

VERMONT TELEGRAPH.

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

BRANDON, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1837.

VOL. X. NO. 13

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 at 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, &c., at the discretion of the publisher.

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

Vermont Telegraph.

BRANDON, SATURDAY, Dec. 16, 1837.

SECOND COMING OF CHRIST.

To Wm. Miller, Low Hampton, N. Y.

Dear Sir:—While I feel, in some measure, the force of that command of our Saviour, "Call no man master," I trust I feel willing to receive instruction from yourself, or from any other source. It is not from a love of controversy, nor from a desire to prove your sentiments, upon the second coming of Christ, false, that I now present my "objections;" but, that we may all be benefited, and find the truth concerning this great event. You will perceive that my objections are not only opposed to your theory concerning the "time of the end," but, alike opposed to nearly, or quite all writers upon this subject. And I have felt no small hesitancy, in presenting myself before the public in opposition to opinions long since promulgated, and, by almost universal consent, believed. But erroneous comments upon the Bible, by whomsoever made, will do that look no good, nor aid in defending or promoting the cause of God. I do not present myself your equal in years, or historical reading. Still, I hope I shall not be considered unduly officious, though I object to some of your sentiments and proofs. I ask, therefore, of you and the public, a candid perusal of my objections and reasons, and if need be, a candid reply. I shall confine myself, mostly, to the Bible and your own writings, without attempting much historical evidence, believing the latter to be very doubtful, and hence to be but little relied upon.

With these remarks, I proceed to my first objection, to be found in the Telegraph of Nov. 11th, which is, that "The seventy

perform all my pleasure, even saying to Jerusalem, *thou shalt be built*, and to the temple, *thy foundation shall be laid.*" Also xlv, 13: "he shall *build my city*, and he shall let go my captives, not for price nor reward, saith the Lord of hosts." Compare with Ezra, 1st chap.—also with Ezra vi, 3. See also Jer. xxv, 11, and marginal reading on that text. [The reader is desired to take his bible and compare, &c.]

Although Cyrus does not mention building the city in his decree, yet the Jews did so understand him, for they did build the city, at least in part: see Ezra iv, 12, when their enemies certify to Artaxerxes, that the Jews had "come to Jerusalem, *building the rebellious and bad city*, and have set up the walls thereof, and joined the foundations."

There were a number of decrees concerning the restoration of the Jews, and rebuilding of Jerusalem, but all seem to be connected with the decree of Cyrus. The enemies of the Jews complain to Darius, but he establishes the decree of Cyrus; they complain to Artaxerxes, and he commands them to cease *building* the rebellious and bad city. Afterwards, in the 7th year of his reign, he permits Ezra to go up to Jerusalem with gold and silver, to buy bullocks, &c. for sacrifices, and to "beautify the house of the Lord which is in Jerusalem." see Ezra vii, 17—27. After this, in the 20th year of his reign, he permits Nehemiah to go up to finish the work, (already begun,) which he did in 52 days. Neh. vi, 15—also Ezra vi, 14. I think, therefore, that no person who has no prepossessed opinion to support, will attempt to date the commencement of the 70 weeks, at any other time, than at the decree of Cyrus, about 536 years before Christ.

Now if the 70 weeks mean 490 years, as you have stated, then they ended about seventy-nine years before Christ's death. But supposing they began with the permission of Artaxerxes to Nehemiah, (the only thing like a decree to *rebuild*, except the one in question, by Cyrus,) to go up and rebuild the city, then they do not end with Christ's death, as you state, but *thirteen* years after; it being dated the 20th of his reign: Neh. ii, 1. But supposing, (though not admitting,) that they begin as you have stated, I have other reasons for my objection, and hence pass to others.

Secondly, The language made use of by Daniel.

Dan. ix. 24. Seventy weeks are deter-

upon this part of the 70 weeks; I shall not, at present, attempt an explanation.

