

VERMONT TELEGRAPH.

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

BRANDON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1838.

VOL. X, NO. 31.

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 months after eight months, and within the year, at \$3.00 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 arrearages are paid, except at the discretion of the publisher.

All letters, to secure attention, must come postage paid.

Vermont Telegraph.

BRANDON, SATURDAY, FEB. 10, 1838.

The article below was designed by the writer to be a substitute for the one which appeared last week, and was accompanied with a request that the other might be withheld, and this take its place. But it came too late. The other was already printed. The parts of this, however, which answer to the other, are so blended with the other parts, that it was difficult making the separation—so the whole is given.

For the Vermont Telegraph.

SECOND COMING OF CHRIST.

Low-Hampton, N. Y., Jan. 1838.

Dear Brother Angier: Your letter of Dec. 10, 1837, published in the Vermont Telegraph, Vol. X, No. 13, I now take the liberty to answer, through the same medium. I had hoped that you would not only present your objections, but would have given me light and instruction on those passages, which you think, and perhaps with good reason, I am ignorant of; but as you decline the task of instructing one so ignorant as myself, I hope to this disappointment I may submit with a good grace, believing that you have a good and sufficient reason for so doing.

Your first objections are against my explanation of the seventy weeks. Let us then re-examine the subject. You admit that seventy weeks is a given time in this prophecy. For you say, you have no doubt that the seventy weeks began with Cyrus' decree and ended with the destruction of Jerusalem. If so, then seventy weeks are about 606 years. Or one year, two months, fifteen weeks, two days, twelve hours, and about forty-two minutes, our time, to one day in prophecy—or one week in prophecy, would be eight years, seven months, three

men to cease, and that this city be not builded, until another commandment shall be given from me." Of course the next commandment was given to Ezra in the seventh year of Artaxerxes. And Ezra certainly understood that they had liberty to build the city and walls—see Ezra ix, 9. In his prayer he says, "For we were bondmen; yet our God has not forsaken us in our bondage, but hath extended mercy unto us in the sight of the king of Persia, to give us a reviving, to set up the house of our God, and to repair the desolations thereof, and to give us a wall in Judah and Jerusalem." We see plainly by Ezra's prayer that he understood, that the interdict by Artaxerxes to "cease building," was now taken off. And afterwards "Nehemiah had a permit," as you say, to go up and assist Ezra in building the walls, streets, and city. When he built the walls, and afterwards the city. See Nehemiah vi, 15, and vii, 4. Ezra being governor 13 years and Nehemiah 36 years. (See Polyglott Bible, introductory remarks on Nehemiah,) making in all 49 years or seven weeks of years. I know my dear brother you intimate, and for what purpose I cannot tell, that there was a decree given to Nehemiah, and that there was nothing like a decree between Cyrus and Nehemiah. Will you be so kind as to show me any decree given in Nehemiah, and tell me what you call that in Ezra vii, 13, and ix, 9. I have never been able to find any command from any king of Persia to restore the captives, or to build Jerusalem or the walls, after the one to Ezra.—But I find Ezra and Nehemiah were contemporaries in the work of the building the walls and city. See 8th chapter of Nehemiah. And as Gabriel has given us seven weeks to have all these things fulfilled in, and as they could not all be done in 49 days, I therefore understand it to be seven weeks of years, or 49 years, the whole time Ezra and Nehemiah were governors of Judea. Then if the seven weeks began 45 before Christ, they ended in the year 408 before Christ. Then began the sixty two weeks, at the end of Nehemiah's administration, at the end too, of the Bible history—and from thence to John's preaching in the wilderness was 434 years, or sixty-two weeks of years, ending A. D. 26, unto the Messiah. Not, as you say, to his birth,—for he was never called Messiah until he or his forerunner was called to

