

not believe that in Abraham's family, and among Christians in the apostles' days, the right was claimed, and exercised, to deprive the slaves of the blessings of moral and intellectual cultivation and the privileges of domestic society? Indeed, in your third letter, when speaking of a slaveholder, you say, 'he may cultivate their' (the slaves') 'intellects, and improve their morals.' It is conceded, then, that slavery may exist without those evils which you mention. The right, therefore, to commit them is not necessary to ensure the exercise of the original right of the master, and slavery does not confer it as you affirm.

If instead of right you had used the word power, and had asserted the great danger of confiding such irresponsible power in the hands of any man, I should at once have assented. There is quite abuse enough of this authority to make me regret its general existence. But the possession of power is, in itself, neither good nor evil. Were I invested with despotic power over the whole earth, there could be manifestly no guilt in this. Good and evil, right and wrong, would depend on my use of such power. Mr. Birney, the abolition candidate for the Presidency, says, 'He would have retained the authority of an emperor; yet his oppressions, his cruelties would have ceased: the very temper that prompted them, would have been suppressed; his power would have been put forth for good and not for evil.' Now what is this but an avowal that he could, conscientiously, have held a vast population in the most abject slavery—having power over labor, and property, and liberty, and life; and that, in itself, would be no crime? The power of the master I therefore admit. I admit, too, its frequent and shameful abuse, and I unite with you in deploring and condemning this as heinous sin. But to include in the idea of slavery 'the right' to oppress and degrade, is to confound two things entirely distinct, and which really have no sort of connection.

It is urged, however, that slavery is a sin, because it does violate those primary rights which belong to all human beings, and of which none can deprive them without doing aggravated wrong. This is your second proposition, in enforcing which you consider man, (1.) as an immortal being preparing for eternity; (2.) as an intelligent being capable of knowledge; (3.) as a moral agent bound to serve his Creator; (4.) as endowed with personal liberty; (5.) as a fallen creature to whom the gospel is sent; (6.) and, lastly, as sustaining marital and parental relations; and I understand you to affirm, that, in all these respects, slavery is necessarily an outrage on the rights of man. 'To put the matter in a simple light' you suppose one to 'set fire' to his neighbor's house; to shoot him as he comes out of it; to seize his wife and children, and keep them as slaves, and forbid them to read, and consign them and their offspring to mental imbecility, and deny them the knowledge of God: and I understand you to affirm (for otherwise the supposition is wholly irrelevant) that slaveholding necessarily involves all this crime. You then remark, that 'the question before us simply is, whether this would be criminal?' and add, 'I do not see how any intelligent creature can give more than one answer to this question.' And verily, so say I; and my only surprise is, that the very enormity of your premises did not startle you, and cause you to suspect error somewhere, and admonish you that what you supposed to be 'the only question before us,' never was, and never could be, a question at all with any intelligent creature.