The latter part of this verse, and the one following, I think I understand. "And the people of the prince that shall come, shall destroy the city and sanctuary." Who is the prince? Christ? Most certainly not, unless *his people*, or christians, *destroyed* the city and sanctuary. But who *did* destroy the city and sanctuary? I answer, the soldiers (people) of Titus. Titus, then is the prince here referred to. "And the end thereof shall be with a flood, and to the end of the war desolations are determined." End of what? Answer: End of the 70 weeks, and of the city and sanctuary. All end together,—for, *only* 70 weeks were determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city. And when the city was ended, the Jews as a people were ended; and remain

so to this day, and will "until the consummation." Verse 27: "And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week, and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease." Who shall confirm the covenant? Christ? No, for the same *he* "confirms the covenant," who "causes the sacrifice and oblation to cease." Did Christ cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease? We have no such account, either in sacred or profane history. Besides, Josephus tells us, that they did not cease until the 17th of July, the same year Jerusalem was destroyed. [See Jones' Chh. His. vol. 1, page 174,—also Josephus' wars, B. 6, chap. 3, 4.] But what covenant did Titus confirm? I answer, was there not a covenant or contract of amity and peace between the Jews and Romans? I presume you will admit it. Did Titus violate it until he had repeatedly sent overtures of pardon to them? Was not the covenant confirmed on the part of the Romans, till he had addressed them in person, in an eloquent speech, which drew a flood of tears from his eyes, beseeching them to throw down their arms, and return to their loyalty to Caesar? Let the candid reader judge whether this was not confirming a covenant. [See Josephus' wars, B. 4, 5, 8,—also history above, page 172.]

But I think there is further proof that the pronoun *he* refers to Titus. "And for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate," &c. Who made it (Jerusalem) desolate? Answer: Titus. For what did he make it desolate? Answer: For the overspreading of abominations. What were these abominations? Answer: One was the cruelties, brutality, cannibalism and a still wickedness of the Jews. "I should undertake an impossible task," says Josephus, "were I to enter into detail of all the cruelties of these impious writers

If then, Christ did refer to Dan. ix, 27, I think my objection is established beyond reasonable contradiction. But if you should refuse to admit that Christ refers to this text, I have further evidence on hand, which I shall present for your disposal.

I now submit my first objection to your candid examination, and that of the public. Should you succeed in removing it, and in showing my reasons to be groundless, then you will have done something towards making me a convert to your system. But if, on careful investigation, you find my objection unmovable, I presume you will, at least, think your time well occupied, in giving your whole system a thorough investigation. If the ground taken in this article be correct, it furnishes a strong evidence of the truth of my second "objection," viz: that a day in prophecy does not mean a year. For, if the 70 weeks begin with the close of Cyrus, and end with the destruction of Jerusalem, then, instead of covering the space of 490 years, *only*, they cover more than SIX hundred years.

I designed in this article to have animadverted somewhat upon your proof, that the 70 weeks are a part of the 2300 days, but for want of room defer that for the present.

Yours truly,
AARON ANGLIER.
Waterbury, Dec. 10, 1837.

For the Telegraph.
PEACE.—No. VII.

Annual Concert of Prayer for Peace.
We have always doubted the expediency of multiplying monthly concerts of prayer for particular objects; but it surely cannot be too much to ask, that the followers of the Prince of peace should set apart one hour in a year to pray for his smiles upon efforts in the cause of peace. The 25th of December, the time selected for this concert, is fast approaching; and we hope that pastors and churches of every name will make timely arrangements for the occasion.

The providence of God is encouraging our prayers. Special efforts in this cause were first made only a little more than twenty years ago; and the smiles of Heaven have crowned them with such success as to keep the general peace of the civilized world during all this period, and thus prevented an immense waste of blood, and treasure, and human happiness. The leading cabinets of Christendom are pursuing a policy far more pacific than formerly; their services have been generously tendered, in a variety of instances, to avert the threatened horrors of war from our own and other countries; the sentiments of the civilized world have already undergone a very perceptible change in favor of the adjustment of international difficulties, are fast coming to be generally adopted; and it would seem as if nothing more were need-

privileges, and thus exposes them to almost certain perdition. It destroys more or less the efficacy of the gospel in Christian lands, and checks its spread and triumph through the world. It is a mass of abominations; and Christians are as truly bound to pray for its removal as for the banishment of idolatry or superstition from the earth.

Shall we then ask in vain for the prayers of God's people? If you pray for sinners perishing around you, for a few hundred thousand wretches, for two millions and a half of slaves, will the sons and daughters of the God of peace forget four millions of soldiers in Christendom, or refuse to pray, with united, ceaseless importunity, for the removal of so fearful a sin and scourge of war? We regard this cause as a part of the instrumentalities needed for the world's conversion, and we wish it borne before the throne of the God of peace by all the hearts that are wretched for the violation of a command.

