

THE BIBLICAL RECORDER.

THOMAS W. TOBEY, Editor.

Devoted to Religion, Morality, Literature, Agriculture and General Intelligence.

M. A. MEREDITH, Publisher.

VOLUME XVII. NO. 35.

RALEIGH, N. C., FRIDAY, AUGUST 27, 1852.

WHOLE NO. 1116

THE BIBLICAL RECORDER,

A Religious and Literary Paper:

Published weekly at Raleigh, N. C., at \$2 00 per annum, payable in advance.

All letters on business should be directed to the publisher, Marcus A. Meredith. Letters containing communications, or in any way relating to the editorial department, should be addressed to "Editor of the Biblical Recorder." Private letters to the Editor, should be addressed to the Recorder, address thus: Thos. W. Tobey.

All communications, to insure attention, must be directed to Raleigh, N. C.—post-paid.

For further particulars see last page.

THE LAW OF NEWSPAPERS.

Subscribers who do not give express notice to the contrary are considered wishing to continue their subscription.

If the subscribers order the discontinuance of their papers, the publishers may continue to send them until cash charges are paid.

If an advertiser neglects or refuses to take their papers from the office to which they are directed, they shall be held responsible until they have settled their bill, and order their papers discontinued.

If subscribers remove to other places without informing the publisher, and the paper is sent to the former direction, they are held responsible.

The courts have decided that refusing to take a paper or periodical from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is "prima facie" evidence of intentional fraud.

For the Recorder.

Debate on Infant Baptism,

HELD AT ROBERT'S CHAPEL, NORTHAMPTON CO., N. C., JULY 13, 1852.

Infant children are Scriptural subjects for baptism.

Elder Arnold, M. E., affirms. Elder Britton, Baptist, denies.

Elder A. It devolves on me to review the argument of my respected opponent. He admits as I foretold he would, that "the kingdom of God" and the church are synonymous terms—baptism being the only door of admission, I still insist that the words of Christ in Matthew 28, do contain a positive law, enjoining their reception. He says, "I trod lightly on the commission of Christ to his apostles, as if afraid of the hot embers beneath." I answer, I kept the path before me, and did not turn to the right or left. What would he think were I to charge on him, that he said nothing about close communion, in his speech of an hour. But I return to say, baptism is the only proper door. Baptism is not to prepare infants for the church—they are already prepared. Some one, I hear, has said outside the church, during the recess, that "it is a sin to baptize infants!" I call on him, I demand of any one to answer, wherein consists the sin of baptizing infants? What law is violated? We can refuse or we can reject, as ministers of the gospel, "of such" believers are fit, he admits, so are infants. Believers are more saved than infants. Elder B. admits, the same temper is common to both. Why then are infants excluded? I repeat it, I stand here in the advocate of children, admit we are not commanded even, we are not forbidden to baptize them! But he says, "Christ did not baptize these children. I ask, whom did Christ baptize? None. But Christ blessed them, why did he not baptize them, asks my opponent. I reply, they received the greater blessing, why then not receive the others? We can't give Divine union, but why not give all we can? But he insists "on an express warrant!" Do you do nothing without an express warrant? Let us test this thing, why do you keep the first day of the week as the Sabbath? Have you express warrant for this innovation? Again, why do you administer the communion to females, to ladies? If then you have no express warrant for these things, you allow, why accuse us of adding to the Scriptures? Is there an express denunciation against men in the Bible? or horse racing? Not one, yet by clear inference there is Bible warrant against it, and we preach against it. I contend the law of God admits children. Baptism is the only door into the church—why not open it? Admit, there is no express command nor example in the New Testament. But what of that? I know how to get them there; (into the church) I will baptize you if you have the temper of little children! My opponent read here from a newspaper, although he objected to my reading from an "old scrawl," as he calls it. I won't have anything to do with that "Tennessee Baptist" newspaper sir! The editor has said some hard things about Bishop Soule, and the Methodists. My opponent says, he has overbalanced me, by the number of his witnesses. No sir! one or two good witnesses outweigh great numbers. My opponent asks, why some Pedobaptists baptize children of believers only, and some of unbelievers. I can only state my own practice, and belief. All christian countries should baptize the children of *dankies* as well as *whites*, wherever the gospel has been preached among the people of a country. But my opponent demands of me one example of baptizing children. He shall have it! ch. x. 1 Cor. 7. Moreover brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, now that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses, in the cloud and in the sea." 1st and 2d verses. Here sir were more than 10,000 children baptized at once, not by immersion sir, these little ones would have been drowned! I know how he will try and get over this sir. He will say it is an Old Testament testimony. It is figurative! I take Paul before his testimony. "I would not have you ignorant brethren that they were baptized. Paul says they were baptized—so say I. Here he quoted also 1 Cor. 12: 13. Again, I call your attention to another argument, 1 Cor. 7: 14. Children are entitled to baptism, because "now they are holy." But my time I hear, has expired.

