

THE BIBLICAL RECORDER.

J. J. JAMES, Editor.

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

G. HERBERT & Co. Proprietors.

VOLUME XX. NO. 39.

RALEIGH, N. C., THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1855

WHOLE NO. 1079

THE BIBLICAL RECORDER, A Religious and Literary Paper.

Published weekly at Raleigh, N. C., at \$2 00 per annum, payable in all cases in advance.
All letters on business should be directed to G. HERBERT & Co., Raleigh, N. C.
All letters containing communications, or in any way relating to the editorial department, should be addressed to Rev. J. J. JAMES, or "Editor of the Biblical Recorder."
All communications, to insure attention, must be directed to Raleigh, N. C.—post-paid.
For further particulars see last page.

THE LAW OF NEWSPAPERS.

1. Subscribers who do not give express notice to the contrary are considered wishing to continue their subscription.
2. If the subscribers order the discontinuance of their papers, the publishers may continue to send them till all cash charges are paid.
3. If subscribers neglect or refuse to take their papers from the office to which they are directed, they are held responsible for the office, or removing and leaving it unsealed for, is "prima facie" evidence of intentional fraud.

For the Recorder.

Campbellism and Bible Unionism.

Ma. Editor:—The Recorder of 6th September is at hand, containing another article from the pen of G. W. Johnston on this (to him) very debatable subject. He seems very disposed to agitate.

When I took up the paper and read the article in question, I enjoyed a right hearty laugh over it. Our brother was, surely, in a bad humor when he wrote it. By the way, I had never seen the Recorder of August 16, in which Bro. J. says my last piece appeared; and until I saw his reply I did not know what fate had befallen it. I did not know but that it had realized a bad fate from the yellow fever,—as it had to pass through Norfolk,—but behold, the next news I hear from it, after mailing it, is that it has *fit*—so, at least, I suppose some think.

It seems from Bro. J.'s last piece that he is becoming tired of the controversy. He sets out by professing indifference to it. Now if he had not said this, I had never known it; for I supposed that, all along, he wrote with a great deal of zeal. He closes by saying he is tired of the work—"not because it is hard work, but because he had as soon undertake to straighten a grapevine as to keep pace with some men in their crooked attempts at disputation." This sentence, if I understand it, conveys opposite ideas. 1. A declaration is made that the work is an easy task—"not hard," and 2nd. A comparison is instituted, which, if it means any thing, must mean that the work is very hard. The meaning, I know, is that it is hard because of what he deems his opponent's crookedness; but that does not relieve the sentence of its inconsistency at all. If a thing is hard it can't be easy, no matter from what cause the hardness may arise. But the comparison, after all, is perhaps better than I deserve; for however crooked grape-vines may be, they bear most delicious fruit.

Bro. J. charges me with making a man of straw; and says of me—"If he finds very great pleasure in fighting a man of straw of his own creation, I will not attempt to disturb his complacency, but bid him 'blaze away.'" If not disturb my complacency, why keep writing? Why not—to use the very beautiful and reduced expression which he borrows—permit me to "blaze away?" Bro. J. can "blaze away" as much as he pleases, but I can assure him that blazes do not compose the weapons of my warfare.

Bro. J. charges me with not dealing fairly in my comments on what I conceived to be taught in his former articles; and a while before this brags the victory. Well, with all my unfairness, if he can brag the victory, what must have been the result had I dealt fairly? But it is of very questionable propriety for a man to proclaim his own victory. But this brag game is not always so; some may be deluded by it, but the discriminating certainly will not. When a man supposes he has gained a victory, it is not to be wondered at that he should, from the high pinnacle on which his own imagination has placed him, look down with a scornful air on his supposed vanquished foe, and say with complacent dignity, "yours is a bad cause, and leads to many contradictions!" He then shrugs his shoulders with unaccustomed dignity, surrounded with a halo of glory originated in his own fruitful imagination.

