate influence, and there may be peace and joy; or if there be not rapture, there may be composure, and the calm of religious satisfaction; and then a life of piety will afford the best evidence of a change of heart, as it will show that old things are passed away, and all things become new.—2. Cor. v: 17.

I knew an aged minister, now gone to his rest, who once went into the pulpit gloomy and dejected, oppressed with the fear that he should be damned; when he began his sermon, his anxiety and agitation were so great as to bring blood from his nose; and with the first drop of blood his fears were gone. His body was wrong, and hence his mind was distressed. The loss of blood tended to rectify his system, and then his mind was rectified. To keep both mind and body right, it became necessary for him to abstain entirely from animal food; and there may be times when partial abstinence would be good for others.

I remember, too, when a beloved sister of mine brought me her open Bible, and wanted to know if she had committed the unpardonable sin; but disease was then at work with her brain, a deranged physical system brought gloom upon her spirit, and in a few short months she was in heaven! I hope it may not soon be thus with you, nor with those near you, who propose this question; but rest and medicine may possibly in these cases be better than a hundred letters, or whole volumes of advice. Try it!

But surely I have gone where I did not expect to go when I began this letter, even to the grave of the early dead. But it is good sometimes to wander. One has beautifully said of those who die early, "they are like the lambs that the Alpine shepherds carry in their arms to higher and greener pastures, that the flocks may follow!" It is of these the spouse speaks when she says, My Beloved is gone down into his garden, the Church, to gather lilies—Sol. Song vi: 1—3. He takes them from the embrace of earthly friends, only that they may be nearer to himself; he transplants them from his garden here below to the garden above, where they shall flourish for ever, and where no rude blasts shall ever smite them more. They rest in his bosom—the bosom of his love. There may we rest!

YOURS, TRULY.

From our London Correspondent.

The French Emperor and the Council Table at Osborne—The Danubian Principalities—Russian Designs—French Policy—Crisis at Constantinople—France and England Fast Allies—Royal Visits Indefinitely Postponed by the King of Naples and the Emperor of Austria—The Reasons Why—The Crisis Solved at Osborne—Miss Madeleine Smith again, and keen Partizanship—The Indian Revolt—The "Cassandra" Prophet—Recommendations—The Sparing Mercy of God—Effect of the Revolt on Commerce—Compensations—The Policy of the Future, as to India—Death of Dr. Blomfield—His Career and Character—A Better Man—The Free Church a Great Fact—Mr. Bright's Election for Birmingham—The Atlantic Telegraph—Latest from India.

LONDON, August 13, 1857.

THE VISIT OF THE FRENCH EMPEROR, to which I briefly alluded in my last, although strictly private in its character, and confined to the Queen's residence and Park, in the Isle of Wight, has yet had a decided political significance. While Louis Napoleon's would be assassins were being sentenced, after trial, in Paris—one to transportation for life, and two others to fifteen years' imprisonment—Palmerston, the Premier of England, and Clarendon, our Foreign Secretary, with Walewski, the French Ambassador, and another French Minister, were gathered around a Council Table at Osborne House. What was the cause of this grave conclave's deliberations, at which, it is to be presumed, both the Emperor and the Queen were present? Know, then, that the question of the Danubian Principalities was under discussion. They are nominally under Turkish rule; but the population, by a large majority, belongs to the Greek Church, and look to Russia with veneration. Russia strongly advocates the union of the Principalities, and the placing of a native Prince, who would be her creature and puppet, on the throne. Some say the French Emperor is for the union, with the view of having a French Prince appointed. England opposes the union of the Principalities—thus backing Austria, who fears the re-establishment of Russian influence on her borders; and Turkey, which, besides being reluctant to modify her sovereign rights, believes that the same encroaching policy which led Nicholas to discuss the dismemberment of the body of "the sick man" as soon as he should die, would attempt to regain, by diplomacy, what was lost by war.