Elder B. Gentlemen, Moderators and brethren. If the question before us were to be decided by bold assertions without proof, my opponent would certainly prevail. He has given us some references on one point, and no proof. By a mode of reasoning I could prove one of the purest blooded whites before me, to be African merely by false assumptions, and bold sweeping inferences. What sir? Infringe infants Christ's kingdom, where there is no command, no precept and no example! This mode of reasoning is demonstrated by witnesses as able (and more numerous) as any Pedobaptist Elder A. I presume he was jesting in the example he presented to cite from 1 Cor. (Elder A. I call on all sir, in good earnest.) Well, I demand an example of christian baptism, not of circumcision. Every one knows this was

figurative, and so intended to allude to the primitive mode of christian baptism. For Israelites were not sprinkled, nor poured, but overwhelmed or surrounded by the clouds and the sea, a striking emblem of immersion, where the people were hid from sight, covered; evidently wholly figurative. Does he contend that this was an example of christian baptism, in the name of the Trinity? a *literal* baptism into Christ? He dare not. His second example is from 7 ch. of 1 Cor. 14 v. Well! he has before contended that all children are to be baptized! Now this text limits baptism only to the child of one believer. The husband must believe, or the wife, as the case may be. This text is honey to a Presbyterian, but death to a Methodist. He (A.) contends, baptize all if any. I bring Barnes against Elder Arnold. (Here he quoted Barnes against this passage having any thing to do with baptism.) Paul simply advises, "that divorcing should not result from either party's embracing christianity." I know gentlemen, that Baptist authorities would so interpret this text. But I go to the Pedobaptist. The Presbyterian admits none to baptism, unless one of the parents is a believer. The Methodist admits, where both are unbelievers. The doctrine is equally good for heathen, as for christian lands. The same result would follow. The world would be brought into the church, indeed, thus the United States, by their practice, is brought within the pale of the church. Strange anomaly! Instead of the church converting the world, they make the world convert the church! If any of these infants are ever converted, they are converted after their admission into the church! Elder A. admits there is no express command, nor example—(Elder A. I mean in so many words.) That's enough for me, sir!