Bro. J. attempts to get rid of my argument based on his declaration that the Bible Union is a mediator between Baptists and Campbellites; by an allusion to the mediatorship of Christ. My argument was that if the Union was a mediator, there was a necessity of a Bible Unionist being contaminated with Campbellism, or of Campbellites partaking of Baptist sentiments. Bro. J. says, "the tendency of Christ's mediator is to produce reconciliation, though it does not necessarily produce it in every case." I say it does necessarily produce reconciliation in every case properly brought in contact with it. And if the Bible Union be a mediator between Campbellites and Baptists, it must, according to the analogy introduced by Bro. J., produce reconciliation between the two parties. What I contend for is that it is no mediator, necessarily. Baptists and Campbellites that have inclination towards each other can make almost any thing a stepping stone; and if the Bible Union has been used for this purpose, it has been greatly degraded. And now for the second time during this controversy, I disclaim any inclination towards Campbellism; and I do hope that I will be believed now at least, and that Bro. J. will no more attempt to assign me the most unenviable position of an apologist for Mr. Campbell or any of his sect. The peculiar and distinctive doctrines of Campbellism I repudiate and detest as heartily as Bro. J. possibly can; and I speak against them both in private and in public. Yet Bro. J. will have it that the Bible Union is perverting my mind from the truth. Will he never believe me, or let others believe us? Or does he design to injure me in the public estimation?

Bro. J. calls for proof that Dr. Maclay commended the Campbellites while travelling as agent for the A. and P. Bible Society. Now, I did not, that I remember, say that he did; I only asked if he never heard that he did. As to the proof, I have as good a right as Bro. J. has produced that he commended them while acting as agent for the Bible Union. A brother, minister of undoubted character told me that, if his memory was not at fault, such was the fact. On the faith of this statement I raised the inquiry, thinking possibly that Bro. J. had heard the same thing. But instead of answering my question, yea or nay, he calls for proof. For all he has said in answer to my question, I know not but that he has heard the same thing a hundred times.

Bro. J. has a great deal to say about my misrepresentations of him—all growing out of the import of his first article; I mean the import of it to my mind. As to the design of his mind, I had but one way of judging of that, viz: by what he wrote. To what he has written, I have therefore confined my strictures; and have endeavored from first to last to make only such deductions from his writings as appeared reasonable and just. If I have erred in this, it was not intentional. Upon this point, however, the impartial reader is best prepared to judge.

Two more points in J.'s last piece, and have done—done perhaps forever with him on this subject. 1st. He uses an argument to prove that I am a fool, because I said I could not understand a sentence he wrote. Because of this most ungenerous personality, I was very near not noticing him any further. And he speaks in another place of my being hard run. No wonder at all—can a cat make battle against a lion? or is the Lilliputian equal to the Gulliver? 2nd. He charges the friends of the Union (myself among them) with making and promulgating a falsehood, and persisting in it. And the ground of this charge is, that we have said that there are Pedo-baptists favorable to, and engaged in the work of the Bible Union—than which a clearer truth never was or never will be uttered.

It is bad enough to be held up to public pity or contempt as being very dull, (a fool in school-boy phrase,) but it is worse to be charged with falsehood (lying in common parlance.) But this is the treatment met with by those who are endeavoring to procure faithful versions of God's holy and precious word for the nations of the world. This is truly humiliating to think of. I close with a part of the prayer of our Lord for his enemies, having reference to all opposers of the Bible Union—"Father, forgive them."

The Baptists.

The Baptist church of Christ is a congregation of baptized believers, associated by covenant, to the observance of the ordinances of Christ governed by his laws; and exercising the gifts, rights, and privileges invested in them by his word; that its only officers are bishops or pastors, and deacons; whose qualifications, claims, and duties are defined in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus.

And no corruptions, no matter of what character, invade Baptist churches? They contain inherently all the elements of restoration. They have only to recur to first principles, to their inspired laws of membership and discipline. By the former, no persons are admitted to a place among them, but those who are decided in the judgment of charity, to be truly penitent believers in Christ, born of the Holy Spirit; and by the latter, all those who depart from piety in life, or truth in principle, are promptly separated from communion and fellowship. By this simple, but effective process, how often has she purged herself of evils of all kinds. Antinomianism attempted to fasten itself upon our churches. It was promptly thrown off. Campbellism in many parts came, with its Pedobaptist doctrine of sacramental efficacy. They arose and cast out this source of impurity. Thus they have acted in all ages. They have only to enforce the fundamental laws of their constitution, which require that God's spiritual house shall be composed of spiritual materials. While they do this, they will ever rejoice in a pure doctrine, a pure membership, a pure able ministry, and a vigorous life. Pedobaptists earnestly contend that it is essential to a happy result in the promises that all infants be baptized, received into the church, and be there brought up with the people of God. But Baptists have ever repudiated such an idea, and insist that the successful, moral, and religious training of children can only be fully obtained by strictly adhering to the teachings of Divine Inspiration; and since their baptism and reception into the church in infancy, are measures not authorized in the gospel, nor in consonance with reason, they must indisputably be productive not of good, but of much evil. Hence no mists are thrown around them by the Baptists, which deter them from understanding the gospel of Christ. They are not obliged to perform the double labor of "unlearning what they have learned ams," and then learn the truth. They set out in a right direction, and industriously pursue it. They learn that all, whether baptized or unbaptized, are by nature depraved, vitiated, and sinful; and in order to be saved, they must repent and believe in our Lord Jesus Christ; "for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved;" that all true religion is personal; that every one must account individually to God his maker; and that each must, for himself, think, decide, and obey the great I Am. Their minds are not principled by error, but open to the reception of truth, without prejudice, and to practice it without prejudice.