of Jesus Christ with the Holy Ghost and with power," to preach, and work miracles, which began the last half of the last week of the seventy. "Know, therefore and understand." You see we are commanded to understand, and I dare not say you cannot understand, "that from the going forth of the commandment to restore." What? The captivity, according to your own showing, and I agree. Jeremiah xxvii, 2: "They shall be carried to Babylon, and there shall they be until the day I visit them, and restore them to this place." I agree there was a restoring under Cyrus; but not a final restoration until Ezra, when they were finally restored under the decree of Artaxerxes. "And to build Jerusalem," that is, the city, walls, streets and houses—not the house of God which is at Jerusalem, according to Cyrus' decree. Yet, if the angel had meant this decree, he would have mentioned this most prominent object.—"To build," shows that the city would be built under the decree here specified; but according to your own propo, it was not done under the decree of Cyrus, but quite the reverse. See Ezra iv, 21; and Neh. vii, 4. "Unto the Messiah the Prince," meaning the anointed prince, or Jesus sent to preach, and bind up the broken hearted, &c. "Shall be seven weeks." Daniel might here inquire, what are those seven weeks for? Gabriel answers, "the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times." The history of Ezra and Nehemiah shows the fulfillment. "And three score and two weeks." Here again the question might be asked, what of the three score and two weeks? Gabriel would answer, "unto the Messiah the Prince." The preaching of the gospel kingdom. "And after three score and two weeks," which will make 69 weeks, of the seventy, "shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself?" This evidently means Christ. The high priest alluded to this prophecy, when he persuaded the council to put him to death. See John xi, 47—53. "Ye know nothing at all, nor consider that it is expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and the whole nation perish not." You can turn and read the whole passage. "He tasted death for every man." "And the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood. This I admit means the Romans, and so far we agree. And I thank you my brother for your willingness to understand this part.

"And unto the end of the war desola-

Christ or the Messiah. See Isaiah lxxv, 3: "Strengthen ye the weak hands, and confirm the feeble knees." Rom. xv, 8: "Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers." That is, the covenant made with Abraham. See also 1 Cor. i, 7, 8: "One week." This makes up the seventy weeks. "And in the midst (or last half) of the week, he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease." Who shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease? I answer the Messiah. What sacrifice? The last and only sacrifice in which God was well pleased; or that could take away sin. Take notice, it is in the singular, if the angel had meant the Jewish, it would have been sacrifices and oblations. Yet it would not have been true as it respects oblations being taken away at the destruction of Jerusalem, for the Jews offer oblations (gifts) even down to the present day, and did offer sacrifices in the days of Julian, about 300 years after the destruction of Jerusalem. See Gibbon's History of Rome: "And every priest standeth daily ministering, and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins; but this man (Jesus Christ) after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, forever sat down on the right hand of God." Heb. x, 11, 12: "Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice first for his own sins, and then for the people's, for this he did once, when he offered up himself." "By which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." 10 chap. of Heb. This my brother was the sacrifice and oblation which ceased. The gift of God to the world was taken up to God and to his throne, and the person of Jesus Christ is not with us; but has ascended up on high to intercede for all the true children of faith.

"And for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate." Who shall make it desolate? You say Titus.—This cannot be, for Titus has long since gone the way of all the earth. And Julian, the apostate as he is called, would have built Jerusalem again, and restored the Jews to their place and privileges, had there been no other power but Titus to counteract him. But he that had all power in heaven and earth, who had said to the Jews in the days of his flesh, "Now is your house left unto you desolate," and he who had said by his prophets, Jeremiah xix,

PEACE.—No. XIII. The Principles of Peace intelligible and practical.

You see on what points the friends of peace are agreed. I do not pretend that they think perfectly alike on every one of the particulars I have mentioned; for such coincidence can be found on no subject whatever. Nor do I mean that no person professedly favorable to our cause, dissents from any of these views; for every body would fain be thought friendly to peace, just as the sleek wine-bibber—even the man who drinks his quart of rum a day without tumbling into the gutter, deems himself temperate, and would be very glad to promote temperance in a judicious way. For such persons I cannot speak; but the intelligent, active friends of peace hold, without essential variation, the principles I have stated.

These principles seem to me sufficiently intelligible. When we assert, that war is in every case offensive to God, and cannot exist without deep guilt on both sides; that the gospel, as the rule of conduct for all mankind, ought to regulate the intercourse alike of individuals and nations; that war for any purpose except the defence of life, if not in this case too, is only a mass of sin; that even such wars can never be justified unless all other possible expedients have been tried in vain; that the entire war-system of Christendom, founded in violence and guilt, is unwise and wicked; that all the causes of war ought to be removed, and specific means employed for the universal prevalence of peace; we cannot help thinking these positions to be as clear and definite as the principles which lie at the foundation of any other reform.