But he demands, why we admit ladies to the communion! Did the Pentecost church have no female members, (Acts 1: 14.) If they began with the apostles, did they not continue with them, "in the breaking of bread, from house to house?" Let him give us as good an example as this for baptizing infants, and we would show him, our action. But the christian Sabbath, troubles him. We read, "On the first day of the week, the apostles assembled with the church to break bread, &c." again, we have other references to the usual habits of the primitive church, in the same express words, not inferences. The first day of the week, these inspired men led the church to devote to public worship. We need no stronger example. Let him, I repeat, here, give us as good an example for infant baptism! My opponent, I solemnly warn you, my brethren, gives too much power to the ministry. He says, he knows how to get infants into the church, although no express command nor example justify! Beware of allowing any man to lord it over God's heritage, it concedes too much power to ministers, to allow any so far fetched inferences. He has not answered one out of the three arguments, I have already advanced. He just slurs over our witnesses, I therefore adduce a fourth argument, viz: 4th. The Argument, from the Design of the Ordinance. Baptism, without faith and repentance, is not worth a groat! Baptism is the act of a believer, rising his faith in Christ's coming, dying, rising, and reigning, and all in the believer's behalf. You deprive children of professing their faith, you nullify, and make void the design of this ordinance, if you baptize in infancy. Look at the phrase, "Buried with him," that is, professing faith in this ordinance, in a buried and risen Saviour! This is the only door! Then, he is a church member. Why then do you refuse your church members the communion? why debar them any church privileges? "Not entitled!" do you say? Then the design of baptism is by you frustrated! Mr. Wesley says, "children are ingrafted through faith, in baptism." He admits immersion was the primitive or ancient mode of baptizing. I say, that children are without faith, and not ingrafted, as he contends. This is my fourth argument. Elder A. without blushing quotes his own party, Mr. Wesley, Mr. Watson, Mr. Benson and Adam Clarke, all Methodist Pedobaptists! Who doubts, but all these will testify in favor of my opponent's their own reputation, and that of their church, as well as his, are all at stake. "Is this valid testimony in a religious discussion like the present? But, let us follow him, and we will endeavor to wrest some of his own allies from him: to bring some of his own witnesses against him? We will admit Pedobaptists have souls, and minds too, and some of them are very learned men. I hold up before you Barnes' Notes on the Gospels, and ask your patience, while I read his comments on Mat. 19: 14, that first passage he quoted, which seemed so precious to him, on this question.

Elder A. Yes, 'tis precious passage.

Elder B. Well sir, hear Mr. Barnes, an eminent Pedobaptist writer, one of your own witnesses. He then read from Barnes in this place cited on Mat. 19, "of such," "Like them." Persons with tempers such as those little children." Also, Barnes' denial that the passage had any reference to the baptism of children. The Lord blessed them, prayed for them, commended them as "patterns of meekness, and dismissed them, without sprinkling, pouring, or baptism." Olshausen, Kitto and Bishop Taylor, all Pedobaptists, he then cited, all of whom deny the reference of this text to baptism. The last writer indignantly rebukes those who rest their plea for infant baptism, on so shallow a pretext, saying, "it proves, they only want better arguments, that they resort to such a text! for what did our Lord do with these children? he blessed and dismissed them!" Therefore I contend, said Elder Britton, they are not to be baptized. I use these Pedobaptist authorities because he has laid the stress of his arguments on them. I contend they are all guilty, all implicated, but where they fall out among themselves, we are entitled to the benefit of their testimony. It is good, so far as it goes, to throw light on the harmony of Pedobaptists, on this wide spread error among them. Here is more of it, much more. Poole's continuators on Mat. 19: 14. "Infant baptism cannot be founded on this passage." Burkitt, another Pedobaptist, on the same passage says it touches, "not to baptize, but to bless." That's the idea! candid witness! so say we. You see, how they set aside each others testimony, I have they set aside each others testimony, and now quoted enough Pedobaptist testimony, and now enough to overbalance the four or five Methodist witnesses cited by Elder A. It is Pedobaptist witnesses cited by Elder A. It is admitted, that these learned Pedobaptists have conceded the point, for which we strenuously contend, viz: that the doctrine of baptizing in

infants is not taught in the Sacred Scriptures.—It is not in the Bible! Pedobaptists, who need not agitate themselves! Their camp of infidelity is divided! But, I have not quoted all their refractory witnesses. Bishop Burnet of the Episcopal church says, "There is no express precept or example in Holy Scripture for baptizing infants." Dr. Wall, Episcopal church "There is no express instance nor example for baptizing children." Fuller, the Pedobaptist, says, "I confess there is no written authority, but (hear him!) there might be, though it is not written!" "There's reasoning for you! Why, with this concession, 'might be so may be so,' we should soon have as many various religious theories in every church, as there are different human faces in this large and respectable assembly! But here are more turbulent witnesses among the Pedobaptists. Limborch and C. Carth. p. 418. They testify against it. To complete the list, here are more than 40 other Pedobaptist witnesses who contend against the rite of infant baptism, and say, it is unlawful! One of them says, infant baptism was introduced only "to feed the consciences of parents." All teach that the utmost scope of the passage was "only to bless children." Yet we hear men here presume to govern Christ's kingdom! Who dare to fill up blanks, which God has left! I have no appeals to make to your feelings here, the ground is awfully holy!

