

VERMONT TELEGRAPH.

"I AM SET FOR THE DEFENCE OF THE GOSPEL."

BRANDON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 3, 1838.

VOL. X. NO. 15.

BY ORSON S. MURRAY.

TERMS.
The VERMONT TELEGRAPH is published weekly, at \$2.00 a year, payable within four months—after four months and within eight, \$2.25—after eight months and within the year, \$2.50—after the close of the year, to rise in this ratio.
To companies who receive twelve or more copies in one bundle, and pay within four months, at \$1.50—after four months, to rise as above, \$1.75 within eight months &c.
Agents, who procure and pay for six subscribers, are entitled to the seventh copy gratis.
No paper to be discontinued until arrears are paid, except at the discretion of the publisher.
All letters, to secure attention, must come Postage paid.

Vermont Telegraph.

BRANDON, SATURDAY, DEC. 30, 1837.

For the Vermont Telegraph.
SECOND COMING OF CHRIST.
To Wm. Miller, Low-Hampton, N. Y.

Dear brother:—Leaving many things for the present, which I wish to say upon my second objection, I pass to my third, viz: *Misapplication of scripture—transgression of your own rules of interpretation,—proving two things by the same event, &c.*
I wish to head this article with a very just and important remark of yours, page 77, viz: "There is a close connection in the word of God which must always be kept in view, and if our exposition of one [passage] contradicts another of the same connection, or like import, we may know there is a wrong in us." To this I most heartily subscribe. Attention to it would have prevented the publication of thousands of the theories of men, which have inundated the world, wrapping up immortal minds in darkness and mysticism. The Bible is a plain book on all points necessary for us to know, in order to please God and work righteousness. And others where mystery is now concerned will all be made plain to us, when time and its rolling events shall break the seals, and open to us a new source of wonder, and admiration of the great eternal mind. Great care should be taken that in our explanation of God's word, we do no violence to its meaning,—because a train of consequences follow, which when once begun will never end. I wish to feel in this discussion that we are treading on holy ground. And while I may notice a few instances where, in my humble opinion, you

is this the very reason why I mean *two*.—Had I left out the *copulative*, then "John, the fine scholar," would mean but *one*, John and scholar being in apposition. Had your text read: "How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, the abomination of desolation," &c., then *sacrifice* and *abomination* must have been put in apposition and mean the *same thing*. But, *Secondly*: To find whether the daily sacrifice means Jewish or pagan, I try your rule for finding the true meaning of passages, page 4. I wish to know the meaning of, "daily sacrifice," in Daniel; "and I take my concordance and trace the word, and in" Numbers iv, 16; xxviii, 24; xxix, 6; and Ezek. xlvi, 13, I find that it "invariably" mean sacrifices commanded by Moses—or *Jewish sacrifices*. Wishing to find your explanation, I "trace" on and find it, in the Bible, *nowhere so explained!* Hence I conclude that you have not only "misapplied scripture," but "transgressed your own rules of interpretation."
Thirdly: It is evident that Daniel must have understood Jewish sacrifices, and not pagan, from the fact that the word stands "coupled," or in connection with the *sanctuary*. This you acknowledge means the "temple at Jerusalem," page 37. Where were those sacrifices offered with which Daniel was particularly acquainted, and about which he felt so much anxiety?—Answer: In the *sanctuary*, at Jerusalem. Daniel then, must have understood sacrifices in connection with the *sanctuary*, unless told to the contrary.
Fourthly: I think you have tacitly admitted, if not proved, that the "daily sacrifice" means Jewish, and not pagan, in this same lecture. See your explanation of the two verses immediately preceding your text, in both of which the word, "daily sacrifice" occurs, page 45. After quoting: "And out of one of them came forth a little horn which waxed exceeding great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land. And it waxed great, even to the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them. Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host, and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down. And an host was given him against the daily sacrifice by reason of