It is easy to criticise these statements, but not more so than it would be to find fault with the positions taken in the cause of temperance itself. I could perplex its advocates with a multitude of difficulties; they have of late met not a few even from their professed friends; and the main reason why the cause has not from the first dragged in the mire of similar objections, is found in the fact of its having floated upon a tide of popularity which carried it over such obstacles without touching them. Let ministers, and judges, and lawyers, & physicians, and merchants, and teachers, and Christians, all come up in solid phalanx to the cause of peace, as they did to that of temperance; and nine-tenths of the objections over which people are now halting, would no longer be heeded, or even thought of.

We are confident, too, that our principles can and should be carried into practice. Point us to a single one that is not practical. Is there no practical power in the positions, that God looks upon every war as a tissue of sin; that no war even

quired him to choose for his associates such holy men as scribes and pharisees were supposed to be, and to spurn from his presence publicans and sinners, that is, tax-gatherers and profligates, the former being generally considered as signally guilty of extortion and injustice; the latter as chargeable in an uncommon degree with those vices which pollute and debase the human character. In refusing this charge, our Lord might have told his accusers that the exalted opinion which they entertained of their own goodness was entirely groundless; that instead of being holier, they were in reality far more depraved than tax-gatherers and profligates; that their hypocrisy, and spiritual pride, were far more offensive to God than the immoral practices with which publicans were chargeable. But he chooses to reason with them in a different manner. He admits for arguments sake, that the opinion which they entertained of their own sanctity is perfectly correct—that they are as holy as they think themselves to be; and that, on the other hand, the publicans and sinners are as criminal as they are supposed to be. And he undertakes on this very ground, to justify himself in neglecting the former, and associating almost exclusively with the latter. "What man of you," says he, "having an hundred sheep, if he lose one of them, doth not leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness, and go after that which is lost, until he find it? And when he hath found it, he layeth it on his shoulder rejoicing. And when he cometh home, he calleth together his friends and neighbors, saying unto them, Rejoice with me; for I have found my sheep which was lost." He adds, "I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth more than over ninety and nine just persons that need no repentance." As if he had said, You scribes and Pharisees think yourselves uncommonly holy; and you consider these publicans and sinners as abandoned to vice and wickedness. Be it so; on that very ground my conduct is perfectly justifiable. I have come into the world as the great and good Shepherd. You suppose that you are the ninety and nine sheep who remain quiet in the pasture; and that these publicans and sinners are in the condition of the one sheep which went astray. Be it so. What is then proper for me the Shepherd, to do? Ought I to continue with those who remain quiet in the pasture, or go after that sheep which is gone astray? The latter, unquestionably.—That is, I should say little or nothing to you Scribes and Pharisees, and devote my whole time to these publicans and sinners who have gone astray like lost sheep, and labor night and day to bring them back to the fold of God. And no one ought to

decreed and ended with the destruction of Jerusalem. If so, then seventy weeks are about 606 years. Or one year, two months, three weeks, two days, twelve hours, and about forty-two minutes, our time, to one day in prophecy—or one week in prophecy, would be eight years, seven months, three weeks, three days, nineteen hours, and twelve minutes, in common time. As we have no scripture rule for reckoning time thus, charity (not my theory) for the word of God would induce me to believe that, since how you must have made a wrong calculation. And although you are very confident that you are right, yet it may be possible we may find the error on your side; and the Bible harmonize.