But my opponent says, Suffer them to come. And in his eagerness to prove his desired point, he proves too much, and hence he proves nothing to his purpose. Suffer them to come! Are they coming voluntarily? of their own free will and choice! Let them come on then—we shall not oppose such coming as this! But do not force them to come, and then tantum with opposing them! Don't drag them to come, and then talk about permission! My opponent here begs the very question in debate between us, and decides in his own favour, that bringing children to be sprinkled is "suffering them to come to Christ."

But in a note to Mat. 28: 19, 20. I recall him to the Commission of Christ to his ministry, on earth, "Go teach all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Again, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Mark 16: 15, 16. I remarked, Mr. Moderator, that my opponent trod very lightly on the commission, in his speech, it seemed as if he feared that the embers under the ashes would prove too hot for him to stand on. He talks of a positive law! here sir is a positive law, enacting that believers are scriptural subjects of christian baptism. And the inference is by fair construction, irresistible, that negatively, unbelievers are excluded, as unfit, scripturally improper subjects, for an ordinance, thus limited expressly to their opposites, viz: believers. If not, why should Christ express the pre-requisite of faith, in any? Why not baptize all indiscriminately, without either teaching or preaching?—We have a law sir, which enacts that all free American males shall be required to bear arms, between the ages of 18 and 45. Is not the practical operation of that law to limit the requisition only to citizens between 18 and 45 years of age? The law does not say, none younger nor older shall bear arms, or shall not do it. Nevertheless the positive enactment specifically defines, Who shall be required to bear arms? And all the rest are notoriously exempted by the express letter of the law. The spirit of the law is equally plain to be understood. So, sir, it is with the divine ordinance of baptism. Go teach—not baptize all nations in the name of the Trinity, taught and untaught! What! baptize all nations, old and young, white and black! Do they do it, sir, I ask? Where their discordant harmony again comes to our ears. Some would baptize the children of believing parents, some where one parent only is a believer, and others where both parents are unbelievers! I call for an explanation of this discrepancy. Why not baptize the children of the unbelieving? Are they not of the nations? Here is another Pedobaptist witness. "The command is 1st. Teach. 2nd. Baptize in the name." 3d. Teach all things else commanded." McKnight. Mark is still more explicit. "Go preach the gospel in all the world to every creature. But infants can neither hear nor believe. What is to become of them? Send them to perdition! No! by no means sir, teach all who can understand. God will take care of those who cannot exercise the qualifications for moral obedience, better than you can!" Again Calvin, "The words demanded teaching before baptizing, here, Matthew 28: 19, teaching and faith precede baptism, and he slurs it over that the Anabaptists (whom he hated and denounced) would seem to be right, in requiring faith before baptism." We go farther sir, and contend there is no seeming about it—they are right on the authority not of men, but of God's express word! Barrow testifies on this passage, "1st. Teaching or teaching, and then immersing the disciples who believe." Again Laurin, another very learned Pedobaptist says, instruction should precede baptism. They were to have the answer of a good conscience, and such persons were called "the illuminated!" How would this sound if applied to infants—"illuminated infants" sir! "Mattheusate" disciple, so testifies Limborch another erudite Pedobaptist.—Again Baxter, "Disciple, baptizing them. If this be not so, why baptize one more than another! The sense requires 1st. Teach. 2nd. Baptize. 3d. Then teach all other things necessary to be taught in the school of Christ. Saving faith goes before baptism, otherwise, continues Mr. Baxter, we must renounce all rules of order!" Now all these men write like Baptists, however different their practice. I recall Elder A. to the question. He inquires of me, How are we to receive them, if we don't baptize infants? I demand of him in my turn, How did Christ receive them? Neither by sprinkling, pouring, nor immersion. He took them in his arms and blessed them. Cannot ministers thus receive children, protect, pray for, instruct and assist them? Can they not in His name bless them? Must they be, without any proper qualification, hurried into the door by baptism. He insists very strenuously baptism is the only door. And in infancy or childhood too, the only qualification of entrance into the church of Christ? I must beg leave here, to differ from my opponent. Would he fill the church of God with human flesh and bones, irrespective of faith and repen-

