

# VERMONT TELEGRAPH.

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

BY ORSON S. MURRAY.

BRANDON, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1837.

VOL. I. NO. 10.

## TERMS.

The VERMONT TELEGRAPH is published weekly, at \$3.00 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 pay is 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, NOV. 25, 1837.

For the Telegraph.

## SECOND COMING OF CHRIST.

BROTHER MURRAY:—I perceive in the last Telegraph a communication addressed to you, and through your useful paper to the public and myself, from brother Angier, pledging himself to present and prove, six objections, to my lectures on the second coming of Christ on or before the year 1843—"as soon as he can command time." I wish to say to brother Angier, time is precious,—and certainly if I am correct. I hope then he will not be tardy in the proof of his objections. For the public mind will of course be suspended until they see, or read the force of his objections. And an eternity of happiness or misery may hang on a few moments of time, which some probationers may now enjoy. Therefore we ought to be very careful that the blood of souls are not found on our skirts.

Some of those points on which his objections are built, are in my humble opinion sufficiently established by testimony already produced in my lectures; but if brother Angier should otherwise judge, I hope he will tell the public and myself, what those passages of scripture which I have presented as evidence do mean, and if it is better proved, and clearer light than that which I have presented, I hope to find rejoicing in the light.

This, to me, appears to be the ground which brother Angier ought to pursue on his two first objections. If he establishes

himself and tell Christians that this is as correct as the rest of their doctrines. With those who disagree with brother Miller, this is the best reason why the subject should be attended to now—just as, on the other hand, the fact that "the time is at hand" is, with those who agree with brother Miller, the best reason why their doctrine should spread as fast as possible, so that souls be saved and all be ready.

For the Vermont Telegraph.

## MINISTERIAL EDUCATION.

MR. EDITOR:—I have read with some degree of interest the "Annual Report of the Faculty to the Board of Trustees" of the Newton Theological Institution, as published on the first page of a late number of the Telegraph. In 1829

when the question of a literary and theological school, similar to that which has since been established at Brandon, began to be agitated, some half dozen queries were inserted in the Telegraph for the purpose, as it appeared, of eliciting the sentiments and feelings of the Baptist churches on the subject. The Telegraph was then under the editorial conduct of brother I. M. Allen. The queries were replied to, in which the position assumed was, that the Baptists of Vermont did not need such an Institution, and that, viewed in the light of the scriptures, the work would be supererogatory and gratuitous. The Editor, in his strictures on those communications, which were somewhat severe, stated his conviction that "the few who had embraced their doctrine, bore a very inconsiderable proportion to the whole body of the Baptist denomination."

Very soon afterwards, whether in an annual Report, or otherwise, I am unable now to say, it was stated by the Theological Institution at Newton, and published in the papers, that a majority of the Baptist denomination were yet to be convinced that it was their duty to aid in carrying the scheme for the education of pious young men for the gospel ministry, or words to that effect. And now in 1837, when the question is raised in the official report to which I have adverted, that "to thousands and tens of thousands it seems utterly incredible that a man who has been through college, should really need

more acceptable to God by shutting up our young men in literary cloisters for eight or ten years, where they are necessarily put upon studying many things which indeed may enable them to approve themselves more unto carnal men, but have no more connection with the gospel of Christ, with the "good news" and "glad tidings" of salvation, proclaimed from the cross, than they have with the Alcoran of Mahomet, or the shaster of Hindostan.

There are other points in the report to which I should be glad to invite attention; but having, Sir, already troubled you and the reader longer than I intended, a query or two shall close the present paper. From the record of scripture and of all past observation and experience of the Lord's dealings with his people, can no reason be drawn for the "strong popular prejudices," the "mighty current of adverse influences" acknowledged in the report as still existing in the Baptist churches? Second: The report admits that the present is "a period of widespread religious declension." Is there any principle in literary and theological institutions tending to produce or promote a better, a more spiritual state of things in our churches?

"Thousands and tens of thousands."