In my examination of Cyrus' decree, I find two prominent objects presented, *restoring the captivity*, and *building the Temple*. The first object which the Angel has applied in beginning his seventy weeks, surely might apply here, viz: "to restore." But the other two, "to build Jerusalem," and "the street shall be built again, and the wall, (shall be built) even in troublous times," can never be applied in truth, to Cyrus' decree, nor to Darius' decree, which I agree was but a renewal of the decree by Cyrus. For it is evident that the streets, nor the wall, nor the city were built under either of those decrees. Take notice, the angel says, they "shall be built," under the decree which begins our seventy weeks. Now can it be possible, my brother, that so prominent an object as building the Temple, or the house of God at Jerusalem, would have been left out of the angel's description, if he had designed the decree by Cyrus? I think not. Again, if Gabriel had meant that decree, why did he not tell Daniel when he came to him two years after that decree, in the third year of Cyrus, (the decree being in the first year of Cyrus,) that the decree was already past? Why direct him to the fifth king of Persia, or the fourth from Cyrus, "noted in the scripture of truth," to begin his ram pushing against Grecia? Surely, my dear brother, I am wretchedly deceived if it is not as plain as can be made, that Artaxerxes Longimanus, the fifth king of Persia, was the king who would issue this decree. And now let us examine the decree to Ezra. You say, my brother, that you "cannot find one word about restoring, &c." I am very sorry you did not read Ezra, vii, 13: "I make a decree, that all they of the people of Israel, and of his priests and Levites, in my realm, which are minded of their own free will to go up to Jerusalem, go with thee." If this decree does not command a restoration of the Babylonish captivity, then in vain may we look for one under Cyrus; for almost the same words are used in one case, as the other. Under that decree the city nor walls were not built. See Ezra iv, 21: "Give ye now commandment to cause these

administration, at the end of the days of the vision—and from thence to John's preaching in the wilderness was 434 years, or sixty-two weeks of years, ending A. D. 28, unto the Messiah. Not, as you say, to his birth,—for he was never called Messiah until he or his forerunner was called to preach the gospel, which you know my brother began in John. Messiah means the "anointed." And Isa, lxi, 1, says, "The spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek," &c. Acts iv, 27, and x, 38. Therefore he could not be called properly "the Messiah," until he was anointed with the Holy Ghost, and with power to preach and work miracles, either in himself or in his forerunner. Then from the preaching of John to the crucifixion of Christ was one week or seven years, ending A. D. 33, which makes 490 years, or seventy weeks of years.

I will now examine your construction of the 9th chapter of Daniel, 24th to 27 verses. "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people," &c. What for to do? "To finish the transgression." When was transgression finished? I answer, when Christ nailed the ceremonial law to his cross, which was added by reason of transgression, until the seed (meaning Christ) should come, says the Apostle, or when "he was cut off out of the land of the living for the transgression of my people was he stricken." Isa. liii, 8. See also Heb. ix, 15. This must have been accomplished at the death of Christ. "And to make an end of sins," See Rom. vi, 10: "For in that he died, he died unto sin once." John i, xxix: "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." Heb. ix, 26: "But now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." Was this all performed at the death of Christ? I answer it was, for the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin. "To make reconciliation for iniquity." This was also performed by his death, "that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enemy thereby," See also Col. i, 20—22; Heb. ii, 17—18. "To seal up the vision and prophecy."—Now if the death of Christ was to seal up the vision and prophecy, what can we understand the word seal to mean? I answer to make sure. See Esther iii, 12: viii, 8; Sol. Song, iv, 32; viii, 6; Daniel vi, 17; John iii, 33: vi, 27; Rom. xv, 28; 2 Cor. i, 22; Ephe. i, 13. "After ye believed ye were sealed," &c., iv, 30; 2 Tim. ii, 19. Then, if so much of the vision of the ram, the he-goat and little horn, should be accomplished in the specified time, seventy weeks, at the death of the Messiah, so in like manner would the remainder of the vision, which was 2300 days long, be fulfilled in the time and manner specified. "And to anoint the Most Holy." This can mean nothing less than "the anointing

of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood. This I admit means the Romans, and so far we agree. And I thank you my brother for your willingness to understand this part.

"And unto the end of the war desolations are determined." Do you understand this? It is a war after Jerusalem is destroyed. It continues as long as desolations are determined in the earth. What war dear Sir? I forgot that you have told me in the beginning, you would not be a teacher. But I think you ought to pardon my offence, for every reader, who has read your pieces would suppose by your language, that you was the teacher, and rather harsh and dogmatical too. But enough of this unchristian spirit. "The war." To get an explanation of which we must go back to the vision, Dan. vii, 21, 22; "I beheld, and the same horn," meaning the little horn, see verse 8, the same Roman power or people, the fourth beast or kingdom of Daniel's vision, which was to destroy Jerusalem, "made war with the saints, and prevailed over them, until the Ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High," and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom."