You admit that the holiest men in the Old and New Testaments were masters of slaves; but do you believe they were the monsters of wickedness depicted in your portrait, or that they violated all the rights which you have specified? Slavery, then, may exist without inflicting these aggravated wrongs. Again, allow me to refer to your third letter, where the heart of my dear brother argues, (for the heart hath its reasonings, and they are often truer than the slow deductions of the head), and to cite the following language: 'I have known Christian slaveholders who have devoted themselves through life to the welfare, temporal and spiritual, of their slaves, with the spirit of the most self-denying missionaries; and who, I confidently believe, if they could do it with a reasonable prospect of improving the condition of their slaves, would gladly manumit them, and support themselves by daily labor at the North.—Such men and women do honor to human nature. They are the true friends of their race.' Now, here is slavery. Here is no painting of fancy; no impracticable, utopian abstraction; but slavery as you have known it, and others know it to exist. And, is this one of the greatest crimes which can be conceived? Or is it not here conceded, that cases may occur where there is, not only no guilt in the act, but no moral evil in the thing? You agree with me that if slavery be a sin, it is the immediate duty of masters to abolish it, whatever be the result; and I say, too, this is their duty, whatever be the law of the State. Suppose, now, the laws of South Carolina should forbid an adulterer to dissolve his criminal connection; or require one of her citizens living by piracy to continue his desperately wicked career. These enactments are felt by all to be impossible, while no such emotions are excited by laws protecting slavery; a truth of itself showing that, in the instinctive consciousness of mankind, slavery is not necessarily in the category of crimes.—Suppose, however, such a code; and suppose the adulterer and pirate should persevere in their courses, and plead these laws; could you—could even your kind disposition bring you to regard them as innocent? How would it sound to hear my brother say, 'I have known Christian adulterers who have devoted themselves through life to the welfare, temporal and spiritual, of their paramours, with the spirit of the most self-denying missionaries; and who, I confidently believe, if they could do it with a reasonable prospect of improving the condition of their paramours, would gladly leave them, and discontinue the guilty intercourse. Such adulterers do honor to human nature. They are the true friends of their race.'!! In fact, a single glance at the definition of slavery will convince any body, that the argument advanced is precisely like that which proves murder of the most aggravated sort to be criminal, when the only issue is, whether in

any case it be justifiable to take human life. Of all the rights enumerated by you, slaveholding necessarily interferes only with personal freedom; for we have before seen, what is perfectly manifest, that a man may be held in bondage, and yet be treated in every respect as an immortal, intelligent, moral, fallen, ransomed being, yea and a Christian brother, and his conjugal and parental relations be sacredly respected; which I take to be the exact precept of the gospel. The question then is simply this—is it necessarily a crime in the sight of God, to restrict or control that personal liberty which every man is supposed to have in a state of nature?

Most affectionately, dear brother,
Yours,
R. FULLER.

THE RECORDER.

RALEIGH, SATURDAY, FEB. 22, 1845.

TERMS.—Two dollars per annum payable in all cases in advance.
Orders, payments, &c. &c. for the Recorder, by persons visiting Raleigh, may be left at the Book Store of Turner and Hughes.

BRO. JAMES M. THOMAS will please accept of our thanks for his attention, and for his handsome list of new names. The papers are all sent, as ordered, from 1st January.

Died, in Tarboro, Edgecombe county, on the 11th inst., at an advanced age, HENRY AUSTIN, Esq. a worthy citizen, and a highly respectable member of the Baptist church. Brother Austin was the first Treasurer of the N. C. Baptist State Convention. He was an excellent officer, an enterprising church member, and an intelligent and liberal disciple of Jesus Christ. He has left behind him a widow, several children, and a large circle of friends and acquaintances to mourn their loss.

THE CHRISTIAN POLITICIAN.

There is something about this brother Brisbane, which, notwithstanding all his faults, commands itself to our favor. When he takes occasion to remark on the productions of his opponents, he has the magnanimity to insert the articles remarked on—thus giving his readers some chance to see and judge for themselves. The dishonest trickery so commonly resorted to by religious papers down East, of inserting garbled fragments, or suppressing the articles *in toto*, while the said articles are made a theme of remark, and often of misrepresentation, seems not as yet to have been adopted by him. This virtue is so rare in these days of fanaticism, abolitionism, and editorial mischief-making, that we consider it entitled to our special notice and commendation.

We should publish his entire article, but for the fact that a large proportion of our paper is now occupied with the letters of Drs. Wayland and Fuller. It may be observed, however, that most of his remarks relate to the man Torrey, the facts of whose case are well known, and in relation to which there is now no ground for dispute.

On the union of religion and patriotism, he says he concurs with us, provided that, by religion be meant Christianity, and by patriotism be meant philanthropy. We see no need for disputing about words.