REMARKS.—It is not to be denied, that some men have been good and useful ministers of the gospel, who have never enjoyed the advantages of literary, scientific, or theological institutions. But it is not to be denied that these were learned men. It is absurd to talk about an ignorant man being "apt to teach." My brother, who signs his name, "Thousands and tens of thousands," would feel himself insulted to be called an ignorant man, notwithstanding his apparent hostility to institutions of learning. And I do not believe he holds to the absurdity that an ignorant man can be "apt to teach." I believe he will acknowledge that, the heart being right and all other things being equal, any public, or private, teacher is qualified for the discharge of his calling, just in proportion to his knowledge of the subject on which he teaches. All will agree that, for a minister of the gospel, the first and great thing is to be taught of God; and that for this teaching, no kind or amount of hu-

man teaching, and greater felicity of communication, if he had enjoyed greater advantages?

The question to be settled is, do, or do not, institutions of learning for qualifying ministers for their work, afford them increased facilities for improvement—advantages for the attainment of useful knowledge which they cannot otherwise enjoy? If they do not, they are not what they may be—they are not what they ought to be. And the fact that they are not what they ought to be, and may be, is no reason why institutions should not exist for the purposes for which these are designed. That there ought to be, and may be, such nurseries of piety and schools of science, primarily, and principally devoted to the qualification of young men, chosen of God, for the work of the gospel ministry, as will combine facilities for improvement which they cannot otherwise enjoy, is to me as plain a truth as that God has instituted a gospel ministry, and that those who enter the vineyard will succeed in their labors in proportion as they have knowledge and understanding of the work they are to perform. What! shall every other profession and calling, whether useful or baneful, have its school of learning for the qualifications of its votaries—and shall this, which is more important than all of them, be neglected?

How far the existing theological schools are what they ought to be, I shall not now stop to inquire,—but will barely remark that, in literature, I object to a large proportion of the heathen classics,—and in morals, to everything that is based on Paley's doctrine of expediency.

## PARENTS' DEPARTMENT.

From the Mother's Monthly Journal.

## NEVER ATTEMPT TO DECEIVE A CHILD.

Mrs. Kingsford.—I have been a reader of your Journal for some months past, and think it well calculated to enlighten and qualify mothers for the discharge of those important maternal duties which God, in his institution of parental relation and responsibility, has imposed on them. How happy that mother, who discharges these duties in the best possible manner for the physical and moral benefit of her child, and for the interest of His kingdom, who has committed this trust to his charge.

There is one error in the management of children to which mothers and parents are particularly prone, when, too, they are least aware of it. I mean the fraud and duplicity they practice upon them, when they are sick, in order to induce

the cross to preach the "riches of redeeming grace" to thousands of benighted souls in heathen lands; or he may be the honored instrument, under the guidance of the Divine Spirit, of arresting the desolating tide of moral crime and degradation which is sweeping over his own beloved country. He may, if you discharge your duties to him as required of you by the precepts of the gospel, be one of the selected instruments, in the hands of an omniscient and gracious God, in preparing the world for the ushering in of that glorious millennial morn, when the splendors of the Sun of Righteousness shall shine over the whole earth. Do you, then, appreciate the length and breadth of your influence upon your offspring? The whole mass of human mind in the whole earth, can you comprehend or fathom it, and no mathematician can work out the sum total of its good or bad consequences! It may occasion innumerable anthems of praise to God and the Lamb, or it may produce untold misery, and wailing, and unearthly despair, throughout the never-ending ages of eternity.

A FATHER.

Richmond City, O., Oct. 7, 1837.

## RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

WALK BY FAITH.—Christian reader, are you aware of the merited doom from which Christ has rescued you? Oh! what would now be your prospects were it not for a Savior's love? And are you indeed ransomed from hell? Is the sentence of your condemnation reversed? Can you look with composure upon the lowering storms of eternity, feeling that you are secure from their fury? Happy, happy Christian; the blood of atonement has marked you as redeemed; the image of God is replaced upon your soul; the love of every spirit now winging its heavenly flight, is extended to you with fraternal warmth.