tance! The world would then be the church in opposition to the express declarations of its Great Head, "My kingdom is not of this world," viz: spiritual, not fleshly. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Go disciple, baptizing. Pedobaptists make baptism the disciplining act! Why then do they debar their disciples from communion? Why do they not give them all the church privileges? They have only been brought into the entrance, and there they stop. Such reasoning as my opponent uses, would introduce all into the church, in infancy, and no believers would remain to be baptized in adult age! Where then would be the use or import of a perpetual commission? It could not be applied to believers for lack of subjects! It is out of place here for him to say, "I reckon so," such inferences will not do, to gloss over errors so dangerous and wide spreading tendency as this! He ought not to be so sensitive about our opposition to such grave departures from the truth as it is in Jesus. He and his brethren oppose other errors—in like manner we oppose his, and those who agree with him.—Here we adduce the crowning authority of a great Pedobaptist writer, who lets us into the whole secret as to how sprinkling was substituted for immersion; a writer, whom before we have quoted as conceding that faith should precede baptism. Calvin says, The church has allowed herself (mark, not Christ has allowed) to change the rite of baptism somewhat except the substance! Remember in closing my remarks, that I have cited three to one Pedobaptist witnesses, overbalanced entirely his Pedobaptist testimony.—Men, too, eminent in their day for great classical learning, and skill in Biblical criticism. The case is made out, that there is neither precept nor example for baptizing infants in the Holy Scriptures. I have proved that they concede the legitimate inference from the commission to be "Teach first and then baptize the taught." I have shown that Mr. Wesley taught that "the unbaptized children were not saved!" We do by his doctrine, as Baptists, we reprobate it!—It is not according to Holy Scripture. I have adduced two incontrovertible arguments against infant baptism. I have proved that faith is an indispensable qualification for a valid baptism. Baptism, faith and repentance must unite on the individual, or HE IS NO CHURCH MEMBER! 3d. I now show that it is not apostolic to baptize any but believers. See Acts 2: 38. The Apostle Peter here preached, the people heard, believed, repented and were baptized in the name of Jesus, with the promise of the Holy Spirit. This was the personal duty of all to believe and thus obey in regular order the claims of the gospel. This is my defence of the scriptural subjects for Christian Baptism.

From the New-York Recorder.

Sketches and Recollections of British Preachers.

BY THE AUTHOR OF "THE LIFE OF CHATTERTON," "PEN AND INK SKETCHES," ETC., ETC. REV. DR. JOHN CUMMING, OF LONDON.

"It is as natural and necessary for London to have some great attraction on the Sabbath, some lion for the pulpit—as to have attractions of a more worldly nature for the week; and there usually is some one place to which the people stream, at the gate of which you behold scores of carriages and cabs—the haunt of fashion, the place of glittering Bibles and hymn-books and prayer-books, of soft cushions, crimson hangings and tassels. There are many requisites which must meet to produce a success so decided as this. The preacher should be a Conservative, and minister of the Church of England or Scotland, eloquent, (floridly so,) a commanding and attractive figure, a full and sonorous voice; he should be anti-Romish, strongly attached to the order of things as by law established, a slight spice of eccentricity of opinion or manner, a respectable (all the better if an aristocrat) standing in society. Most of these qualifications have combined in those preachers who have been the magnets of the metropolis."

So writes a recent pulpit critic, and we entirely agree with him. The qualifications he describes, met in Edward Irving; they met in Baptist Noel, and eminently so in the person of the subject of our present sketch, Dr. Cumming.

At this moment, Dr. Cumming is perhaps the most popular preacher in London; the most followed and sought after. His church doors are thronged, during every service, by hundreds unable to reach the lobby doors. His constant auditors are many of them members of the aristocracy; a large and fashionable congregation. He is wonderfully prolific as an author; he is equally celebrated as a polemic. His name is a great rallying-point at Exeter Hall. Our readers, if they did not know it before, will believe us, that, in all religious circles, Dr. Cumming is a much-talked-of man. In this country, his principal works have been reprinted; and as the great antagonist of Cardinal Wiseman and the Romish Church, his reputation is world-wide.