The following reply to our questions is entitled to consideration:

Sabbath breakers and gamblers were not in good standing in the apostolic churches. And consequently no exhortations were addressed to them as such. Nor were slaveholders (andrapodistes) in good standing in churches; neither were they ever exhorted by the apostles, to repent, and do justice and love mercy, &c. slaveholders were included as well as Sabbath breakers and gamblers. To this question I answer, Yes. The proof is found in that notable passage, "The law is made for men-stealers." And the word is *andrapodistes*, which without question means dealers in men, or slaveholders. Why it was translated "*men-stealers*" I do not know, since it undoubtedly applies as much to those who buy or sell men, as to those who steal them. And if this be not correct criticism I would thank brother Meredith to set me right. But this is not the only passage that condemns slavery.—If thou mayest be made free use it rather, is as much a condemnation of slavery as though the apostle had directly said, Your master perpetrates a wrong in perpetrating your slavery. As to what is said about Christian masters being exhorted how to act towards slaves in that relation, it is a begging of the question, for that is to be proved.—Christian masters are exhorted in regard to "servants," not "slaves."

Here, it will be observed, the argument is evaded by the denial of the fact, that the persons addressed as masters in the New Testament, were slaveholders. In Dr. Wayland's sixth letter, a document which has been indorsed, we believe, by all abolitionists, both great and small, from Cape Cod to the Pacific Ocean, we read the following:

"In the epistles the relation between *masters* and *slaves* is several times adverted to. I will quote, so far as I remember, all the passages which are considered to be of importance in the settlement of this question." Here follows the quotation of the passages alluded to, among which are 1 Tim. 6. 1-5, and Col. 4. 1.

Here, it will be observed, our friend Brisbane has got to overturn the broad concession of Dr. Wayland, and the thousand and one abolitionists, who cry in his train. When he has done that, if he will come to us, we will hand him over to the Christian Secretary, who will probably be able to show him on his fourth page, among his old advertisements, as much evidence of the fact denied, as they both, with "the friend at our elbow" added to them, will dispose of in some time. When all this shall be gone through with, if our friend B. will come back to us, we may perhaps have something to say about his *andrapodistes*.

But we are told, in reply to our second query, that the apostles did distinctly condemn slaveholding, and that the proof is found in 1 Tim. 1. 10, "The law is made for men-stealers." This is all very well as far as it goes. But still there is one small matter lacking, namely, the proof that a slaveholder and a man-stealer, are one and the same thing.

We wonder if brother Brisbane ever owned a horse. If he did, he must be, by his own showing, so far as we can see, a horse-stealer—in plain English, a *horse-thief*.

It is, to say the least, much to be regretted that Dr. Wayland and others, who have written on the anti-slavery side, had not been favored with the above discovery of brother Brisbane. Had they been, the quotation of

that single passage would have put an end to the discussion, saved a great waste of time and labor, and left the poor discomfited slaveholder without a nook or corner in which to hide his *thievish* face. Unfortunately, however, for the whole tribe of abolitionists, brother Brisbane's discovery comes too late. The Dr. has taken his position, and has irrevocably committed himself to another sort of argument.

From the foregoing it would seem that abolitionists are essentially at variance among themselves. When they shall come to be agreed among themselves, respecting the ground on which the slaveholder is to be convicted of wrong, we reckon it will be time enough for those of the South to give ear to their notes of admonition.

One word respecting the argument drawn from the advantage of freedom. "If thou mayest be made free use it rather." The argument is this: Freedom is good; therefore slaveholding is sinful! The same apostle said, "I would that all men were even as I myself." 1 Cor. 7. 7. See also vers. 1 and 8. The argument is this: Celebacy is good; therefore marriage is a sin!—Severe logic this. Wonder if brother B. would not make a good Roman priest. Wonder if he is a married man.

VERBIAGE.