Have you a living faith? Do you believe that you are an heir of heaven? Then every day is a day of happiness. In faith you have a cure for human ill. It dispels every cloud. It dissipates every affliction.

"For earth hath no sorrow  
That Heaven cannot heal."

Walk then by faith. Live upon the promises. Send your thoughts to regions tenanted by Heaven's glorious intelligences, and they will return to you laden with treasures more brilliant and satisfying than the mines of Mexico, or the wealth India can afford. Shrink not from the contemplation of hell and its horrors, for God has revealed those horrors to us that we may contemplate them.

Then will compassion for the perishing stimulate you to effort and to prayer. Your unburdened heart will give utter-

be unfair, because many members of the Society are warmly in favor of the distinguishing features, of the Administration. Or if the Democratic party should claim the Anti-Slavery Society on their side, because it is in favor of equal rights, this would be equally a fraud upon the thousands of zealous Whigs who are devoted Abolitionists. We are therefore greatly surprised, and grieved, that the New England Spectator should so little appreciate the principles and objects of the Anti-Slavery Society, as to claim us on its side in the local or sectarian controversies which it is carrying on. Practically, that Society is orthodox. It is known that at Boston the term orthodox has a definite and technical meaning, and designates a portion of party of the people. Modern pragmatism said this for the object of prejudicing against the Society all that numerous and respectable and influential portion of the people of Massachusetts who are not by common parlance included in the designation of orthodox. We should have understood the object. But how a friend of the Society could thus seek to identify abolition with a party, we know not. The Anti-Slavery Society is now, and by its constitution cannot be what is technically termed "orthodox." It is Abolition, and only that.

No party, in politics, morals, or religion, can buy the Anti-Slavery Society to itself, by any offers of favor or flattery. If there were no principle in the case, the interests of the Society would forbid it, because no party has the power to do that for us, which we expect to gain only from the whole people.

On the other hand, if by the rapid progress of Anti-Slavery principles, the time has come, or shall come, that any sect or party can gain influence to themselves by favoring our cause, that is a matter which, of course, the Anti-Slavery Society cannot control, with which it has therefore no concern. We desire that all do as much as they can for our cause; and whatever good they can gain by it, rightfully belongs to them. And if, on this account any other sect or party find themselves losing ground, all we can say is, that they reap what they have sown, and if they wish to recover their position the way is open. If they will have it, they must win it.

Those of us who are Calvinists, have no ground of complaint, because many Methodists and Friends, and Free Will Baptists, and Unitarians are so zealous in behalf of the slave; nor because their zeal in the cause of human rights wins for them the respect of the impartial public. Neither would our Methodist or other Anti-Calvinistic members have any good reason to complain, should the so-called "orthodox" of Massachusetts all at once come forward with such zeal and self-denial, as to place them where some among them

what those passages of scripture which I have presented as evidence do mean, and if it is better proved, and clearer light than that which I have presented, I hope to be able to do so.

This to me, appears to be the ground which brother Angier ought to pursue on his two first objections. If he establishes them to the satisfaction of the public, then the remainder of his objections, must, and will be admitted of course; and so our discussion may "leave off." But if he cannot destroy these two first points, the foundation will stand, howsoever the other objections may or may not be supported. I am therefore perfectly willing to join issue on these two points presented, and do hope brother Angier can "command time."

One thing, I must object to in the outset, viz: such arguments as brother Angier has brought at the close of his first communication. "What will the infidel say?" Such ifs and arguments on the word of God, I cannot for a moment suffer a thought in my mind, that it is worthy of a christian discussion; for the same argument may as justly be brought against all scripture truth as against me. For instance, it would operate with equal power against Noah, Lot, Abraham, Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, &c., as in this instance. It might be presented against all preaching, all moral reform, all societies, especially against peace and abolition societies, in our world; it is bowing to expediency, or the wisdom of men, rather than to obey God. The amount of it is: "What will the world say?"