In the very heart of London, and almost within the shadow of Drury Lane Theatre, is situated Dr. Cumming's church. Let us proceed thither.

It is the morning of the Sabbath. From scores of church-towers sound forth the "churchy-going bells," and we, with thousands of others hurry along the streets towards one of the many hundred places of worship which deck, like oases, the great moral metropolis desert. Leaving the Strand on our right, we enter Covent Garden, its famed market-place now silent and almost forsaken—and leaving that locality, cross Bow street, pass beneath the colonnade of the theatre, and when half way through it, step over the narrow strip of roadway and enter Crown Court. A stranger might pass the entrance to this obscure thoroughfare a hundred times, and never suspect that a church of any magnitude was within a dozen paces of him; but were he to lift his eyes, he might perceive overhead an inscription informing him that there was situated Crown Court Church.

We enter the court, and the Scotch church is on our left. As a building, it has few claims to architectural consideration. The gallery stairs are outside the front, presenting a somewhat curious appearance; but the necessity for economizing in space doubtless suggested the arrangement. Up those stairs hundreds upon hundreds are pressing, and crowds are squeezing

also into the side-doors. Carriage after carriage is setting down its freight of fashion. Cab after cab drives up, from which people leap hurriedly and make their way to the doors of the edifice, and an unbroken stream of pedestrians flows in from either end of Crown court. Watch for a moment the countenances of the church-goers; there is as much curiosity depicted thereon as might be noticed in the faces of the impatient multitude who throng the doors of the neighboring theatre on the first night of a new piece. And no wonder that such interest is evinced; for this morning one of the most renowned preachers of the day is to preach on an all-absorbing topic. Cardinal Wiseman has sounded forth his trumpet-note of Romish defiance; and now the Protestant champion is about to enter the lists as his adversary.

We have at length succeeded in gaining the interior of the Scotch church. It is a large, oblong building; a gallery, deep and commodious, runs along one of the long and two of the short sides, the pulpit being placed in front of the centre of the other long boundary wall. The only national emblems to be seen are the thistle-shaped shades of the lamps, and a thistle in each of the painted windows. In all other respects, the place resembles an English Dissenting chapel.

Near the pulpit, on its left side, and in a secluded spot under the gallery, sit a gentleman and lady, with two little children. The gentleman is of somewhat diminutive stature; his head is large and thickly covered with dark brown hair, which struggles carelessly across his capacious forehead. His eyes are keen and cold, the nose short and somewhat pointed, the mouth thin-lipped and decisive; two mere apologies for whiskers appear on the prominent cheek-bones. On the whole, the countenance is indicative of considerable intellect; but it has a jaded, haggard look, and lacks energy. There is even something of insignificance in the whole person. But its owner is by no means an insignificant personage; for the little man who sits so quietly in that quiet, shaded pew, is Lord John Russell, the Prime Minister of England and the leader of the House of Commons. The lady and the little girls are his wife and children.

The first hymn has just ended, and the minister of the place ascends the pulpit stairs. He is regarded curiously by the strangers present; for every eye is fixed upon him. But on his assuming the attitude of prayer, each head is bowed; reverence banishes curiosity, and a deep, solemn hush pervades the place.

The prayer commences; it is, as all prayers should be, deeply fervent and intensely devotional. We have, before now, been absolutely disgusted with certain exercises of this kind; for there are ministers whom we could name, who have a vile habit of talking at God, instead of praying to him. They exhibit a familiarity upon profaneness, and illustrates the truth of the declaration that

"Fools rush in where angels fear to tread."

John Foster, one of the profoundest thinkers of modern times, pointedly refers to this practice, and severely reprobates it, in his Essay on the Aversion of Men of Taste to evangelical Religion. Dr. Cumming's prayer was a model of its kind; there were no tiresome repetitions, no daring and irreverent approaches to the Divine presence, no presumptuous requests. All was solemnity, humility, and devotion; the fervent aspirations of a devout spirit; the breathings out of the creature to its great Creator.