We find the following scrap in the last Christian Reflector. We have rarely met with an article of the same length, which contained more words about nothing.—The editor affects to misunderstand, and thereby tries to misrepresent, the fragment referred to; but had he published the entire article, instead of the *alforesaid garbled extract*, his readers would have comprehended the matter, his own verbosity to the contrary notwithstanding. Having declined the condition, we will not say from what motive, on which we had proposed to publish the whole of Dr. Wayland's letters, he thereby let pass the only opportunity he ever had, or perhaps ever will have again, to secure the publication of the said letters in a Southern paper. This is quite incomprehensible, however, to the sagacious and magnanimous editor of the Christian Reflector. Troublesome times these for abolitionists. And still, it strikes us, they have not yet seen the worst.

"THE EXTENT OF OUR EDITORIAL RESPONSIBILITY.—We find in Zion's Advocate the following paragraph credited to the Biblical Recorder, of North Carolina.

"It is obvious to all the world, that if Dr. Wayland's letters are not published at the South, the editor of the Reflector may thank his own courage and magnanimity for the failure."

We wonder that so high a compliment escaped our particular notice in its original connection. Little did we anticipate in the outset of our editorial career, that the time was coming when we should be responsible, not only for what we do or neglect to do ourselves, but for what all the editors of the South decline to do; and that so mighty and extensive would our influence and reputation become that facts like this would be obvious to all the world. Verily, the Christian Reflector is making wondrous advances. By how slight a turn, do we utterly annihilate the independence of the whole Southern press! A little artful manoeuvring on our part, will suffice to prevent all the editorial chivalry of the South from the maintenance of its own rights and honors!"

NO REPORT.

MASSACHUSETTS AND SOUTH CAROLINA.—The editor of the N. C. Biblical Recorder in copying our article in reference to the treatment of Mr. Hoar, says: "One would suppose from the above, that Massachusetts had never known anything about popular riots, and that the accounts about burning convents—making war by night on a few defenceless nuns, &c. &c., were all a fabrication. And one would be apt to conclude too, from the same data, that the historical records in relation to the burning and hanging of witches, and the expelling of Quakers and Baptists, on account of their religious opinions, were all a mere matter of romance. Inaccurate Massachusetts, how much it is to be regretted that history, and even the journals of the present day, have so sadly dishonored thy fair fame!"

Now although we have very little "state pride," yet we must confess that such a paragraph as the above rather tends to arouse it. One act of a lawless mob during the present generation, and two instances of popular delusion, one or two centuries ago, are charged on Massachusetts. Very well, we will not report, for as we made no invidious comparison between the two states then, so we shall make none now.

The Recorder goes on to say that we "represented the people of South Carolina as excited solely by fear;—and what is still more wonderful, fear of Mr. Hoar, who assured them that he would not fight, and that he was too old to run."

Not so "wonderful" after all. Nothing is more obvious to the whole world than that the state of South Carolina was moved by fear—*yes* fear in their treatment of Mr. Hoar—that fear which resorts in hot haste to blustering and a disregard of law. We said that the treatment of that gentleman was "a confession of weakness and insecurity really humiliating," and we added, "thank Heaven, Massachusetts is not yet afraid to suffer the laws of the country to be tested within her borders, and may the day be distant when she will be brought into the position now occupied by her sister State."

Nothing is more clear than that South Carolina did fear to have the proofs of her oppressions brought to light, and her deeds tested in the supreme judicial tribunal of the land. And because Mr. H. would neither fight nor run away she feared him the more. It was the noble principle of freedom, and regard for the rights of all the citizens of his state as represented by him that she feared—not his physical power; and her fears could not be allayed till he was expelled from her borders.

The foregoing is from the last Christian Watchman. From the first two paragraphs we are left to infer, that the editor, after a little reflection, has concluded that it is best not "to throw stones." He says he will not report &c. Had he made this statement before his late allegation against South Carolina, and his present charge about fear, oppression, &c. we should have known better how to understand it.