ary. I now ask you to show chapter and verse where it is so called, or acknowledge, that you have "transgressed your rule of interpretation." The question of the saint was about a certain "sanctuary," and the answer, if it be an *answer*, is about the *same sanctuary*.
But I proceed to notice, as to the time when the *sanctuary* began to be trodden under foot. You say it has been "trodden under foot since the days of Daniel."—Astonishing! Was Cyrus "treading down" the temple, when he gave a decree to *build it*? Was Artaxerxes "treading under foot" the temple, when he sent Ezra with immense sums of money to *beautify* the "house of God," and set in order the temple worship? Was Rome "treading under foot" the "sanctuary," when, under Herod the great, it was repaired at immense cost, and made to vie in beauty and splendor, even with the temple built by Solomon? Is *building a house "treading it under foot"*? Is *beautifying, repairing and adorning a house, "treading it down"*? If so, I confess my ignorance of my mother-tongue, and beg for instruction. But happily for me, I can call on Isaiah for explanation.—"The people of thy holiness have possessed it but a little while, our adversaries have trodden down thy sanctuary." Isa. lxi, 18. To what does he here allude? Answer: To the *destruction of the sanctuary* by Nebuchadnezzar. I must believe, hard as it may seem, that you never would have thought of commencing this "treading down the sanctuary" when you do, if it had not been necessary to make your 2300 days end in 1843. And I now call on you to show that the temple was ever "trodden down," from the days of Cyrus, the Persian, to the time that Vespasian ascended the Roman throne, about A. D. 70. Then, Nebuchadnezzar like, it was "trodden down" to the ground, and the "host," or temple worshippers, with it. Here was giving "both the sanctuary and host to be trodden under foot." And "under foot" they now remain, and will, until the time denoted by 2300 days, shall be accomplished.
I shall close this number, with a few remarks on your phrase, "daily sacrifice abomination." This is of frequent occurrence, and is used by you as if of divine origin. But I have tried it by your rule, and find no such phrase in the Bible. I find "daily sacrifice," and "abomination of desolation." I now ask you where you get it, from the Bible, or from your own vocabulary? I

But I think he has materially failed on this point. If I understand his reasoning in this discourse, he makes the whole of religion to consist in a man's own individual *views* of the subject, or his *feelings* with reference to duty; instead of testing his religion by the unerring word of God.
It is true, "God is a spirit," and will not accept of any worship other than that in which the *heart* is found. In short, the whole of man's duty to God, is included in the following short and solemn injunction of heaven, "*my son, give me thine heart.*" This is equivalent to loving God with all the heart; and none can do this, without conscientiously observing all his commands. Says Christ, "If you love me, keep my commands." It is evident that a strict and conscientious observance of God's commands, is the only sure evidence of love to him. "Why call ye me Lord, Lord," says the Savior, "and do not the things that I say?"
But, to return to the title page of this discourse, I am at a loss to determine what Mr. B. means by "*dissuasive from controversy.*"
If he would dissuade men from disputing, or quarrelling, about baptism, I would do the same. If he would dissuade men from making baptism the whole of religion, a brother's heart and voice should go with him. But if he would dissuade the christian from thinking about this precious ordinance, consulting the scriptures respecting it, or from letting what light he has on this subject shine around him in a proper way, I must *dissent* from him here. The Lord saith: "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works," &c. And again, "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them."
I admit with Mr. B. that if the *heart* is wrong, *all* is wrong; so on the other hand, if the heart is right, (the outward conduct being regulated by the heart;) *all* is right. If a man's heart is right with God, he will be inclined to do all things according to the pattern shown him, i. e., he would wish to obey the Lord in the strict letter of the command; and if he found himself disposed to alter that command in the least, or to substitute something else in the place of it, it would be a very strong, presumptive evidence at least, that his heart was not right. "By their fruits ye shall know them."
If I am not mistaken, the great object of