The prayer is ended; another hymn has been sung, and the preacher rises to commence his discourse. But before he names his text, let us occupy a moment or two in sketching his portrait, faithful as may be, with pen and ink, as he stands in the sacred desk.

The preacher is rather above the medium height, but attired as he is in clerical robes, one is apt to be deceived in such a matter, which after all is not of any great importance, if we agree with Isaac Watts, that "the mind is the standard of the man." Dr. Cumming's face is remarkably expressive; a glance at it might convince an ordinary observer that it belongs to one whose mind is of no common stamp. Look at that high, broad, white forehead, across which black hair sweeps, revealing the ample temples, and behind that broad, barrier of bone you will feel assured is a brain of uncommon capacity. We are not thick-and-thin believers in the speculations of phrenologists—those wisacres who parcel out the brain field as they would a potato-patch—but we know that in a well-balanced cranium may generally be found the true mental coin, which rings as well as shines. Such a head has Cumming; and sterling indeed is the golden store which he coins in his cerebral mint. Eyebrows large, well-arched, and black, shadow a pair of dark eyes, of a serious and fearless expression. The nose is slightly aquiline, but not large, and on its bridge perpetually rests a pair of spectacles, from which we may infer that much study has somewhat impaired his visual organs, however much it may have sharpened his critical perceptions. Some one has said and I think with truth, that the mouth is a far more expressive feature than the eyes. Certainly in the case of Dr. Cumming it is so. The upper lip is thin, but well shaped; the lower one full, and pressed, when the countenance is in repose, against its fellow. This same mouth is very expressive; at times a half smile plays upon and around it, but it generally exhibits a tinge of pensiveness approaching to melancholy. The complexion of the countenance is dark, and large black whiskers form the lateral boundaries of the oval-shaped face. Such is the outward man—so far as we can hope to convey an idea of it, of the celebrated pastor of the Crown Court Scotch Church.

Opening a little Bible, which he holds with both hands, Dr. Cumming commences his discourse by reading his text from it. Very clear and musical is his voice. Although by no means loud, it can be heard with the utmost distinctness in the most distant part of the church, and consequently, as there is no shuffling and noise made by leaning forward to catch the sounds, perfect stillness reigns. Without a single preliminary "hem" or a moment's hesitation, he at once commences the elucidation of his theme; and before he has uttered half a dozen sentences, it is evident that all his matter has been carefully arranged beforehand. There is not the slightest hesitation; his words and ideas flow forth like a clear, continuous stream, and his style is as transparent as its waters. The eloquence of some ministers resembles the course of a mountain torrent; now hawling through narrow ra-

vines; now expanding in a calm, lake-like expanse, reflecting the loveliness above and around; anon rushing and roaring over precipices and rocky barriers, and then dancing in sunlight through verdant meadows and mossy winding ways. Such orators startle by antitheses, charm by felicitous similes, and please by variety. Not such are the characteristics of Dr. Cumming's oratory. From the moment that he commences his discourse until the concluding sentence passes his lips, the unrippled current of his eloquence flows on. There are no passionate outbursts; no succeeding passages of pathos; little to dazzle; less to startle; nothing to bewilder; all is clear, calm and convincing. With his little Bible in one hand, or more frequently in both, he generally plunges at once into his subject. His voice, which informs us pleasantly of his northern origin, is quite musical. Seldom does it rise or fall above or below the key in which it is at first pitched, yet so sweet and so flexible that it is never monotonous; besides, every sentence is admirably balanced, each period carefully rounded, and every tone finely modulated. When hearing Cumming, one is reminded of Henry Smith, the "silver-tongued," of Elizabeth's time. But, though the subject of our sketch is truly "silver-tongued," the solemnity, at times the severity of his manner, preserves him from an undue softness. Perhaps there exists not a more fearless preacher than the Doctor, a fact which has been proved over and over again of late, as his Popish antagonists have found to their cost. His manner in the pulpit is pleasing; he seldom uses any other action than a gentle waving of the hand, or a slight turn in the pulpit towards the different portions of his audience. No cushion-thumper is he; for effect he depends more on what he utters than on the graces of action, though such he does not altogether disregard; but he has nothing in common with certain pulpit coxcombs, who in the pulpit flourish their bordered pieces of inspiration-law, and throw themselves into such attitudes as compel one to believe that with them, the looking-glass has been almost as essential in their preparation for the sacred desk as the bible itself.