In the latter part of his article the editor institutes a new issue, which is adroitly concealed from his readers by suppressing a part of the paragraph from which he quotes. His former article, which called forth our remarks, was ostensibly, and in fact, predicated on Mr. Hoar's official report; a part, or the whole of which, was published at the time in the Watchman. In that report Mr. Hoar had represented the citizens of Charleston as having been excited by what they considered an *insult* from Massachusetts. The Watchman, in his remarks on the same, represented them as having been excited only by fear. This we said, and say still, and the Watchman now virtually concedes it by changing the question, was a misrepresentation of the facts of the case.

The Watchman still insists, however, Mr. Hoar to the contrary notwithstanding, that the South Carolinians were excited solely by fear, and in part by fear of Mr. Hoar. As he lays claim to a species of perception, or intuition, not claimed by Mr. Hoar, nor any one else

so far as we know, and certainly not by ourselves, we can of course have no further debate with him on the subject. One thing we should think tolerably obvious however, namely, that South Carolina, however much she may have been in dread of the *secret workings* of certain of the citizens of Massachusetts, did not have before her eyes much fear of that State, as a State, and in her more open and avowed positions. This, we should think, was sufficiently attested by the treatment shown both to Mr. Hoar and his commission—and also by the laws subsequently enacted.

For the Recorder.

DEAR BRO. MEREDITH:

Bro. Johnson's letters to bro. Hooper, contain some good things, but there are several curls and crooks that need straightening. I should like that he would revise and somehow amend or qualify, himself. If not, that some of our correspondents who have time, talent, and spiritual discernment, would undertake to rectify knotty places. I will refer some one who may undertake it, to a few—Recorder no. 46. "There is not a single instance of the preaching of the gospel to the thoughtless and impenitent sinner accompanied with public prayer recorded in the New Testament." There is the fact.—Let us see if it is a fact? Read Acts 7. Did not Stephen preach the gospel in detail as recorded there?—Who constituted the audience? The council who condemned, and the multitude who stoned Stephen to death. Did Stephen call them stiff-necked, and uncircumcised in heart? And were they then thoughtless and impenitent sinners? Read ver. 60. Did not Stephen kneel down and pray with a loud voice for them? Is kneeling down in a public assembly, and praying with a loud voice, public or private prayer? Then how does the fact stand? Again, our brother writes, "we do not read of public prayer being made by any one in connexion with the preaching of the gospel." What were the disciples doing with one accord, in one place, on the morning of the Pentecostal revival? Did they continue in prayer from day to day, unconnected with the preaching of the gospel? Why does bro. Johnson pray before and after, in connexion with his sermons? I have not time to enlarge, and a word to the wise is enough.

Further, I do not remember particulars, and have not time to examine, but if I mistake not, bro. Johnson's views on religious excitements, sound very much like the language of certain men, when witnessing a religious excitement, who said, "these men are full of new wine." Neither do I think Paulinus has mended the matter, but runs a head of bro. Johnson; and appears so averse to a little noise in religion, that he is even in advance of those who said, "Master rebuke thy disciples;" for he assumes the authority to rebuke those ministers who weep between the porch and altar, and poor sinners who cry aloud for mercy, and even to charge them with wicked motives. Indeed from the tone of Paulinus's numbers, one would suppose, that if he had been present, when Bartimieus cried out, "Jesus thou son of David, have mercy upon me;" that he (P.) would have called out in the tone of the staff-man, *keep silence*.

Now, reader, do not suppose that I would justify the extravagances of the wild Baptists described by bro. Hooper, who so abuse protracted meetings, as to stir up a confused noise, more like a corn-shucking frolic, than the solemn and deep fetched sighs, and cries of mourning sinners; or the heart felt glorifications in the grace of God, expressed in countenance or by voice, of delivered captives. Yet to borrow an idea of Jonathan Edwards, who I think a good standard on religious excitements, I do not know which is the greatest evil in the abuses of the gospel. "All heat and no light; or all light and no heat." A true gospel revival must have to do with all the faculties of the soul, the passions as well as the understanding.