GEO. C. BUCKWITH,
Cor. Sec. Am. Peace Soc.

Editors of religious papers friendly to the cause of peace, are respectfully requested to insert the above.

For the Vermont Telegraph.
THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH.

No species of aggravated wickedness is of more frequent occurrence, in what is denominated a Christian community, than the profanation of the holy Sabbath. That it should be so with the giddy, thoughtless throng, is not surprising. The reason is to be found in the alienation and depravity of their hearts. To them the hallowed hours bring no charm, but are irksome and unwelcome. The busy man considers this sacred day as interfering with his hopes of gain or professional employment, and he throws off its restraints, that he may lay up a treasure on the earth. The lovers of mirth and folly view it as a morose intruder upon human pleasure—as laying an icy hand upon the true joys of life; and they plunge into scenes of amusement. Thus this holy day is given to worldly business, or turned into a day of visits and excursions, enlivened by all the merriment and variety of a holiday.

But it is truly surprising to witness the laxity and carelessness of professing christians on this subject. It would seem from the practice of many that they believed the law of the Sabbath was erased and abrogated—that the fourth commandment had sunk and disappeared—that it was swept away with the ruin of the national institutions which were designed for a temporary purpose. It is true that much of Judaism should be regarded as the obsolete and repealed observances of an antiquated ritual. But there is a clear and marked distinction

the believer, never has left out the law of the Sabbath from that inscription. Show me the man who discovers a conscientious attachment to all the other articles of the decalogue, and I will show you that in his heart, and in his practice, *this* is to be found; and it will stand out as prominently as any other on the point of his external observances. It is altogether an erroneous view of the commandments, to look upon them as so many observances to which we are bound by as many separate and distinct ties of obligations,—so that the transgression of one of them may be brought about by the disruption of one separate tie, and leave all the others with an entire and controlling influence as before. The commandments ought rather to be looked upon as joined by one great and general tie of obligation, and that there is no such thing as losing the hold of one upon the conscience, but by the unfastening of that general tie which binds them all to the conscience. And thus it has happened, that by the whole unchanged law being stamped upon the heart, the keeping of this day holy has come down to us through eighteen centuries, without any enactment in the New Testament—without any particular or formal setting forth of Sabbath duties, or laying down of a Sabbath ceremonial. It is because the new creature loves that law which he aforetime hated and violated, that the keeping of this day sacred may be recognized as the badge of every faithful christian, as the great index and palladium of religion in every christian land. Yes, the newborn soul loves the quiet of that sacred morn. He loves the retirement of this day from the din of earthly business, and the inroads of worldly men. Sweet to his soul is the exercise of that consecrated hour, when there is no eye to see him but the eye of his heavenly Father. How can it be possible that a man can be under the influence of piety, who does not love that day which brings to piety its most precious opportunities? How is it possible that he can sustain the character of a religious man, if the day which offers him the best time for the lessons and exercises of religion, is spent in other exercises, or suffered to roll over his head in no exercise at all? How can he love the law, who seeks to misconstrue or evade it? who disregards its strictness by securing a little hay, or grain, making a little cider as the weather is growing cold, or journeying, or salting his cattle, or wastes the hours in sports or in worldly conversation? Answer it ye who call. Joseph.

For the Vermont Telegraph.
REVIVAL IN WINDHAM.
At the commencement of the year, some

public, a candid perusal of my objections and reasons, and if need be, a candid reply. I shall confine myself, mostly, to the Bible and your own writings, without attempting much historical evidence, believing the latter to be very doubtful, and hence to be but little relied upon.

My reasons may be found under the following heads:

First. Their commencement. **Secondly.** The language made use of by Daniel. **Thirdly.** The manner in which Christ alludes to them.

First. Their commencement. Seventy weeks are determined upon the people, and upon the holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity; and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy. Know, therefore, and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem, unto the Messiah the Prince, shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times. And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself: 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, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined. And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined, shall be poured upon the desolate.—Daniel ix, 24—27.