must in *every thing*. He seems to think, that in order to comply with the strict import of the Savior's command, "this do in remembrance of me," we must assemble in an upper room, wash the disciple's feet, use unleavened bread, sit in a reclining posture around the table, and all this in the night. Any one, on a moment's reflection, will be satisfied that these circumstances had nothing to do with the ordinance itself; that consisted in partaking of the bread and wine, with proper views and feelings; and this might be done in any place, or at any time.
With regard to the bread, it was such as they had at the time. The supper immediately followed the eating of the passover, which required unleavened bread. Any other bread would have answered the same purpose, at that time, had it been on the table. It must of course be *bread* of some kind, or the design would not be answered. Mr. B. seems to mistake, entirely, the *design* of the two ordinances. The supper, as a standing ordinance in the church, was designed to perpetuate the remembrance of Christ's sufferings and death. The symbols chosen, represented his body and blood. As often as we partake of these chosen symbols, we do show forth the Lord's death till he come.
The design of *baptism* was to represent in a figure, the *burial* and resurrection of our Lord. That this was the design of the ordinance, will appear from the following passages of scripture: "I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished." "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." "Else what shall they do which were baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for the dead?" "The like figure whereunto baptism doth also now save us, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead," Luke xii, 50; Rom. vi, 4, 5; Cor. xv, 29; 1 Peter, iii, 21. These, with many other, passages that might be quoted, very clearly show that the primary design of the ordinance was, to represent to the believer the burial and resurrection of Christ.
This, immersion, or baptism, represents to the christian—his death to sin and the

live." Paul says, "*be not conformed to this world.*" Mr. B. says, "choose that mode which is most convenient." Christ says, "*deny thyself, take up thy cross and follow me.*" Mr. B. says, "choose that mode which is most free from every objection on the ground of strict propriety, and decorum—a mode offering no offence to the most sensitive and shrinking delicacy, &c." Our Lord says, "*Woe unto you when all men shall speak well of you.*" "If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household?" It is very evident that our Savior consulted not the refined feelings, or shrinking delicacy of man. He commissioned his disciples to "go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." "Teach all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." But no where did he tell them to choose such different modes as would be congenial with the most refined feelings of society, or as would be best adapted to the climate, or season of the year. No. His plain, uncompromising command was, "*Teach all nations, baptizing them,*" or, according to the strict and literal translation of the word, "*immersing them.*" Now if our Savior intended that this ordinance should be so altered as to meet the circumstances and feelings of men, in different ages of the world, why did he not say so, or give some intimation of it at least? But no—the same command that was binding on christians in *India*, would be obligatory on christians in *Greenland*.
But what do I hear? Listen a moment to the melting description. "*All is still, all is solemn; every eye is fixed: and heaven and earth seem pausing for a moment to witness.*"—WHAT? why according to Mr. B.'s own account, a mere "*form of a ceremony, a shade of a shadow.*"
All heaven is represented as ceasing their songs, and gazing with fixed admiration upon a mere *nothing*, yea, *less*, the *shade* of of nothing; yes, and all this in the midst of the "*breathless silence of a full and solemn house!*" What magic art is that, which can bring heaven and earth together, and fix their gaze upon the mere "*costume of a ceremony, the drapery of religion!*"
I am not a little surprised to find Mr. B. guilty of so striking a paradox, even on the same page. Notice the foregoing description given of the administration of a form of a ceremony, inviting the attention of heaven and earth; and then listen to the following language, found on the same page: "On every account, except that of expediency,

gun will never end. I wish to feel in this discussion that we are treading on holy ground. And while I may notice a few instances where, in my humble opinion, you have failed to give the true meaning of scripture, I would cover them with a mantle of charity, and not unnecessarily impeach your motives.

I shall not confine myself particularly to the order in which the three points mentioned in my third objection occur, because if what I have already written on my first and second objections is correct, it will be seen, and you will doubtless admit that you have "misapplied scripture." But I shall take the liberty to introduce these points somewhat promiscuously, in treating upon the following particulars found in your lectures.

1. Daily sacrifice, sanctuary, host, &c.
2. The two witnesses.
3. The Asiatic churches, especially the Laodicean.

First: The daily sacrifice, &c. On page 36, you attempt to explain Dan. viii, 13, 14: "How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and host to be trodden under foot? And he said unto me, Unto two thousand three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." This is your text for your 3d lecture; and, to do justice to my own feelings, and to the subject, it would be necessary to write a review. But time and space allows me to touch only upon a few things, contained in it, particularly those mentioned above. In speaking of the "daily sacrifice," you say "As both Jews and Pagans had their rights and sacrifices, both morning and evening, and their altars were kept smoking with their victims of beasts, and their holy fire was preserved in their national altars and temples devoted to their several deities or gods, we might be at a loss to know which of these to apply this figurative expression to, did not our text and context explain the meaning." "It is very evident," you continue, "when we carefully examine our text, that it is to be understood as referring to pagan and papal rites; for it stands coupled with the 'abomination of desolation,' and performs the same acts, such as are ascribed to the papal abominations, 'To give both the sanctuary and host to be trodden under foot.'"