Now to wind up these off-hand hints, it is not likely that either bro. J. or P. is a Boanerges, a weeping Jeremiah, or an awakening Bunyan or Whitfield, and would be out of their element in a revival; and if so, some stammering exhorter might awaken more sinners in one hour, than either in a year. Therefore, they may be as unfit to write about revivals, as to be fit instruments in a revival. Yet if they were to preach about baptism, close communion, election &c.—might far excel John Bunyan or Whitfield. I have as little confidence in the opinions of ministers upon the subject of revivals, whose labors have never proven successful in the awakenings and solid conversions of sinners, as I would have in the lectures of a surgeon, who had attempted the practice of surgery, and failed in nine cases out of ten; and as little confidence in those ministers, whose converts have generally proven deceivers or deceived in their religion. They may see, and tell of many errors in revivals, but may not know how to lead or to direct others in revivals. If I guess right, I hope that some sound, experienced, spiritual revivalist, would take up the subject closely, and set things right; for it must be admitted on all sides, there are abuses of gospel order, in modern revivals of religion. While the unworthy author of these hints, must believe, that both Dr. Johnson and Paulinus, have far missed the mark, in their attempts to correct the errors upon this subject.

I wish it understood, that my remarks are not designed as an answer or a review of either of the publications alluded to, but a mere hint, to shew the necessity of a prayerful, scriptural, and detailed discussion upon the subject. So that, if possible, a union of sentiment may be brought about in our denomination.

OBSERVATOR.

For the Recorder.

TO THE REV. A. B. SMITH.

REV. SIR: As you have more than once alluded to me in your pamphlet on the mode of baptism, and your very unchristian-like communication published in the Southern Christian Advocate of the 17th Jan. 1845.—I think justice to myself and the cause of truth, requires that I should set you right on some points upon which you are evidently wrong. In the first place, the great revival of religion of 1843, commenced early in the Spring with the Baptist church at Cedar Creek, and spread in different parts of the county, and in the course of the year between one and two hundred persons were added to the churches by baptism, and among them a goodly number of Methodists who had become dissatisfied with the sprinkling of their church. The notion of immersion had got such a hold in the minds of the people of Anson and Richmond, that Mr. Durant of Anson, and Mr. Bradley of Richmond, were compelled to lead several of their people down into the water like Philip did the eunuch, and as Mr. Wesley says, baptise them according to the practice of the first church by immersion.

It is true, they did not always perform this sacred duty in a becoming manner; for Mr. Bradley buried one man face foremost. Well, I suppose a dead man had better be buried face foremost than not at all.—Bro. Smith as it may, our friend was not pleased with this mode of baptism; for he appeared to one of our ministers as Paulinus did to his friend Achilles, and called for baptism. Under these circumstances it was very prudent, unless this devil of immersion, as the Catholics say, could be whipped out of the consciences of the people, infant sprinkling must come to the ground, and with it the Methodist church. Hence the mighty effort of Mr. Smith and his co-adjutors to conceal from the people the evidence which the Bible furnishes in favor of immersion. The first attempt at anything like a sermon on baptism, that I recollect, was delivered at the vet by the Rev. John Tarrant in the spring or summer. I was not present on that occasion, but succeeded with some difficulty in getting a few sweet morsels from that discourse, from which I learned that he made very free use of the Greek prepositions, my favourite words, and proved to a demonstration that, to understand them as the Baptists do, Zachaeus went up the hollow of the tree, like a rabbit.

This was a brilliant discovery, almost equal to the one made by Mr. Smith from the same preposition, namely, that, to baptise in the river Jordan, means in the *grounds* of Jordan. The effort of Mr. Tarrant failed to give satisfaction. The Baptists still went on preaching and baptising; consequently Mr. Smith was called in to being the best qualified to manage a *bad cause*.