If brother Angier has no better arguments than this (only one) in his first communication, I do beg of him for the love of truth, to withhold altogether. Let our enquiry be, "What does God say?" "What wilt thou have me to do?" And our dear Father in heaven will take care of consequences. Wm. MILLER.

Low Hampton, Nov. 17, 1837.

Brother Miller has misunderstood brother Angier. The query, as to "what the infidel will say," was manifestly not brought for an "argument against" brother Miller, but to urge the importance of an examination of the subject, by some one disagreeing with brother Miller, so that, if he be in error, his error may be detected and exposed before the time arrives. The infidel is always ready to take any advantage of Christianity. If christians in general receive and embrace brother Miller's views, and time shall prove them to be erroneous, the infidel, surely will ask, "where is the promise of his coming," and will comfort

the scheme for the education of pious young men for the gospel ministry, or words to that effect. And now in 1837, the report to which I have adverted, that "to thousands and tens of thousands it seems utterly incredible that a man who has been through college, should really need to study any longer before he become a pastor."

I am, Sir, one of the "thousands and tens of thousands" who think it strange, passing strange, "utterly incredible" that eight or ten years of study in colleges and theological schools should be necessary to fit a man for an office as simple and plain as that of a shepherd or pastor of a church, especially when it is considered that Baptist churches are gathered well nigh exclusively from the ordinary and humble walks of life. I have the happiness to be acquainted with a Baptist elder, and I doubt not but there are many such scattered among the mountains of Vermont, who seldom calls on me without imparting some new light on the scriptures, affording a theme for pleasing and profitable reflection for days, perhaps weeks afterwards. This worthy and esteemed pastor, makes no pretension to human literature and science, and yet possesses an "aptness to teach" and a felicity of communication above most I have known.

The report notices "the strong popular prejudices on this subject" (clerical education) and the "mighty current of adverse influences" with which the Institution has had to struggle; and think that they ought to thank God and take courage that the Institution has held on its way against them. "Every year," the report adds, "strengthens our conviction that our common Lord and Savior approves of the establishment of this Institution, and of the great objects which it has been laboring to secure." Here is a cutting and bold rebuke indeed of the "thousands and tens of thousands" of Baptists who do not happen to believe as the Faculty and Trustees of the Theological Institution at Newton believe, and who, consequently, do not, and can not act with them.

It would seem, from the "strange popular prejudices" still existing on this subject, and the "adverse influences" against which the advocates of clerical education still have to contend, as noticed in the report, that there is still a majority, ("thousands and tens of thousands") of Baptists who do not fellowship the scheme for making ministers of Jesus Christ

believe he will acknowledge that, the heart being right and all other things being equal, any public, or private, teacher is qualified to teach the gospel. It is not his knowledge, or his knowledge of the subject in which he teaches. All will agree that, for a minister of the gospel, the first and great thing is to be taught of God; and that for this teaching, no kind or amount of human wisdom can be a substitute. But having this, the question is, whether literature and science are not useful appendages. I contend that they are—and that they are appendages worth vastly more than they cost.

I will endeavor to illustrate my view of the case. Let two young men of equal natural powers, equal advantages, and equal piety—both under the impression that God would have them devote themselves specially to his service and labor in his vineyard—set out, say at the age of 20, neither of them having yet enjoyed the advantages of any part of what is termed a liberal education. Let one immediately step forth into the field, be recognized as a minister of the gospel, taking upon himself the duties, and labors, and responsibilities of a pastor and teacher. Let the other—while he by no means neglects "the gift that is within" him—devote himself principally, for awhile, to what I will term laying a foundation—by which I mean the undergoing of a thorough mental discipline, obtained at the same time that he takes deep and healthful draughts at the fountains of literature and science, and acquires a large fund of knowledge immensely useful to his profession. I need not say that, in my opinion, the latter of these two will be the more useful man.