Now, to me, your proof that the "daily sacrifice" means pagan sacrifice, and not Jewish, is, so far as it goes, proof to the contrary. The fact that it is coupled with the "abomination of desolation," proves that they mean two things. Suppose I say, "John and the fine scholar went to school," do I mean two boys, or one? According to your argument, I mean only one, because they are coupled together with a copulative conjunction. Now, who does not see that

and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down. And an host was given him against the daily sacrifice by reason of transgression, and it cast down the truth to the ground; and it practiced, and prospered: [Daniel viii, 9, 10, 11, 12:]—you say, "two or three things in the above description, clearly show that by the little horn, in this passage, we are to understand the Roman power, viz: 'its conquering to the south and east, and pleasant land, stamping on the host, magnifying himself against Christ, and destroying Jerusalem, the place of his sanctuary,' &c. Now here is the same he brought to view as in Dan. ix, 27, and then it is declared, as I have shown in objection first, that the person or kingdom who destroyed 'Jerusalem, the place of his sanctuary,' took away the 'daily sacrifice,' or caused it to cease. That this daily sacrifice was Jewish, and not pagan, I presume you will not deny. And as you have shown in the passage last quoted that Rome (or as I have shown, Titus, a Roman general, in particular,) destroyed Jerusalem, and the sanctuary, too, and as the daily sacrifices and the destruction of Jerusalem are both brought to view in the same verse, nothing being said about pagan rites, therefore Daniel must have understood Jewish sacrifices, and not pagan.

But I pass to notice your explanation of "sanctuary and host." By "sanctuary" you say—page 37, "we must understand the temple at Jerusalem and those who worship therein, which was (has been) trodden under foot by pagan kingdoms of the world, since the days of Daniel the writer of our text." What you mean by saying, "those who worship therein," I do not know. I wish to ask where you get your authority from the Bible to call "worshippers" a part of the sanctuary? I always supposed they worshipped in the sanctuary. If you had said by "sanctuary and host" we are to understand the temple and the worshippers therein, I should most heartily concur in the opinion. But you have explained the word, host, to mean those who "worship in the outer court, and fitly represent the Christian church." The word, host, then, represents, the Christian church, according to your explanation, and the sanctuary the temple at Jerusalem. Mark that. Now let us examine the rest of your text. "And he said unto me, Unto two thousand three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed," i. e. the "temple at Jerusalem." O no, say you, this "means the true sanctuary, which is built of lively stones to his own acceptance through Christ." But, brother Miller, I must call on you to show why the word sanctuary has two meanings, in your text. Besides I have tried your rule of interpretation, and have traced the whole Bible through, and nowhere find Christ's church called a sanctu-

But I have tried it by your rule, and find no such phrase in the Bible. I find "daily sacrifice," and "abomination of desolation." I now ask you where you get it, from the Bible, or from your own vocabulary? I suppose you mean by it, an "abominable daily sacrifice," and apply it to the sacrifices of pagan Rome. But are not all pagan sacrifices abominable? If so, why select out the particular sacrifices of pagan Rome—Daniel's "daily sacrifice," and your "daily sacrifice abomination," are with you synonymous. But if my remarks on the "daily sacrifice" are correct, you will see your mistake. Your "daily sacrifice abomination" ends, as you have it, in the year A. D. 508; whereas, Daniel's "daily sacrifice" ends with the destruction of Jerusalem, about A. D. 70, making 438 difference. Perhaps the reader may inquire whether these remarks are merely to show that you have "transgressed your own rules of interpretation," &c. I answer no. They have an important bearing on my 2d objection, and go to show that a day in prophecy does not mean a year. They will make 2300 days mean only the time since the destruction of Jerusalem, for then the "daily sacrifice" ceased, and the "sanctuary" began to be "trodden under foot," which is about 1767, making five hundred and thirty-three years difference. Or, upon the principle that a day does mean a year, the "sanctuary" will not be "cleansed" until about A. D. 2370, instead of 1843.