Louis Napoleon, in *his* policy on this matter, has no notion of playing into the hands of Russia. This visit to Osborne was intended to prove this to our Queen and Cabinet. His cousin, the Prince Napoleon, whom the Emperor might wish to see on the throne of the Principalities, is a thorough partizan of the English Alliance, and detests Russia so heartily, that he treated the Grand Duke Constantine, at the time of his visit to Paris, with considerable disrespect, and actually went to Bailin to be out of his way. Meanwhile, the Ambassadors of Russia, France, and Sardinia, have been trying to coerce the Sultan, and to overthrow the Ministry, and Lord Stratford's influence and policy. So that the Conference at Osborne comes in time to prevent great mischief, and we hope it will do so. At all events, Russia is told that the two powers who carried on the war against her, till she was driven away from her intended prey, will not permit her to presume upon their division; and that they will still firmly oppose her aggressive designs.

Royal visits to England are not likely to take a wide sweep for some time to come, in the present state of Europe. The King of Naples certainly neither desires nor *dares* to come. A very *warm* reception certainly would be given the tyrant, and the stern shout of freemen in his ears, and the "curses, not loud, but deep," which would assail the Pope—blessed persecutor and oppressor, and torturer of helpless prisoners—would make him prefer even a shower-bath of Vesuvian cinders, and a walk along the edge of the burning crater, to the streets of Britain's metropolis.

As to Francis Joseph, of Austria, the story goes, (and I believe a true one,) that when the Archduke was here in a ship of war, last year, he sounded our Ministers as to whether a visit from his royal brother would be acceptable and popular. After a due amount of diplomatic bowing, and expressions of the desirableness of the thing in the abstract, the Archduke was politely informed that the proposal seemed not very feasible. The people of England had not forgotten that while, during the war, Austria stood by with folded arms, our soldiers, scanty in numbers, were pouring out their blood like water, and that she had all the advantage and none of the suffering or the peril. Other considerations were added, no doubt. But besides these, Austria, as many of us remember, trod down, by Russian aid, both the civil and religious liberties of Hungary; she expelled the English missionaries and the Bible from the Hungarian Capital, and thrust them out from her borders, as if they were things leprous and defiling. Austrian statesmen, therefore, have *not* found a welcome response to their soft dalliances in behalf of their Royal Master, and the old High party among them are beginning to turn their eyes to Russia, penitent, once more. Thus it is, that despotism, cowardly, cunning, and selfish, holds sway in Europe; afraid of its own shadows, and amid bristling bayonets, trembling on the verge of a precipice!

It will be a great disappointment to Austria, as well as Turkey, to find that the late elections in Moldavia, against which France protested as unfair, have, from evidence laid before our Cabinet by the Emperor, at Osborne, been virtually ignored by England. It has been agreed to recommend to Turkey, that a fresh election, perfectly free, shall be permitted to take place. Probably she must yield to this, but it does not follow that our Ministry is committed to any ulterior French policy.

THE SPIRIT OF PARTIZANSHIP which was manifest in the celebrated trial of Miss Madeleine Smith, has not yet disappeared. Rather let me say, that there are two parties who have their decided opinions, and who are taking further measures to bring them out, with justifying and sustaining facts before the world. Thus, on the side of Miss Smith, (who still remains in Scotland,) a Solicitor in Edinburgh, who got up her case for Counsel, is said, by the *Scottish Press*, to be preparing an elaborate collection of facts, which will go to prove, with the force of demonstration, that she could not be, and was not a murderess. If this is done, it would be a great satisfaction, certainly. The alternative remains, however, that L'Angellier, her lover, was a suicide. He *did*, according to evidence, sometimes speak of destroying himself. This, however, it is said by some, is a proof that he did not do so, as persons who talk in this way are too great cowards to execute their threats! And upon this, out comes an article from the pen of Mr. Peter Bayne, the successor of Hugh Miller in the editorship of the *Witness*, strongly arguing that persons who *talk* about killing themselves, *do*, oftimes, make good their words, and gives a case in point, from among his own acquaintances, when he was studying for the bar, at the Temple, in London. But L'Angellier's memory has its determined vindicators, also. The *Glasgow Herald*, a grave and most respectable family paper, gives expression to their feelings and views. They quote the evidence of two or three landladies in favor of the young man's excellent moral character, and are taking means, by examination of his earlier antecedents, to strengthen their position, that he did not die by his own hands.