"And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week." The pronoun he, you say, refers to prince (Titus). Is this your grammar? If so, give me common sense, and you may have all the grammar. But I think you must be mistaken. For you must be convinced that the word prince is used only to describe the people. "And the people of the prince that shall come," &c.—Who shall come? The people. It does not say the Prince will be there; nor that he will come. And common sense would decide, at once, that "of the prince" cannot be an antecedent. Let us try your rule.—"After Mr. Angier had preached three years with his people, he was silenced, but not for himself: and the people of the town of Waterbury that shall come shall destroy the house and place of worship, &c. And he shall confirm his contract one week," &c. Who does the pronoun he refer to in this case? To the town of Waterbury. O no, say you. Why? Because the town is not an agent in the case, but the people, and Mr. Angier. Very well,—may not the people be the antecedent? No, for then it would have been they—plural,—of necessity it must be Mr. Angier. Again, "John went to the school-house, and found the children of Mr. Angier demolishing the seats and books, and he went and informed the trustees." Who went and informed? Mr. Angier? No. Why not? Because it is not certain he was there, and he is not spoken of, only to describe the children.—I beg of you my brother, study your grammar over again. "Confirm the covenant," means to ratify the Gospel, he meaning

Jews to their place and privileges, had there been no other power but Titus to counteract him. But he that had all power in heaven and earth, who had said to the Jews in the days of his death, "Now is your house left unto you desolate;" and he who had said by his prophets, Jeremiah xix, 8: "And I will make this city desolate, and an hissing; every one that passeth thereby shall be astonished and hiss, because of all the plagues thereof;" and Ezekiel xx, 26: "That I might make them desolate to the end that they might know that I am the Lord." He it is, who for the overspreading of abominations, shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate." We are here brought down to the end of all earthly powers, to the consummation, and the little horn, or desolator destroyed. When the stone cut out without hands, shall rule the nations with a rod of iron, and break them to pieces like a potters vessel. Then you will acknowledge that the Messiah confirmed the covenant—that the sacrifice and oblation ceased in him, and that he made desolate by his power, the Jews, the temple, and their city, "to the end that they might know that he was the Lord." All your arguments about Titus crying over Jerusalem, "one week," which, according to your reasoning would be from the time Simeon took the child Jesus in his arms, until Jerusalem was destroyed, is all folly, and I pity the mind that can be for a moment staggered with such explanations as these.

I think it is fairly proved, that the seventy weeks began with the decree or commandment of Artaxerxes, in the 7th year of his reign, to Ezra, to go up with all the captives who choose to go free, when the walls or city began to be built, as you have acknowledged, and which were built as the angel tells us in troublous times, including Ezra's and Nehemiah's administrations.—Then seven weeks, or 49 years, lasted until the captivity were restored, the walls were built, the city repaired, the abuses and disorders rectified, and the historical part of the old testament completed—to the year 408 Before Christ. Then sixty-two weeks, or 434 years, carries us down to 26 years After Christ was born, to the time John began, as forerunner of the Messiah, to preach the gospel. Then one week, or seven years, John and Christ ratified and confirmed the gospel with many, until the year 33. After Christ. When Christ suffered the just for the unjust, and brought in an "everlasting righteousness"—closed up the seventy weeks, and proved to every candid, unprejudiced Jew, that Daniel was a true prophet, and Christ was the true Messiah. This also proves that 70 weeks or 490 days, were fulfilled in 490 years, "each day for a year," even 490 years. I remain, Sir, yours, Wm. MILLER.

would no longer be heeded, or even thought of. We are, confident, too, that our principles can and should be carried into practice. Point us to a single one that is not practical. Is there no practical power in the positions, that God looks upon every war as a issue of sin; that no war even in defence of life can be justified on any ground, until every other expedient has been faithfully tried in vain; that the war-system of Christendom is utterly wrong; that specific, vigorous efforts ought to be made for the extinction of this custom? Take one of our principles which may seem the most vague of them all, and see if the idea that the gospel should regulate the intercourse of nations, as well as of individuals, will not be found sufficiently practical. How does the gospel require us to treat each other? If we are commanded to "live peaceably with all men, and follow after the things which make for peace, and do unto others as we would they should do unto us, and love our enemies, and never avenge ourselves, but overcome evil with good," would not such principles, if applied to nations, put an end to war at once, and forever?