That the Baptist can never become a persecuting church, is guaranteed by the very nature of its organization. As it is composed of none but those who give satisfactory evidence of regeneration by the Holy Ghost, and voluntarily seek admission to its membership; for none others can be received; "a church with a bishop" to concentrate its designs, steadily adhering to the full independence of each separate organization; offering to ambitious men no distinction, and to its members of whatever grade, no secular advantages. She persecute? Who would she persecute? Not her own communicants; since to them she is bound by the strong

ties of affection, and can, besides, do nothing without their consent. Not those who are without her pale, because over them she has no control. Why would she persecute? To bring men under her communion? She would not have them, until convinced that they were truly converted; and then, unless it was their unbiased pleasure to come, professing they did so from a desire to obey Jesus Christ. She can never be a persecuting church. And to become such she must cease to be "Baptist." For theirs are, and ever have been, Baptist principles. They are the principles taught by Christ and his apostles. They demand the freedom of the conscience. They have been overborne and trodden under foot; but they are not destined to die. "God is in his truth." It must at length triumph. Our people are rapidly filling up the world; they are carrying with them the Bible; they study it for themselves; they form their own opinions; they submit their consciences to no man; they oppress the conscience of none; they set upon their own convictions of duty. This mental independence, commenced in childhood, soon becomes a habit, and is inevitably extended to every department of life. The character of the people is thus elevated, their powers of thought invigorated, their conceptions purified, and they become formidable to tyranny in the State as well as in the church. As such they must expect to be denounced. But they cannot be enslaved. Their principles have ever rendered them obnoxious to despots, and in every absolute government they have been martyred, as the enemies of magistrates and rulers. Light is now, thank God, breaking in upon the world. Truth, practical and religious, is gaining ground. The nations must ultimately sever the yoke of their oppression. And as national liberty extends itself, Baptist principles, and Baptist people, must, and will cover this terraqueous globe.

With Baptists are lodged the only conservative influences now existing in the universe. It is ours, with the blessing of God, to save from being quenched that truth which is "the World's Only Hope." It is ours, also, to save Pedobaptists themselves, of all classes, from the consequences of their own errors. If we do not save them, they must sink. It is ours to spread the gospel throughout the spacious earth. How exalted, therefore, how responsible, how transcendent, how far-reaching, is our mission. It is fearfully sublime. It has, however, been assigned us by God himself. Sustained by grace, let us discharge it with fidelity and love. He is even now clothing us with strength for the work. How unexampled our multiplication. How rapid our diffusion over the whole world! Jehovah is evidently vindicating his gospel truth, in pushing back the invading ignorance, superstition, and infidelity. Of this great conflict, who will attempt to remain an idle spectator? who can refrain from participating in such a battle? who does not involuntarily exclaim with the princely Prophet, "For Zion's sake I will not hold my peace, and for Jerusalem's sake I will not be silent, until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth?"

W. C. S.

Maryland Colony—and Religious Toleration.

A few weeks ago, we published a letter of Rev. H. H. Tucker to Hon. A. H. Stephens, on the question. Was the Maryland Colony the first civil government which established by law religious liberty. We find in the Albany Patriot, an able letter over the signature B., in which are collected some historical items very appropriate to the present question. We copy a large portion of the letter, believing that our readers would be interested in its perusal.