For the sake of those who have not read your "lectures," I would say, that you call the 70 week 70 times 7 days; these days you call 490 years—a day for a year; and you begin them with the 7th year of Artaxerxes, 457 years before Christ, and end them with the 23d year of Tiberias, Cæsar, when our Lord was crucified; being as you say, just 490 years. This you think "firmly proves" that a day in Daniel's prophecy means a year.

One thing is beyond contradiction, that these weeks did begin with a certain decree to restore and to build Jerusalem. But I must beg leave to tell you, and my readers, that in the decree to which you allude, I cannot find one word said about restoring or building the Temple, or Jerusalem.—See Ezra vii, 11—13. I now ask, for the proof, that any such decree was given at this time, or within ten years of it.

About 79 years before this, there was a decree made by Cyrus, to build the house of God at Jerusalem. That this decree of Cyrus ended the 70 years of Babylonish captivity, and began Daniel's 70 weeks, I have not the least doubt, and I think, no one will have, who will read Isa. xlv, 26—28; the last of which reads thus, "That saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall

rebuild the city, then they do not end with Christ's death, as you state, but thirteen years after; it being dated the 20th of his reign: Neh. ii, 1. But supposing, (though not admitting,) that they begin as you have stated, I have other reasons for my objection, and hence pass to notice.

Secondly. The language made use of by Daniel.

Dan. ix, 24: Seventy weeks are determined upon, [or allowed to,] thy people, [Daniel's people, the Jews] and upon thy holy city, [Jerusalem.] Now I wish to ask, if there were any more weeks determined upon the Jews and Jerusalem? If not, let us put down our finger here, and remember that God has appointed the Jewish nation and their boasted city, "their bounds that they cannot pass." But for what was he "determined 70 weeks" upon them? Answer: "To finish the transgression, [see Math. xxiii, 32] and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness; and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy." All these are things to be accomplished within the 70 weeks—within the time allotted to the Jews to remain as a nation, and their city to survive its ruins. Verse 25: "Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commencement to restore and to build Jerusalem, unto the Messiah the Prince, shall be seven weeks and threescore and two weeks," &c. I must object to your explanation of this verse; (page 48,) for, 1. You make the "unto the Messiah" mean, to the preaching of John,—whereas it strikes me, that Simeon thought he had lived unto Christ, when he took him up in his arms, and blessed God and said, "mine eyes have seen thy salvation." 2. You divide the 70 weeks into three parts, and say, "seven being employed in building the streets and walls in troublous times, which is forty-nine years." Now if you begin the 70 weeks right, these forty-nine years can hold out only thirteen,—for you begin with the 7th of Artaxerxes, and we are expressly told, that in the 20th year of this king, Nehemiah went up, and in 52 days finished the city. 3. You say, "there were sixty-two weeks, or 434 years, from the building of the city, to the preaching of John." But here again I think you are wrong,—for it was, according to your own showing, 477 years from the finishing of the city, to the preaching of John, instead of 434. 4. You have left one division of the 70 weeks unexplained, which is, that "after threescore and two weeks, shall Messiah be cut off," &c.: verse 26. I think it no more than reasonable, as you have begun to explain the parts, that you should finish. I therefore ask, threescore weeks from when?

I must say, that, although I have read a number of authors on these divisions, I have, as yet, seen none but what, in my humble opinion, have "darkened counsel by words without knowledge." Therefore,

overspreading of abominations, he shall make it desolate," &c. Who made it (Jerusalem) desolate? Answer: Titus. For what did he make it desolate? Answer: For the overspreading of abominations. What were these abominations? Answer: One was the cruelties, brutality, cannibalism, and all the wickedness of the Jews.