AARON ANGLIER.

Waterbury, Dec. 1837.

(To be Continued.)

CORRECTIONS.—In the article containing objection 1st, toward the bottom of the first column, "firmly proved" should be "fairly proved"—second column, in quotation, Dan. ix, 25, "commencement" should be "commandment"—third column, in quotation from Josephus, "impious writers" should be "impious wretches" in next quotation, "sir," should be "since"—near the end of the article, "close of Cyrus" should be "decree of Cyrus."

For the Vermont Telegraph.

Brother Murray:—The following is a brief review of a discourse, founded on St. John iv, 24: "God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth."

The discourse alluded to above, is entitled, "A dissuasive from controversy respecting the mode of Baptism,—By GEO. C. BECKWITH."

I very much admire his theme of discourse, viz: the *Worship of God*; and had Mr. B. given a proper illustration of God's worship, and impressed this duty upon the heart and conscience of the sinner by all the powerful motives which the gospel presents, I could most sincerely use his own language and say, "A brother's heart would go with him, and a brother's prayers follow

substitute something else in the place of it; it would be a very strong, presumptive evidence at least, that his heart was not right. "By their fruits ye shall know them."

If I am not mistaken, the great object of Mr. B. is, to make men believe that the ordinance of baptism is not worth contending about. And, to show how little importance is attached to what he calls a mere form of a ceremony, or a shade of a shadow, he alludes to family worship. Says he, "some stand, while others kneel around the domestic altar." "But is it material in which of these postures we pray?" To this I would reply: the simple circumstance of kneeling, sitting, or standing in the time of family worship, constitutes no part of that worship. For instance, Mr. B. is in the habit of maintaining God's worship in his family; the hour for devotion arrives; they all kneel down before God; there is no reading of the scriptures, no religious conversation, no devout prayer offered up to God: would there be any worship here, such as God would accept?—Every christian will answer, No.

It is equally true with reference to the Lord's supper, alluded to by Mr. B.—Should I wish my christian brethren to sit, stand, kneel, or recline upon a couch, around the table of the Lord, and at the same time refuse to take my portion of the bread and wine, should I, (agreeably to the intention of the Savior,) comply with his command? No, it is in eating the bread, and drinking the wine, (with suitable feelings,) that I "show forth the Lord's death." The different positions of the body have nothing to do with the ordinance itself.

We will now apply it to the ordinance of baptism. An individual, (wishing to be baptized,) accompanies me to the river side where "prayer is wont to be made." We ride or walk, as the case may be. After having come to the water, we sit, kneel, or stand up, as is most convenient. I now take the candidate by the hand, in the most solemn manner pronounce the name of the Trinity, calling him baptized, and all this without using a drop of water. And I ask, do any or all of these circumstances, or different positions of the body, constitute baptism? No—the simple act of plunging him beneath the watery element, and raising him up from the emblematical grave, constitutes the baptism, and nothing else.

Mr. B. receives his candidate in the broad aisle, before the pulpit, and then, in the presence of all the people, he lays his hand upon his head, repeating in a very solemn manner the usual form, "I baptize thee," but no water is applied: would Mr. B. or any other advocate of sprinkling call this baptism?

On the 5th page of the "dissuasion," Mr. B. labors hard to show, that if we are going to follow Christ's example in any thing, we

many other, passages that might be quoted, very clearly show that the primary design of the ordinance was, to represent to the believer the burial and resurrection of Christ.

This, immersion, or baptism, represents to the christian—his death to sin and the world, and his resurrection to a life of holy obedience. Now, says Mr. B., "I feel not only at liberty, but sacredly bound to adopt that mode of applying water in baptism, which is most accordant with the nature and design of this holy ordinance." Have I not proved from scripture, that the design of the ordinance was to represent a burial and resurrection? Now I ask, what figure, or mode is best calculated to represent these? Who would receive a correct impression with reference to a burial or resurrection, by seeing a candidate sprinkled, or water poured on his head? There is not a particle of resemblance, no, not so much as the "shade of a shadow." Mr. B. then, according to his own statement, ought to practice immersion, for in this, the whole design of the ordinance is answered, which cannot be, in sprinkling or pouring.