It may be proper for us again to state, that we have nothing to do with any political questions which, in the judgment of some, may be involved in the controversy between Messrs. Stephens and Tucker. Like the correspondent of the Albany Patriot, and Mr. Tucker, our object is to vindicate the truth of history, and not to attack nor defend a political party.

Christian Index.

From the Albany Patriot.

Rev. H. H. Tucker—Hon. A. H. Stephens, and the Press.

Messrs. Editors:—I perceive that some of the political papers are abusing the Rev. H. H. Tucker, for presuming to question the correctness of some of the statements made by Hon. A. H. Stephens, in reference to the Maryland Colony, its proprietor, Lord Baltimore, and its claim to be considered the first civil government which established by law religious liberty. As an effort has been made to counteract the influence of the array of historical facts introduced by Mr. Tucker, by representing him as a "deputy preacher," a "bigoted sectarian," &c., allow me to lay before your readers the testimony furnished by a distinguished Episcopal divine, Rev. Francis L. Hawks, D. D., in his "Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of the United States," Vol. 2, Ed. 1839.

The first settlement of the colony was made in March, 1664, (p. 24.) its first legislative assembly was convened the same year, (p. 28.) its second in 1673, and its third in 1688. At its third session, and act was passed, in which it was declared, that "Holy Church within the province shall have and enjoy all her rights, liberties, and franchises, wholly and without blemish." The author cites for authority "Bacon's Laws of Maryland, A. D. 1638—1640; Chalmers 213." He says of the act, "The language is copied literally from the great charter of England," and, in commenting upon it, adds, "If those by whom it was made were of the church of Rome, and intended by the phrase 'Holy Church,' to designate that communion which it is in violation of the principle of toleration, which allowed of no preference to any?" (p. 29.) "In 1640, it was renewed in the same words, as we shall see, at a future period, become a perpetual law of the province." (p. 30.)

The author represents the law enacted after the suppression of Clayborn's rebellion and the restoration of Calvert, in 1745, as enjoining "that no person professing to believe in Jesus Christ, should be molested, in respect of their religion, or in the free exercise thereof, or be

compelled to the belief or exercise of any other religion, against their consent, so that they be not unfaithful to the proprietary, or conspire against the civil government, that persons molesting any other in respect of his religious tenets, should pay treble damages to the party aggrieved, and twenty shillings to the proprietary, that those representing any with approbrious names of religious distinction, should forfeit ten shillings to the persons injured, that any one speaking reproachfully against the blessed Virgin or the Apostles, should forfeit five pounds, but blasphemy against God should be punished with death." He adds, "It was also enacted by the same law, that in case of inability to pay the fines above mentioned, the offending party should be whipped—and in the case of using reproachful words concerning the Apostles or Evangelists, for the third offence, the punishment was confiscation of property and perpetual banishment from the province." (p. 36.) His references are to "Chalmers's Annals, 218; Bacon's Laws of Maryland, 1649, chap. 1.—Speaking of the 'obnoxious names referred to in the law, he says, 'We find among them, 'Heretic,' 'Schismatic,' 'Idolater,' 'Furitan,' 'Independent,' 'Presbyterian,' 'Popish Priest,' 'Jesus,' 'Jesuit,' 'Papist,' 'Lutheran,' 'Calvinist,' 'Anabaptist,' 'Brownist,' 'Antinomian,' 'Barrowist,' 'Roundhead,' and 'Separatist.' The author infers, very rationally, that there were in the colony at that time 'some belonging to most of the classes above named.' How could one distinguish one of these sects from another without subjecting himself to the fine imposed?"

Under the administration of Fendall, commissioned as Governor of the colony by Lord Baltimore, in 1656, the Quakers were apprehended and whipped, (p. 44—45.)

In the year 1689, a Protestant association was formed which resisted the authority of the Deputy Governors. In an address to the king, they sought to justify themselves by reporting the grievances to which they were subjected. They complained of the "sizing Protestants in their houses with armed Papist, and detaining them long without trial,"—of "private murders and public outrages committed by Papist upon Protestants without redress; but are convicted at by men in chief authority, who are governed by Jesuits, and who are chief judges and officers, civil and military." [P. 65, 66. Reference—Chalmers's 382.]

In 1691, King William sanctioned the revolution effected by this Protestant association, and made Maryland a Royal government. In 1692, the legislature returned their thanks to their Majesties, William and Mary, for their "deliverance from the arbitrary will and pleasure of a tyrannical Popish government, under which they had so long groaned," and passed a law which established the religion of the colony. [P. 70, 71.]