The more the public reflects on the causes of THE INDIAN REVOLT, the more fatuous seems to have been the course of the Supreme Government, as well as of the Directors at home. The late Sir C. Napier prophesied the very calamities which have come to pass; but he was, as he said himself, "the Cassandra of India." He denounced the maintenance, at Delhi, of "a phantom King, at vast expense," as forming "a rallying point round which gathered the dreams of discontented princes." With reference to European troops, he would have had "twelve thousand at Delhi, as the magazines there must be powerfully defended, and that great Mohammedan city powerfully controlled." He would have made it the "grand magazine for supplies to all the troops stationed between the Upper Ganges and the Upper Sutledge," and "ten thousand men at Meerut" (the first scene of the recent outbreak,) "to support Delhi, and to form a reserve, in case of a war either with Nepaul, or with Gholeb Sing. Meerut should also be the headquarters of the artillery, if Delhi be not accepted." With Delhi, filled with Sepoy mutineers, murdering their officers, and all Europeans they could lay their hands on, including women and children, and "powerfully defended," not *for* us, but against; and "Meerut supporting Delhi" with a vengeance—verily we have played the fool, and have been punished accordingly. And what is most deplorable, is, that many of the officers perished, deceived by the protestations of Sepoy loyalty. One commanding officer, who had ridiculed the suspicions of others, found out his mistake, when too late, and then blew out his brains.

That total destruction of the English in India has not been the issue, is only to be accounted for by the mercy of God, who turned into foolishness the counsels of the mutineers. And so writes a Church missionary minister: "If the Lord had not been on our side—we are fifty thousand Europeans to one hundred and eighty-six millions of heathen—why they could swallow us up quickly." Then, the dispatch of our troops *to China*, as we thought, *but to India*, as Providence intended, is another illustration of the ways of Him who in wrath remembers mercy.

The effect of the revolt on commerce, has been also discussed. For some time past about £12,000,000 of exports have annually gone to India, of which more than one-half were delivered at Calcutta, for the supply of Bengal, and the North-Western provinces. The reduction of this, even by a half, would be sensibly felt. But even such a result would not be wholly uncompensated. Heretofore, to an enormous extent, specie has been demanded for Indian produce, instead of English goods; the result is, that there has been an alarming and most injurious drain of some seven or eight millions annually, of the precious metal. This drain will cease, at least in part. Add to this *what* I noticed in my last, the forfeiture of the enormous and extravagant salaries paid to native princes, who have been plotting against us. This sum would pay the interest of a loan of eight or nine millions sterling. What has been done to send out troops, is extraordinary. Taking in the past and future of this year, thirty thousand British troops will be in India by November. Thirty militia regiments are to be raised in England immediately. The *Times* has a very striking article on this subject, as well as on the future of English policy in India. Life and treasure are not to be wasted for nothing; reforms in India must be prompt; "nests of Mohammedan intrigue" must be put down, and security obtained.

As to the rule of the East India Company, its days seem to be numbered. It is difficult, however, to perceive how a Minister for India could act from Downing Street, any better than the Company of Directors at Leaden-hall Street, London. There must still be a Governor-General and Supreme Council at Calcutta. It is also certain that English troops alone cannot garrison India. Colonel Sykes believes the Sepoys may yet be found worthy of confidence. Thus the English troops will become a military police, as well as a permanent and trustworthy reserve. [illegible]

THE DEATH OF DR. BLOMFIELD, who retired in September last from the Bishopric of London, naturally induces a notice of his career and character. He was the son of a schoolmaster at Bury St. Edmonds, was sent to Cambridge in 1803, and there distinguished himself speedily as an eminent classical scholar, as well as mathematician. He became a Fellow of his College. He afterwards took orders, became a London rector, and held many other posts of influence and emolument. In 1824 he became Bishop of Chester, and in 1828 Bishop of London. He proved himself a good controversialist in answer to Charles Butler's work in favor of Romanism, and published lectures on the Acts of the Apostles, charges and sermons. He also took a prominent part in the agitation for the better observance of the Lord's day, and *that*, I would say, was the most honorable part of his history. He was especially active, as well as liberal, in connexion with, and at the head of, a movement for building new churches. But in the distribution of his patronage he was not friendly to the Evangelical party, and thus High Churchmen or Tractarians oftimes obtained the new incumbencies, and were either useless or actively mischievous. When the *Tracts for the Times* were published, his policy was a trimming one, like that of almost every Bishop in England. Never did Episcopacy, as such, prove its incapability more strikingly than in that great crisis. Charles James, of London, condemned, but it was with reserve. Apostolical succession he did not ignore; nay, he went so far as to recommend the wearing of the white surplice (a relic of Rome,) in the pulpit, instead of the usual black gown; and on that point the Islington clergy nobly resisted and defeated him. Afterwards he acted out his compromise policy in the case of Bennet at Knightsbridge, and in sanctioning (or not seeing) crosses, &c., in the new church, when he consecrated it. He deserved credit, however, for prosecuting Oakley, the minister of St. Margaret's, Westminster, who held his living while preaching Roman doctrine, until the Bishop, by a suit in the Ecclesiastical Courts, expelled him.