I should think that Mr. B.'s book was anything but what the title page declares it to be, viz: *A dissuasive from controversy*. There are certainly some of the most sophistical reasonings, and fallacious arguments, to substantiate a point, that I ever witnessed in any tract whatever.

On his 9th page, he undertakes to tell us what particular mode he prefers, and begins with saying that it should be "simple:" "ceremonies are only the costume of religion; modes are only the costume of a ceremony; and christianity, destined to become the religion of all mankind, must wear a drapery which she can change in adaptation to the ever shifting circumstances in which her votaries may be placed." He goes on to say, that it should be "congenial especially with the customs of society;" should be "convenient, decorous," &c. &c. Has it indeed come to this, that religion must "conform to the age, country, and climate in which we live?" In order to accommodate persons that are sick and feeble, those who live in cold countries, and others too who wish to be baptized in the cold season of the year, the ordinance must undergo a change, and sprinkling or pouring must be substituted for immersion, which was evidently practised by the apostles, and all primitive christians. Where did Mr. B. get his information on this subject? Where did he find a warrant for changing the institutions of Christ's house, which is equivalent to "changing the truth of God into a lie?" Surely not from the Bible. The Savior never commanded it. The apostles never taught it. Why then should Mr. B. rise up in the nineteenth century, and think to change laws and customs? If there ever was a relic of popery incorporated into protestantism, here we have it. Mr. B. says, "we must conform to the country and age in which we

same page. Notice the foregoing description given of the administration of a form of a ceremony, inviting the attention of heaven and earth; and then listen to the following language, found on the same page: "On every account, except that of expediency, is not the mode of baptism, as truly as that of the Lord's supper, a matter of entire indifference? is it not altogether unworthy of dispute?" And yet, holy angels, and redeemed souls in heaven, can pause in their songs of sublime adoration to witness it! O my soul! May the Lord forgive the man that thus trifles with holy things, and show him a "more excellent way."

And after all, it is not so much a matter of astonishment, that Mr. B. should put so low an estimate upon the ordinance; viewing it in the light he does. I should consider it a mere nothing; for certainly, sprinkling or pouring, for baptism, is nothing more than the "shade of a shadow." It is the "drapery," no, of religion, but of popery.

Let us follow him a little farther. On page 32d, and onward, he says, "What apology, then, can I have for agitating such a controversy? My conscience? what conscientious in opening such a flood-gate of evil upon Zion; in throwing such a fire-brand of strife into her very citadel? can I really suppose it to be the will of God, that I should do what tends to produce so much evil, to tarnish the honor of his cause, and ruin the souls of men forever?" "all this too, for the mere form of a ceremony?"

Is it indeed true, that Christ, the great Head of the church, has imposed a command, and given it in solemn charge to his apostles to proclaim it to the ends of the earth, and yet if we talk about it, and endeavor to ascertain its nature and design, we are charged with opening a flood-gate of evils upon Zion; and throwing a fire-brand of strife into her very citadel?

Again, says Mr. B., "Is this the purpose of my office, or of your own high calling? shall we stoop from the themes of the gospel, worthy of angels, and of God, to dwell perpetually on the bare form of a ceremony? It would be a deadly gangrene preying on the vitals of our piety." "I cannot stoop from an elevation so lofty to dispute about such a shade of a shadow as the form of a ceremony."

Is Mr. B.'s elevation, from which he would have to stoop, more lofty than that of angels and glorified spirits, who are represented as bending their high heads to gaze upon the imposing scene? How could he ever stoop from his lofty elevation to administer this "form of a ceremony," if it is so unworthy his high calling, and beneath the dignity of his office even to talk about it?

A LOVER OF TRUTH.

Whiting, Vt.

The blessing of the Lord, it maketh rich; and he addeth no sorrow with it.