It will be seen that Dr. Hawk concurs with the Rev. H. H. Tucker, in representing that the celebrated law, which it is claimed established religious liberty in Maryland, did restrict the rights of conscience, and was made oppressive to the colonists, but he proceeds a step further than Mr. Tucker, and shows that whatever credit is due for the limited toleration secured by the law, it is to be credited, not to the Catholics, but to Protestants. He says, (p. 34.) "It has commonly been supposed, that the merit of having this early made an escape from the spirit of bigotry and intolerance, belongs almost exclusively to the Roman Catholics, but from the testimony of a contemporary, such would appear not to have been the fact. There doubtless were Roman Catholics in the legislature to share the honor with their companions in that body, but our authority informs us, that divers others had removed into the colony—every encouragement had been given to such removals by the lord-proprietor, and because there were some few Papist that first inhabited themselves and others, being of different judgments, an act passed that all professing in Jesus Christ, should have equal justice, privileges and benefits in that province, and that none on penalty (mentioned) should give the terms of roundhead, &c. Reference—Haumond's Leah and Rachel."—A tract written in 1656.

Why have not those who are seeking to detract from Mr. Tucker's character and standing in society, directed their fulminations against Baneroff and Dr. Hawk? It is because Mr. Tucker is connected with a denomination that happens to be unpopular with them? I would remind the craft that there are upwards of 82,000 Baptists in the State of Georgia alone and that there is not another Editor who is not more or less indebted to them for support.

P. S. The italics in the above extracts are not in the original. Lord Baltimore imbibed a tolerant spirit from his Protestant parents. He held his charter at the will of a Protestant government. The facts must have exerted a great influence over him. Romanist, therefore, are entitled to but little praise for his virtues, and little censure for his failings.

How to be Happy.

I will give you two or three good rules which may help you to become happier than you would be without knowing them; but as to being completely happy, that you can never be till you get to heaven.

The first is, "Try your best to make others happy." "I never was happy," said a certain king, "till I began to take pleasure in the welfare of my people; but ever since then, in the darkest day, I have had sunshine in my heart."

My second rule is, "Be content with little." We deserve but little, we require but little, and "better is little, with the fear of God, than great treasures and trouble therewith."

Two men were determined to be rich; but they set about it in different ways, for the one strove to raise up his means by his desires, while the other did his best to bring down his desires to his means. The result was, the one who coveted so much was always regretting, while he who desired but little was always contented.

My Third rule is, "Look on the sunny side of things."

Look up with hopeful eyes.
Though all things seem foreforn,
The sun that sets to night will rise
Again to-morrow morn.
The skipping lamb, the singing lark, and the

leaping fish, tell us that happiness is not confined to one place. God in his goodness has spread it abroad on the earth, in the air, and in the water. Two aged women lived in the same cottage; one was always fearing a storm, and the other was always looking for sunshine—hardly need I say which it was whose face was lighted up with joy.

From China.

SHANGHAI, April 18th, 1855.

DEAR BRO. PASCHAL:

I take pleasure in being able to report peace and prosperity. That is the peace of Shanghai, and prosperity of the mission. It is quite a delightful relief to be able to go in and out, hither, thither without restraint or fear of balls. Missionaries are making good use of the liberty, and the people I think are somewhat more inclined than before the siege, to listen to the truth. A few hear the word gladly, for its own sake, some listen through idle curiosity, others hear rather than take the trouble to get out of the way. Mr. Crawford's boys school and my girls are both carried on in different rooms of the house we formerly occupied in the city. We have twenty-four girls and twenty-six boys. Every Sabbath and Thursday Mr. C. holds service in a little chapel up stairs formed by throwing two rooms into one. The pupils of both schools, teachers and a few neighbors attend. Among those who attend regularly there are two who seem to feel some earnestness for their soul's salvation. One, I sometimes hope, has passed from death unto life, but very great caution must be exercised in judging of the conversion of the heathen. Mr. C. also has preaching every Sabbath morning in our study. Those who attend here besides our servants are a few people from a village three or four miles distant. Of these some come to see how a foreign bono looks—how foreigners dress and talk; others to see what doctrine this is which has caused so much excitement among the neighbors, and lastly, a few come to find out "what shall we do to be saved?" Of these one of the most interesting is a young lady of eighteen, the only child of her mother who is a widow in feeble health. She first heard the truth about two months since and says she immediately believed it. After coming regularly several Sabbaths, her mother seeing her take so much interest in something foreign, began to remonstrate, "Who will turn silver paper to me after I die, and will pay for getting my soul out of hell, if you my only child, believe in Jesus?" "Why, mother," replied the girl, "if you will believe in Jesus yourself he will save you from hell—my burning *ding* to Jesus and—"