The Oakley just mentioned, is now "Father Oakley," of St. John's Popish church, Islington, the accredited missionary of Cardinal Wiseman, whom, ere now, I have seen at Moorfield's Cathedral, holding a holy candle in his hand, during Requiem Mass for the slain Romanists in the Crimea! Thus "evil men and seducers wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived."

The Bishop of London dissented from the decision of the Gorham case, as he believed that baptizmal regeneration was *not* an open question, and that the Church's formularies taught it, as unquestionably they do. He was a strange compound; very much of a despot, but yet having Evangelical leanings, which increased and deepened, I trust and believe, up till his dying day.

We have now got a true Protestant and a consistent man in his room, not formally identified with the Evangelicals, free from their mannerisms, of a catholic spirit, and displaying a manly and healthy policy, as well as true piety.

The *Times* was one of the fiercest opponents of the Evangelical and Non-Intrusion party in Scotland, in 1843. But now it extracts into its columns a paragraph which proclaims to the whole world that the FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND IS A GREAT FACT. It is as follows:

THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.—From an inaugural address, recently delivered by the Rev. Dr. J. J. Wood, at Dumfries, it appears that, while at the Disruption of the Established Church of Scotland in 1841 there were only four hundred and seventy-eight ministers who abandoned their preferments and emoluments, the Free or "Secession" Church, now (1857) numbers no less than eight hundred and one ordained ministers, and eight hundred and eighty-one congregations, including both "sanctioned charges" and stations, and that about one-third of the church-going population of Scotland belong to its communion. In the first year of its existence, the sustentation fund amounted to £68,704; for the year ending May, 1857, it had reached the sum of £108,792.

MR. JOHN BRIGHT, the rejected of Manchester, at the last general election, has been just chosen to represent the borough of Birmingham. Mr. Bright is a vehement orator, and has been the pugnacious apostle of peace at any price doctrines, both in and out of the house. Again and again, in the last Parliament, did he protest against the war with Russia, and wash his hands of the bloodshed thereby incurred. Now that his health is somewhat restored, and his two years prescribed repose being almost up, he sends word to the Birmingham people that, while he thinks India has been mismanaged, he is for the insurrection being put down by military force, as a stern necessity. He says nothing against the continued manufacture of weapons of war in the capital of the midland counties; and the *Times* indicating that he will be wanted next year in Parliament, to support the new Reform Bill, he is unanimously elected. He will not take his seat till next Spring. It is well in a free country to have all classes represented. Mr. Bright is earnest and honest, but his school is a cold-blooded one, utilitarian to the core, and has no sympathy with Evangelism whatever.

THE ATLANTIC TELEGRAPH.—At a banquet at Valentia, in Kerry, inaugurating the undertaking, the Irish Lord Lieutenant (once well known in America as Lord Morpeth, now the Earl of Carlisle,) spoke with great power and beauty, and with an intense kindliness of feeling toward the United States. A Romish Bishop also—superior to his fellows in charitable feeling as he is in genius—poured forth an oration full of poetry and enthusiasm, closing with an allusion to the telegraph wire passing not over the troubled and ever restless bosom of the ocean, but through the calm and unruffled depths, where all is tranquility and peace, thence indicating its grander use in cementing, in hallowed brotherhood two mighty nations.

But shall it succeed? The *latest* news is, that yesterday morning, at the time the conducting vessels were probably four hundred miles from the Irish shore, the communication with the shore, previously incessant, had suddenly ceased! This is very painful, and I confess that the experiment seems very doubtful in its results. May our apprehensions prove unfounded!