Bear in mind: I am not now declaring in favor of everything which is now included in a popular literary course. There is much yet in popular institutions of learning that ought to be purged out—and for such purification my limited influence shall be exerted. But, if I understand my brother, he labors not for the purification of these institutions, but for their suppression—nor does he ask for any substitute. He appears to be hostile to the very idea of institutions of learning for those who are about to engage in a calling, than any other more important and responsible.

He mentions a minister of his acquaintance who, he says, "makes no pretension to human literature and science, and yet possesses an aptness to teach, and a felicity of communication above most he has known." However modest the pretensions of his minister, I ask my brother whether he has not, after all, been a studious, and is not a learned man? If not, whence his "aptness to teach," and his "felicity of communication?" How can a man teach, except he first learn; and how communicate, except he first receive? Moreover, would not this same man now have greater aptness to

happy that mother, who discharges these duties in the best possible manner for the physical and moral benefit of her child, and for the interest of His kingdom, who has committed this trust to his charge.

There is one error in the management of children to which mothers and parents are particularly prone, when, too, they are least aware of it. I mean the fraud and duplicity they practice upon them, when they are sick, in order to induce them to take medicine. I know that this error has been repeatedly pointed out and rebuked, but I have witnessed this breach of faith in parents, during a practice in medicine of about ten years, and have been so much disgusted and wounded with it, that I can not forego my protestations against it. Parents, on such occasions, are frequently over-anxious about the dangerous situation of their children, and are ever ready to do all in their power to ensure their recovery. In their solicitude to give medicine, they lose sight of the only right system of management, and many seem to think that then all particular authority should be dispensed with, and a false sympathy, mingled with fraud and deceit, be substituted in its stead. "My son, come, take this medicine, (presenting a nauseous dose of castor oil or ipecac.) it's good—it's proper good—it's sweet; you'll like it, my son: come, take it—it's proper good; Ma likes it, (touching her tongue to it;) come, then, take it, and I'll give you a lump of sugar." Thus telling a positive falsehood, in order to accomplish the object—not reflecting, that the innocent child takes it, it will detect the fraud, and be highly indignant at it; and therefore refuse everything having the appearance of medicine. How much better, to tell the child, "This is medicine—it tastes bad, but is designed to cure you, and your mother wishes you to take it;" and if the child refuses, (however ill,) institute mild but proper authority. Once so doing generally suffices, and prevents further trouble. I have attended children who had been cheated and deceived by their parents so often, and so grossly, that it became totally impossible to get one particle of medicine down them, by force, persuasion, or artifice; and that, too, when medicine was indispensably necessary. I have often wondered that children, who have been so often thus treated, should regard their parents as much as they do, and that they do not despise all parental authority whatever, as nothing can be better calculated to annihilate all confidence, and eradicate all affection from their bosoms.

Mother! do you ever think of the moral mischief you are occasioning to your child when you thus deceive it? You are learning it, perhaps before it can prattle, to dissemble and equivocate! Do you realize where the influence of such dissimulation will end? Do you realize the extent of your influence upon the physical, moral, and eternal, condition of that little offspring which is committed to your care, and which God has commanded you to "train up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord? Perhaps that little son you are fondling in your arms, or hanging on your embrace, may, if you are a faithful mother, be a missionary of

Heaven's glorious intelligence, and they will return to you laden with treasures more brilliant and satisfying than the mines of Mexico, or the wealth India can afford. Shrink not from the contemplation of hell and its horrors, for God has revealed those horrors to us that we may contemplate them.

Then will compassion for the perishing stimulate you to effort and to prayer. Your overburdened heart will give utterance to fervent supplication and persuasive pleadings. And such prayer is the effectual prayer of the righteous which avails in heaven.—Abbott.