"Four times, near, even, believe in me word to go out there and teach her something of this doctrine which has so much interested her daughter." A few days after Mr. C. and I went and the old woman made a great many inquiries about this new religion and listened very attentively to our teaching, but I learn still looks coldly upon her daughter's coming. Her uncle and aunt are still more decided and speak very crossly to and of her. The neighbors say she shows no resentment but a meek quiet determination. She has continued to come every Sabbath until the last when it rained all day. A great trial I fear awaits her. She is betrothed, and soon to be married to a heathen. Her friends fear that when the parents of the bridegroom hear of the bride's believing in Jesus they will reject her. And should she refuse to go through with the idolatry in the marriage ceremony, then what? everybody asks. Then what? concerns me less than "will she have courage, faith, to forego?" I have no reason to believe her yet a subject of saving grace, but think she is earnestly seeking it. This is only one instance of the joys and sorrows, the encouragements and anxieties of missionary life.

Wong continues to be a source of joy and comfort to us, and I trust by his bold stand in the cause of Christ and his influence, making himself useful to his countrymen. His wife says she believes, but it is evident that she cares very little for religion.

Remember me affectionately to dear Mrs. P. and the children. I am almost sorry you are left Clinton, because I always associate you in my thoughts with the place. For many reasons I have not written as often to my dear friends there as I wished. I should like to hear from you. Also from Mrs. P., Bel and Martha—and I suppose Amanda might write now.

Yours truly,

MARTHA F. CRAWFORD.

The Diabolism of War.

We intended to write an article upon the proceedings of the Turkish and French soldiers and certain English merchant seamen, at Kertch, and in the Yenikale in the sea of Azoff. On second thoughts, however, we have decided to lay before our readers, without notes or comment, the accounts given of these proceedings by eye witnesses. The facts below will speak for themselves. We leave them to produce their proper effect upon the minds of those who may peruse them.

Lord Raglan writing to Lord Panmure under date of May 29, informs the war secretary that the allied expedition to Kertch, which left its anchorage off Sevastopol on the 22d, reached its destination on the morning of the 24th; where the troops being landed without delay, the war steamers pushed on towards Kertch and Yenikale, and all the objects in contemplation were accomplished in 24 hours without resistance on the part of the enemy, without the striking of a blow and without the firing of a solitary shot—the allies thus obtaining bloodless and unopposed possession of the Sea of Azoff.

The Russian army, amounting to about 2,500 men, abandoned Kertch in the afternoon of the day on which the Allied troops landed at Ambalaki, and were followed by a large number of inhabitants, consisting of the nobles, government employees, and persons of wealth, who carried with them such property as they could collect in their trepidation, leaving behind them their houses full of furniture, and all articles which were too cumbersome for so sudden a removal. The persons left in the city were the poorer Russians, Greek traders, Jews, and Tartars. The allies entered Kertch the following morning. The population, one and all, made

submission, offering bread and salt to the conquerors in accordance with Russian custom. They were assured that they would be protected, and their lives and property spared. The troops moved on to Yenikale, leaving behind a few sailors and soldiers to guard the city and destroy certain manufactories of warlike instruments. Let us see what followed.