There is work enough, then, for the friends of peace in carrying into effect the principles which they hold in common; and I confess I see not how any Christian, philanthropist or patriot can consistently withhold his efforts from such a cause. While war is butchering its thousands, wasting its millions of money, and preying upon the dearest interests of mankind for time and eternity, it is worse than folly to stand with folded arms, and scowling brow, picking flaws in our principles or our measures. Do something. Do it in your own way, if you will; but only DO something for the removal of this terrible scourge; and we will excuse a few errors both in your theory and your practice. If your views outstrip our own, stop not to quarrel with us, but push on towards the goal at which we both are aiming. If you think we go too far, then come up to your own principles, and carry them into effect in advancing our common cause. Follow the light you have, and look up to God for more, with a full determination to go whithersoever he may lead.—A Director of the Am. Peace Soc.

RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

From the Mother's Monthly Journal. SCRIPTURAL EXPOSITION.

"I say unto you that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons who need no repentance."—Luke xv, 7. These words were uttered by our blessed Savior on an interesting occasion. "There drew near unto him," says the sacred historian, "all the publicans and sinners for to hear him. And the Pharisees and scribes murmured, saying, This man receiveth sinners and eateth with them." They supposed that in so doing, he acted in direct contrariety to the sacred character which he had assumed. He pretended to be an eminently holy man, and an inspired messenger from heaven. They supposed, therefore, that consistency re-

quire, or go after that sheep which is gone astray? The latter, unquestionably.—That is, I should say little or nothing to you Scribes and Pharisees, and devote my whole time to these publicans and sinners who have gone astray like lost sheep, and labor night and day to bring them back to the fold of God. And no one ought to wonder, if, when I have in any instance succeeded in reclaiming them from the error of their ways, I rejoice exceedingly. This must be the natural consequence of my having found that about which I had felt so much solicitude. You need not wonder that I, the Shepherd, rejoice on such an occasion. Joy is felt in a distant part of the universe. There is joy in heaven, remote as it is from this lower world—"there is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons who need no repentance." Does my reader ask, as many have already done, "Who are the ninety and nine just persons who need no repentance?" I answer, no such persons can be found, for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God. Christ does not mean to intimate that any of our race are sinless. He merely assumes as correct, the opinion which the Scribes and Pharisees entertained of themselves. They supposed that they were so holy as to need no repentance. Our Lord admits for argument's sake, that this was in fact the case, and on this ground he maintains the position, that the inhabitants of heaven rejoice more over one repenting sinner than over ninety and nine individuals, could such be found, who had never transgressed the law of their Creator. J. C.

WHO IS IT?

President Edwards remarks, as the result of long and close observation, that of all sinners, unconverted professors of religion are the most hopeless. In his account of the great New-England revival in which he labored very exclusively, he states that whilst such immense multitudes, and a large proportion of all ages and conditions in life were powerfully wrought upon, and driven to seek refuge from the wrath to come, unconverted professors stood alone unmoved. Reader, are you a professor? Have you been converted? When? How do you know it? Where do you find your evidence? Are you sure that you are not deceived? Is it even possible that you may be one of that class whom the discerning, spiritually minded Edwards saw in his day, to be deceiving themselves, and whose conduct in their safe estate was still such that no appeals could rouse them? May not many of them have long since appealed to the Savior, "we have eaten and drunk in thine house," and been answered, "Depart from me, I know you not?" Are there no readers of this paragraph whose lot will be the same? We dare not hope there are not. Who is it?—I! To some reader God would say, *thou art the man* or the woman. Let us pause, reflect, read the scripture, and read our own heart in its light. Let us ask the gift of the Holy Spirit; for, if ye being evil, know how to give good gifts to your