DAILY PRAYER.—I know that thousands, when pressed on this point, will say that they have no time, their studies are so pressing, so urgent, that they have neither time nor the spirit necessary for prayer. I reply that it will not hinder your studies. On the contrary, the mind will be calmed, rested, and refreshed, by being daily turned off from your studies for prayer. Ask any distinguished man, who has ever tried both methods of study, and he will tell you that he has been prosperous in his studies in proportion to his faithfulness in performing this duty. What shall he said of such a man as Bishop Andrews, who was such a proficient in study, that he could read fifteen different languages, and yet never spent less than five hours daily, in private devotion?

From the Emancipator.  
**THE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY AND THE CHURCHES.**

The A. A. S. Society is a voluntary association of individuals for a specific object, the abolition of slavery, and the restoration of our countrymen who are of African descent, to the civil and social rights to which by common consent, theoretically, belong to all men equally and inalienably. This it has undertaken to accomplish, solely by peaceful means, such as are sanctioned by reason, religion, and the constitution: that is, by the influence of truth, properly exhibited and effectively applied. The Society has no authority, in the proper sense of the term, over any body, not even over its own members. Having only one design—that of accomplishing a particular end, by specified means, it of course desires the co-operation of all who are prepared to unite in advancing the same, and by the same means. Hence, it intentionally knows no difference, among its friends, from birth, complexion, creed or party.—In this respect, it corresponds precisely with the constitutional structure of the Bible Society, the Temperance Society, and the Sunday School Union.

For any sect or party, therefore, to claim the Anti-Slavery Society as belonging to them, or denounce it as being identified with their opponents, would be equally an act of injustice, if not a clear fraud upon the public. This is easily seen, in the case of the two political parties.—Suppose the Whigs should claim the Society as a Whig institution, because it disapproves of President Van Buren's committal in regard to slavery, and because all who have vindicated the right of petition in Congress are Whigs; it would

denied and Friends, and Free-Will Baptists, and Unitarians are so zealous in behalf of the slave, nor because their zeal in the cause of human rights wins for them the respect of the impartial public. Neither would our Methodist or other Anti-Calvinistic members have any good reason to complain, should the so-called "orthodox" of Massachusetts all at once come forward with such zeal and self-denial, as to place them, where some among them seem to think they have a prescriptive right to be, irrespective of their own labors in the cause. If they will earn influence in this way, they can have it.

Proposing as we do, to win over every body to abolition, the Anti-Slavery Society addresses itself particularly to the sources of influence, and seeks to move the hinges of society. We labor therefore to secure the co-operation of every class, profession or combination of men, who have influence over others. We seek the aid of editors, preachers, teachers, patrons; of politicians, divines, and moralists; each in their respective sphere. A great amount of influence, in some parts of the country, is found in college and seminaries. We therefore try to gain them. Another important depository of influence, is in the churches and religious societies and ecclesiastical bodies, of every conceivable sect and name. We wish to have all this in favor of abolition. Political parties, legislative assemblies, professional associations, have their influence. We mean to get all that also. We do not decide on the truth or rectitude of their respective creeds or distinctive principles; but finding them in the community, tolerated and countenanced by a free people, and possessed of influence which can help the slave, we ask them to give us their aid.

And because we are confident of the justness of our principles and the great importance of our cause, we are very urgent upon men of all these classes, appealing to them by every manly consideration, if possible to have them do, in their spheres, what they can and ought, for such an object. And when any class, be they clergymen, teachers, editors, or what they may, withhold their aid, we think they do very wrong, and we are bold to say it. This is not flattery, nor an assumption of authority, either over the churches or the legislatures, or any body. But it is an open exercise of our rights as freemen, towards our neighbors who have equal rights. But as our cause is very just, and is now seen to be so by a rapidly increasing and influential portion of the community, it has come to pass that the situation of some, who have heretofore pertinaciously stood aloof from our work, is growing quite uncomfortable;—and the cry is actually raised by some, that we are persecuting them, in insisting that they should do their duty.

In doing this, we cannot constitutionally pretend to determine the various questions which may arise either within or among these various divisions of society; nor undertake to settle the powers and prerogatives of any class or order of men among them. In regard to church government, we do not decide as to the right