"I should undertake an impossible task," says Josephus, "were I to enter into detail of all the cruelties of these impious writers. Let it suffice to say, that I do not think that since the creation of the world, any city suffered such dreadful calamities, or abounded with men so fertile in every species of wickedness." [Wars, B. 5, ch. 17 & 6—1] Was this the reason why Titus made it desolate? "Sir," said he, "they have so often refused my proffers of pardon, and have preferred war to peace; rebellion to obedience; and famine to plenty, I am determined to bury the cursed metropolis under its ruins, that the sun may never more dart his beams on a city, where mothers feed on the flesh of their children, and the fathers, no less guilty than themselves, choose to drive them to such extremities rather than lay down their arms."—(Wars, B. 6, ch. 3.) This needs no comment, to show that it was for "the overspreading of abomination," that this city was made desolate. There was probably another reason, unknown to Titus, and this was, that the pagan abomination should overspread the Jews—that the "Gentiles should tread them down forty and two months." If more proof, on this point, is required, it is found, in the fact that the grammatical construction of the sentence forbids its relating to Christ. A plain rule of construing language, I think, is admitted to be, to make all relatives refer to the last antecedent, unless the sentiment or connection plainly shows to the contrary. But as there is nothing here, which makes the transgression of this rule necessary to any one who has not a favorite sentiment to establish, I must consider this point settled till disputed. It is evident that he was to live in the last week of the 70: for "he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week, and in the midst of the week, (last of the 70,) he shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease," &c. This you admit, page 48 and 209. Therefore, if, as I have shown, Titus was meant by the pronoun he, I think you must, and will, cheerfully admit, that the 70 weeks did not end with Christ's death, as stated, but with the destruction of Jerusalem.

Thirdly. The manner in which Christ alludes to them.

"When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken by Daniel the prophet," &c. Mat. xxiv, 15. I have no doubt that Christ here alluded to the "overspreading of abomination," &c., in verse 27 before mentioned. And in this belief I am supported by nearly all authors on this text. See Henry, Doddridge and others. That this was one sign, which our Savior gives his disciples, of the approaching destruction of Jerusalem, you have abundantly admitted.

Christendom are pursuing a policy far more pacific than formerly; their services have been generously tendered, in a variety of instances, to avert the threatened horrors of war from our own and other countries; the sentiments of the civilized world have already undergone a very perceptible change, and a more liberal and humane spirit is abroad. The sword for the adjustment of international difficulties, are fast coming to be generally adopted: and it would seem as if nothing more were needed than the blessing of God, expressly promised in answer to prayer upon the right use of means, to insure uninterrupted peace to every land blessed with the light of the gospel.

But the word of God affords the most decisive encouragement to prayer for this object. He has foretold the universal prevalence of peace as expressly as he has promised salvation to the penitent believer in Jesus. "It shall come to pass in the last days"—in gospel times—"that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and all nations shall flow unto it: and they shall beat their swords into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. The wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat straw like the bullock: they shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, saith the Lord." Can language be more decisive than this? The Bible contains no promise more explicit: we have the same reason to expect the world's eventual pacification that the real Christian has to hope for heaven: and we must, if consistent, either discard the word of God entirely, or believe in the absolute certainty of universal and permanent peace.

But how is such a result to be gained? By miracle? Without means? Without an effort or a prayer? Is there nothing for us to do? Are any of God's promises unconditional? No: he will always be inquired of by his people to do the very things he has expressly promised: and can we dream that he will fulfil his promise of universal peace without their prayers and efforts? Will he make this case an exception, a direct contradiction to the whole course of his providence? Then is prayer for the prevalence of peace just as indispensable as for the conversion of sinners in Christian or pagan lands.

How benign the influence of all Christians through the world uniting their prayers for the universal and permanent reign of peace! Would they not breathe through Christendom a spirit that would lull the demon of war to sleep? Should all the followers of Christ in England and this country pray aright for this object, would it be possible for rulers again to embroil the two nations in war? Is there not need of prayer to hush the war-spirit prevalent among ourselves both in the state and the church?

It cannot be necessary to urge upon our brethren in Christ motives to prayer in behalf of such a cause. Need we glance at the waste of property and life in war? Need we sketch its baleful influence on all the interests of mankind for time and for eternity? It is a wholesale destroyer of souls. It is a school of sin, and trains thousands after thousands for perdition. Nearly all its influences are ruinous to the soul. It fosters ignorance, encourages intemperance, and abets licentiousness, and almost every species of vice and crime. It withholds or neutralizes the best means of grace. The millions of standing soldiers in Christendom, it deprives even in peace of nearly all religious

the practice of many that they believe the law of the Sabbath was erased and abrogated—that the fourth commandment had sunk and disappeared—that it was swept away with the ruin of the national institutions which were designed for a temporary purpose. It is true that much of Judaism