In the afternoon the crews of some merchant ships landed and began to break into the houses of absent proprietors, and to pillage the contents. What they could not remove they smashed to atoms. Towards evening, Turkish stragglers from the camp and others who had fallen out of the line of march, flocked into the town and perpetrated the most atrocious crimes. To plunder and wanton devastation they added violation and murder. The Tartars joined the Turks, led them from house to house, and pointed out, as victims to their cupidly and lust, the Russian trades people and merchants who had rendered themselves obnoxious to their ignorance and fanaticism. One miscreant was shot by a French soldier as he came down the street in triumph, waving a sword wet with the blood of a child whom he had hacked to pieces. Others were slain in the very act of committing the most horrible and indescribable outrages. Respect for life was only established by its destruction. Such was the treatment of the unarmed, unoffending, and innocent inhabitants of a city that had cast itself upon the mercy of its conquerors, and had been promised protection and security! Some of the French, we are informed, joined in the excesses of the Turks during this terrible night of nameless horror and blood, and on the following day English merchant sailors united with the bands already ashore in the work of rapine and destruction. At the back of the town stood a building erected after the model of the Parthenon, used as a museum, and filled with antiquities of inestimable value. The Times correspondent, to whom we are indebted for the foregoing particulars of the murderous and polluting orgies of the 25th, paid a visit to this edifice after it had been entered by the monsters already referred to. The ruin was prodigious. The floor was covered for several inches in depth with the debris of broken glass, of vases, urns, statuary, the precious dust of their contents, and charred bits of wood and bone, mingled with the fresh splinters of the shelves, desks, and cases in which they had been preserved. Not a single bit of anything that could be broken or burnt any smaller had been exempt from reduction by the hammer or fire. The glass was smashed to atoms, statues pounded to pieces. The only parlour, in this scene of absolute demolition was within some of the finest houses in the town, such as that of the Governor, whose ruin was equally indiscriminate and universal.

Within four days after the sounding of the Russian vessels employed in conveying provisions to the Russian army in the Crimea, and corn, flour, and bread-stuff, amounting to seven millions of rations, exclusive of 4,000,000 lbs. of corn and 500,000 lbs. of flour destroyed by the Russians at Kertch as it appeared on the 13th instant, twenty days after the inhabitants had tendered their submission to their conquerors. "One might wander through streets of houses, good and indifferent, without finding anything new in the monotony of ruin. The market-place, which had been surrounded with small shops, many of which were kept open after our arrival, was gutted. The cellars under the houses had been ransacked, wine flowed in the gutters, barrels were knocked to pieces, and under the cover of the arcade the ground was littered for an inch in depth with bits of crockery, papers, frames of boxes, jars, bottles, and all the endless articles which once constituted stock in-trade and furniture. The butchers' shops, which offered little when the joints were gone, were nevertheless broken up, and the heavy chopping blocks split up with vast ingenuity. The cafes and the drinking-shop, or *estaminet*, at the corner had been scenes of grand carouses apparently, after which the jovial souls had knocked the establishment to atoms. A large arcade, inhabited by tradesmen, and resembling similar buildings of the second class in Turin, was gutted from top to bottom. The silence and desolation of places which a few days before were full of people were exceedingly painful and distressing. They were found in every street, almost in every house, except when the noise of gentlemen playing on pianos with their boot-heels or breaking up furniture was heard within the houses, or the flames crackled within the walls. In some instances the people had hoisted the French or Sardinian flag to protect their houses. That poor device was soon detected and frustrated. It was astonishing to find that the humblest dwellings had not escaped. They must have been invaded for the mere purpose of outrage and from the love of mischief, for the most miserable of men could have but little hope of discovering within them booty worthy of his notice. The Russians must remember that with all this violence and destruction we have spared their splendid villas and palaces, which for 100 miles stretch away in terraced lines along the south coast of the Crimea. The plunder, in fact, was not controlled at Kertch because our administrators were weak and imbecile, and our position required vigor, and ability, and tact to prevent the commission of offences difficult to be repressed in the train of an army."—The Empire.

The duty and expediency of enclosing postage stamps, cannot be too generally known or too strongly enforced, among all who write on business. Much disappointment will be experienced by those who, through inadvertence or indifference, neglect the precaution, for many would willingly give any information sought, will not be content to pay for sending it to those who want it.

Like the generality of kings and conquerors, Frederick the Great had a most philosophic indifference to death. In one of his battles, a battalion of veterans having taken to their heels, he galloped after them, bawling out—"Why do you run away, you old blackguards? Do you want to live any more?"

Four lines more beautiful than those are rarely written. The figure which they meet is exquisite. "A solemn memento in the east, Tells of the work to be, As travellers hear the billows roll Before they see the sea."

Like the generality of kings and conquerors, Frederick the Great had a most philosophic indifference to death. In one of his battles, a battalion of veterans having taken to their heels, he galloped after them, bawling out—"Why do you run away, you old blackguards? Do you want to live any more?"