Dr. Cumming has one great fault. He seldom preaches a sermon without dragging in Romanism. It is ever the same: "Delanda est Carthago," "My opinion is, Rome must fall." Dr. Cumming does not so much feel that he has a mission to preach the gospel as to attack and to grapple with the Church of Rome. All his sermons have a reference to Rome; all his sermons are pointed against Rome; every argument is directed against Rome. Rome with him is emphatically anti-christ, and the constant harping on one string becomes somewhat wearisome. Mortal offense may we give to some "admiring friends" by such a remark. We know it. But are the admiring friends the best judges? We are no Romanist ourselves; we have never had a single sympathetic movement with the old lady of the Seven Hills, and have been considerably abused by her children; so we can afford to say that, decidedly anti-papal as we are, we do not admire the illiberal tone of Dr. Cumming's speech and spirit. The perpetual strain of meditation on the vices of Popish doctrine has not struck us as very likely to be useful. The mind of the preacher must be warped by such unvarying tones of thought and the hearer becomes listless to the impression intended to be conveyed.

The principal source of Dr. Cumming's popularity is a certain tact of style and a power of adaptation. No other preacher avails himself so readily of the popular literature of the day, its poetry and its history. Some of the uses to which he turns illustrations from nature and science do not indeed show much reading in that direction. As is usually the case with minds ready to seize, the facts seized are sometimes misapprehended. And what a voluminous writer, and alas! what a dear one! The books of Dr. Cumming are the dearest issued from the British press; dearer in proportion than the works of Macaulay, Grote, or Layard.

The sermons of Cumming abound in little gems such as the following, which we select as being very characteristic and happy, and with which we will conclude this paper:

"A broker the other year was purchasing pictures in Paris. He found one, which was a beautiful painting of the Virgin Mary. He purchased it for a little, hoping to sell it for much. He began to clean the painting according to the process that cleaners of pictures employ. In doing so, by accident a little fragment of the countenance of the Virgin sealed off, and he saw something far more beautiful below it. This tempted him to scale off a bit more, and he found it was a masterpiece of one of the most illustrious of masters, representing the Lord Jesus. Now what this picture-dealer did for this painting, Martin Luther and John Knox did for the Church at the time of the Reformation. The incarnation of saints they scraped off. Knox did it often very roughly, but he did it well. They scraped off the pictures of the saints, and then burst forth in all its glory the representation of the Son of God."

Lost Opportunities.

"Oh! if I had known she was to die so young."

Few professed Christians will be likely to read the following, without some quickening or compunction of conscience.

I was spending a quiet afternoon in a friend's room, when a letter was handed her. It was from her distant home, and, begging my indulgence for a few moments, she broke the seal. I saw she had hastily run over the contents, I saw the flush of pleasure fade from her cheek, and the smile disappear from her countenance. "I hope you have heard no unpleasant news," said I, as she slowly folded the letter, and sat gazing into the fire, as if utterly unconscious of my presence. She seemed to collect her thoughts, as if roused by the sound of my voice from some painful reverie, and looking at me intently replied, "Emma D. is dead." "I still did not understand the cause of the emotion that I witnessed, as I knew the individual mentioned was no relation of hers; and from the disparity of their ages, not likely to be a particular friend." "Did she die suddenly?" I asked, hoping to get some clew to the mystery. "Yes, suddenly to me," was the reply; "I knew that she was sick when I left home, and that her friends were anxious for her; but I had no idea that she would die." She then relapsed into silence, and so visibly was the anguish of her soul depicted on her countenance, that I dared not again interrupt it.

"At length, with a deep sigh, she murmured, 'Oh! if I had known she was to die so young.'"