And now for THE LATEST NEWS FROM INDIA, just received by telegraph. It is as follows: Up to the 12th of [illegible] been made, but had been repulsed with great slaughter. The city was said to be full of wounded men, and cholera to prevail. The insurgents had attempted to oppose the march of troops from the North-West, and had been defeated in two engagements. There were about six thousand British troops and five thousand trusty native troops before Delhi. The first of the intercepted regiments, on their way to China, had landed at Calcutta. At that place *the native bankers were hopeful*. The mutiny, however, had appeared in nine fresh places in Bengal, it is feared with disaster to Europeans, as elsewhere.

The Bombay and Madras armies are obedient and loyal. Troops will probably be sent at once across the Isthmus of Suez, to meet steamers from Bombay, and five regiments will probably go from the Cape of Good Hope to India. The crisis is a grave one. The *next* mail will be intensely longed for. The hand of God is upon us, in chastisement, and he calls us to repent and consider.

J. W.

Facts and Gleanings.

"A CUP OF COLD WATER."—In one of the interior provinces of India there is said to be a man, who every morning goes to a distant trough standing by the roadside, and filling it with water, returns to his daily duties. The caravans passing that way call and slake their thirst—he never knows whom he blesses, and they never know their benefactor. He is satisfied that some weary pilgrims are refreshed by his kindness, but who they are, it matters not. They will never return to reward him personally, but his reward is the consciousness of having done a generous act.

A LIVELY EMBLEM OF HEAVEN.—O what cheerfulness, strength and pleasure did the primitive Christians reap, from the unity of their hearts in the way and worship of God! Next to the delight of immediate communion with God himself, there is none like that which arises from the harmonious exercises of the grace of the saints in their mutual duties and communion with one another. How are their spirits delighted and refreshed by it! What a lively emblem is there of heaven! The courts of princes afford no such delights.—*Flavel.*

GOOD ADVICE:

In reading authors, when you find
Bright passages that strike your mind,
And which, perhaps, you may have reason
To think of at another season,
Be not contented with the sight,
But take them down in black and white;
Such a respect is wisely shown,
To make another's sense one's own.
In conversation, when you meet
With persons cheerful and discreet,
That speak or quote in prose or rhyme,
Things facetious, or sublime,
Observe what passes, and anon,
When you come home, think thereupon;
Write what occurs, forget it not—
A good thing saved 's a good thing got.

EXERCISES IN THE CATECHISM.—The great advantage of these is, that they secure the doctrinal instruction of the young. And for this there is—there can be—no substitute. Religious history is good, and the precepts of religion are good, and general religious knowledge is good; but doctrine is not only good, but it is better—nay, best. Doctrine is the substance of history, of precept, of all religious knowledge. Children brought up on sound doctrine are of more mature and vigorous growth, better able to comprehend the preaching of the Word, and thus in a position more favorable to salvation. And when regenerated, they are far more likely to continue steadfast in the faith, and to adorn their calling.

A GLORIFIED SPIRIT.—Would you know *what I am doing?* I see God; I see him as he is, not through a glass darkly, but face to face; and the sight is transforming; it makes me like him. I am in the sweet employment of my blessed Redeemer, my Head and Husband, whom my soul loved, and for whose sake I was willing to part with all. I am here bathing myself at the springstead of heavenly pleasures and joys innumerable, and therefore weep not for me. I am here keeping a perpetual Sabbath; what that is, judge by your short Sabbaths. I am here singing hallelujahs incessantly to him who sits upon the throne, and rest not day or night from praising him.—*Mathew Henry.*

JUDGE NOT HASTILY.—I have been into the studio of a painter. He had an unfinished sketch in hand. Did I judge of his merits as an artist by that unfinished sketch? No. To have done so would have been quite unfair, and he might properly have complained that I did him injustice. "Wait," he would have said, "till the piece is completed, till I have exhausted upon it all my skill—till it has received the last touches of my pencil."

Thus God calls us relative to his works—"to judge nothing before the time." And yet we act very differently. We pass sentence upon his proceedings while yet they are in a state of progression. Wait till his designs are accomplished. Wait till his plans are fully executed. Wait "till the period of the restitution of all things." Wait till God has done; till the Divine limner has finished; and then the production of infinite wisdom and benevolence will speak for itself.—*Religious Herald.*