Mr. Smith, you say I started in front, but one close action was enough for me, intending no doubt to make the impression that I had other opportunities to meet you, and had backed out. Now, sir, for your information I have the pleasure of saying, I am still on the field, with my armour on, and while you and Mr. F. have been engaged in the great battle, I have had several skirmishes with ministers and laymen in which, I flatter myself, I have had the advantage, as they have never showed any disposition to renew the fight. I never had one close action with you on equal ground, and but one on any ground whatever. I unexpectedly heard your sermon on the subject of baptism at Chapel at the close of which you made an appointment to preach on the mode, and said that any brother or gentleman would have an opportunity to reply. I accepted the proposition, and met you. You did not make it convenient to get there until after 12 o'clock. You had occupied about three hours, after which an intermission was necessary. Then came my turn.

I admit I was very much embarrassed; and my embarrassment was increased by the very unkind treatment from a portion of your congregation, many of whom I know professed to be young converts, friends of the gracious revival of which you speak in your sermons. Alas, how little they resembled the followers of the meek and lowly Jesus, assembled for the purpose of learning the truth relative to an ordinance of his house. Your own conduct on that day was far from blameless; for after I had patiently heard you through, in which time you read longly from Adam Clark and others, I attempted to read a few short extracts from Dr. Wall and other pedito-baptist authors, you got up by my side, in the sacred stand, and declared in the face of truth, and that large assembly, that Dr. Wall was a *Boyanist*, and that you could read all day from *Methodist authors* to prove your doctrine! Now, sir, you either did not know what Dr. Wall was, or you did not intend to tell the truth. If you did not know, which must have been the case, it may cause some people to think you are not quite so high up the hill of science as you suppose.—If you did know, it proves you to be destitute of any important qualification for a minister of the gospel.

I can assure you that I am truly sorry to be compelled thus to write; but it seems that you are determined to publish your misrepresentations far and near: it therefore seems to me that forbearance is no longer a virtue. I shall reserve a farther consideration of you and your publications for future numbers of the Recorder.

D. INGRAM.

Lilesville, N. C., Jan. 30th, 1845.

For the Recorder.

DEAR BRO. MEREDITH:

As there seems to be considerable interest exhibited in various quarters upon "religious excitements," suffer a few words from one whose mind has been for some time engaged in an examination of this matter. I have read with mingled feelings of pleasure and disappointment, the communications lately published in the Recorder. Pleased, because of the improving state of the public mind, with regard to what may justly be called the abuse of these "excitements," that seems to be prevailing; and grieved, because in some of these articles, there appears to be a bitterness and coldness calculated to chafe and wither the best feelings of which our nature is capable; and because I think there is discernible an exhibition of a principle abiding with a great many men, viz: a want of independence in boldly and alone expressing their sentiments upon a subject, but always ready to join in the "hue and cry;" when they have a "D. D." or "Professor," to lead off. In this however, I may be, and trust I am, mistaken. Now a justification of the practice of calling up mourners to be prayed for, I have not one word to say. It is altogether unscriptural, and consequently should be abandoned.—And though I have at times engaged in it, it is always with some feelings of misgiving regarding its propriety, and generally with an explanation to the people, that I asked them to come forward, not so much with a view of praying for them, as to have an opportunity of knowing who among them might be concerned about their souls' salvation, and to instruct them as far as I might be able, and encourage them on their way to heaven. But, relative to "religious excitements," we have accounts of several in the New Testament, besides abundant exhortations to promote them. "Strive to enter in at the strait gate." "Give all diligence to make your calling and election sure." "Work out your salvation with fear and trembling;" and many other passages might be quoted which plainly imply an intense exertion or excitement of the mind upon religious subjects; not so great to be sure, but that our "zeal should always be according to knowledge;" for without this check men would, as they have often done, run into the wildest fanaticisms. "Prove all things," says an Apostle, "hold fast that which is good."

Now to the means too frequently employed to get up an excitement I object as strongly as any one. They often reach no farther than the animal part of man, and of course can be productive of no good. Give me the religion that purifies the heart, elevates the soul, and regulates the conduct. "Procul, O procul est te profani."