should be regarded as the obsolete and repealed observances of an antiquated ritual. But there is a clear and marked distinction between the ceremonial and moral law. The latter was graven on stone, and placed within the holy of holies under the mercy seat. The moral laws are stamped with such enduring characters of obligation as no time can efface. How does the law of the Sabbath stand, as to this particular? Why, most surely it is among the duties which are of general and imperishable obligation. At the giving of the moral law God himself thought fit to signalize it.—From the place where he stood did he proclaim the ten commandments, in the hearing of the multitude, while every other enactment was conveyed to the people through the medium of a human legislator. Now to treat the Sabbath law as obsolete, without any repeal passed in the high legislature of heaven, is audacious in the extreme. It is bidding defiance to the declared will of the Eternal. It is resisting a voice which should sound as impressively to our consciences, as the one that issued in thunder from the flaming top of Sinai.

In the practice of the Christian world the Sabbath has been moved forward by one day, and the remembrance to which it is now consecrated is a different one from that of the creation of the world. For this change we can find no positive enactment—but we are sure that a practice so early, and so universal, could not have been introduced without the sanction of Heaven's inspired messengers. While Christianity abandoned one particular day and transferred itself to another, it was guided in the choice of that day by the affecting remembrance of an event, the contemplation of which is calculated to strengthen the faith, refresh the piety, and inspire the best and most religious feelings of those who are spiritually engaged in it. It commemorates the rising of the crucified Savior from the grave, who by taking upon him that great scheme of mercy, by virtue of which there are to emerge out of this ruined and rebellious world a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. Thus there is in this day the remembrance of a new creation. Can an honest, enlightened Christian construe this slight and circumstantial change into a repeal of any part of the law on this subject? No, he must see that the Sabbath law is graven as indelibly on the record, as any one of the unchangeable moralities among which it is situated. And it is written also on the tablet of his heart. The Holy Spirit, whose office it is to inscribe the law on the heart of

can he love the law, who seeks to misconstrue or evade it? who disregards its strictness by securing a little hay, or grain, making a little cider as the weather is growing cold, or journeying, or selling his cattle, or wasting his substance in any worldly conversation? Answer it ye who can. Joseph.

For the Vermont Telegraph. REVIVAL IN WINDHAM.

At the commencement of the year some members of the church were awakened to the importance of living nearer to God, and devoting themselves more to his service.—At that time, after preaching upon the subject, I invited such of the church as felt it a duty to spend a particular day in fasting and prayer. A few met, and at the close of the day, renewed our covenant with God and each other. We then commenced weekly prayer meetings, which have continued with increasing interest. In the spring, as I was unable, through a great infirmity, to perform, alone, the work of a pastor, the church employed brother Milo Frary to preach half of the time. His labors appeared to be blessed by God, in further awakening the church and increasing the attention of the congregation. On the 9th of Nov. we commenced a protracted meeting, which continued 15 days, conducted by elder Wm. Grant of Greenwich, N. Y., who, with elder Hurlbut of Andover, performed the preaching. Other ministering brethren of different denominations labored with us. The Holy Spirit seemed in an extraordinary manner, to attend the plain, simple declaration of the truth. Those who appeared the most stout-hearted immediately bowed under it, and submitted to it. Those who had prayed most earnestly were constrained to say, at the close, God has done for us far more abundantly than we in weakness were able to ask or think.

I know not the number of converts, but more than a hundred professed to obtain hope, including most of the men of wealth and influence, within the bounds of the society. Forty-six were baptized during the meeting, and eleven since, in all 57. Others have related their experience to the church, and will be baptized soon. Several of the converts were from other neighborhoods; and some will probably unite with other denominations.

The good work seems to be progressing and spreading. A protracted meeting is now in progress in the Congregational society in this town, with encouraging prospects. SAMUEL KINGSBURY. Windham Dec. 11, 1837.

HOLDING SLAVES UNDER THE GOLDEN RULE.—To denounce the system of slavery is sinful, and at the same time at tempting to show, that holding servants in such a sense, that the law pronounces them slaves, from no part of this system; or in other words, the holding of slaves, by ministers and members of the M. E. Church, may be and is done in obedience to the Savior's Golden Rule, involves an inconsistency, which can never be reconciled with the unperverted dictates of Scripture or reason.—Zion's Herald.