

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for the *Calcutta Christian Observer* can be found here:

[https://missiology.org.uk/journal\\_calcutta-christian-observer-01.php](https://missiology.org.uk/journal_calcutta-christian-observer-01.php)

Established June, 1832.

NEW SERIES, VOL. IX, NO. 97.—OLD SERIES, VOL. XVII, NO. 188.

THE  
**CALCUTTA**  
CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

JANUARY, 1848.

\* \* \* The entire profits arising from the Sale of this Publication will be devoted to the  
CALCUTTA CHRISTIAN TRACT AND BOOK SOCIETY.

CONTENTS.

	<i>Page</i>
I.—The Opening Year, .....	1
II.—Substance of a Sermon on John, xvi. 7, .....	6
II.—On uncovering the head in Public Worship, .....	9
III.—Uncovering the head in Public Worship, not necessary, .....	15
IV.—The Santál verb.—a curiosity, .....	25
V.—The Hindu Memorial, .....	31
MISSIONARY AND RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.	
1.—Missionary and Ecclesiastical Movements, .....	38
2.—The Calcutta Bible Association, .....	<i>ib.</i>
3.—Church Mission at Meerut, .....	40
4.—Mirzapore Mission Clock, .....	<i>ib.</i>
5.—Baptism at the Scotch Kirk, .....	<i>ib.</i>
6.—Baptisms at Jellalore.—From the Rev. J. Phillips, .....	41
7.—Madras: Baptism of five Hindu Girls, .....	<i>ib.</i>
8.—Division among the Brahmáns.—The boy Ragavooloo, .....	42
9.—Bombay: Brahmanical Strictness, .....	<i>ib.</i>
10.—Alleged Conversion of the Rajah of Travancore to Christianity, .....	43
11.—Ceylon: The Tooth of Buddha, .....	<i>ib.</i>
12.—Singapore, .....	<i>ib.</i>
13.—Conversion of a Musalman at Ahmednuggur, .....	44
14.—Murder of the Rev. Mr. Lowrie, .....	45
15.—An Enquirer after Truth, .....	46

**CALCUTTA:**  
PRINTED AT THE BAPTIST MISSION PRESS.  
1848.

Published by Messrs. G. C. HAY & Co., 56½, Cossittollah.

## FUNDAMENTAL RULES.

---

I. That the CALCUTTA CHRISTIAN OBSERVER be established on those evangelical principles, in which the leading Reformers of the 16th century were agreed.

II. That no piece, advocating the peculiarities of a particular denomination, shall in any case be inserted in the work.

III. That the Editors, who are of different religious denominations, shall be at liberty, without offence to the contributors, to modify or reject all communications which may appear contrary to the above Rules.

---

## TO CORRESPONDENTS.

---

The Editors of the Observer will be much obliged for any LOCAL or GENERAL REPORTS of Missions, in any part of India.

---

The United Monthly Missionary Prayer Meeting will (D. V.) be held on Monday, the 3d of Jan. at the Union Chapel. Service to commence at 7 P. M.

The Monthly Native Missionary Meeting will be held at the Union Chapel, on Tuesday Evening, Jan. 18th, at seven o'clock.

The Committee of the Bible Society (D. V.) meet for the transaction of business on the third Tuesday in every month, at 9 o'clock in the morning.

The Committee of the Bible Association meet on the last Friday in every month at the Bible Society's House, at 9 o'clock in the morning.

---

## ADVERTISEMENTS

IN

### *The Calcutta Christian Observer.*

ADVERTISEMENTS sent for insertion on the Cover of the CALCUTTA CHRISTIAN OBSERVER, will, from this date, be charged at the rate of *one anna a line*: and it is requested that all such advertisements be sent to the Publishers by the 24th, or to the Press by the 25th day of each month.—*July 1st, 1847.*

---

**Just Published,**

*And for Sale of the Baptist Mission Press, Circular Road,*

**THE MISSIONARY'S VADE MECUM,**

Or a condensed account of the Religious Literature, Sects, Schools, and Customs of the Hindus in the North West of India. With Notices of Missionary Controversial works, Lines or Argumentation, &c. By the Rev. T. PHILLIPS.—Price 3 Rupees.

THE  
CALCUTTA  
CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

---

NEW SERIES, VOL. IX. No. 97.—OLD SERIES, VOL. XVII. No. 188.

JANUARY, 1848.

---

1.—*The Opening Year.*

In the good providence of God, another year has ended, and yet another begins. The wing of time is strong, and with unceasing rapidity days, months and years speed over us. Each year comes to us loaded with blessings: each year lays up a heavy account of evil, and adds it to the sins already more in number than the countless sands upon the sea-beach. “A thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past.” In looking forward our days seem to come slowly and we are apt to say of life, “What a weariness is it!” But in the review of the past, years widely separated seem but one. Hence the number and variety of the images presented to us in the word of God, intended to impress us with a due estimate of the shortness of life and of its inestimable value. “My days are swifter than a post;” they are “as a tale that is told;” “as a handbreadth;” “like a shadow that declineth;” “as a vapour, that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away;” “as the flower of grass;” “as the waters that fail from the sea;” “as the days of an hireling;” “as the swift ships, as the eagle that hasteth to the prey;” “swifter than a weaver’s shuttle;” “as a dream, as a vision of the night;” “like the heath in the desert;” “as a flood;” “as a sleep;” “like smoke;” and “as a watch in the night;” and true it is

of men, that "they dwell in houses of clay, whose foundation is in the dust, who are crushed before the moth;" "man dieth and wasteth away." "Thou knowest not what a day may bring forth." "We are but of yesterday and know nothing." Such is the whole of life; what shall we say of its several portions. How much more deeply should we feel their importance, and use them while they are ours.

In entering upon a new year, it becomes us to look *back* and to look *forward*. He who knew what was in man, appointed the sun and the moon for seasons, and to divide our time, that with our lesser capabilities we might be furnished with special opportunities that should lead us to measure the race we had run, and mark that which is yet before us. The past should excite *gratitude*. What temporal mercies, often unnoticed, come to us in ceaseless flow from him, on whom "all eyes wait." "Bread is given to us, our water is sure." "The Lord is our keeper." Above all he giveth us the "bread of heaven," even him "who gave himself for the life of the world." We may thank him for his Holy Spirit, given to instruct, to purify, to guide us: for the word of his grace, not yet taken from us "because of our iniquities:" for his long-suffering and patience; for the frequent fulfilment of his "precious promises;" for the afflictions with which as a father he chastises us; for the grace by which he sustains us in temptations; for the *victories* we sometimes obtain over the devil; for repeated answers to prayer; for the occasions of spiritual profit to ourselves; for a sphere of usefulness to others; for courage to meet life's duties, trials, weariness and conflicts; and for the hope of eternal glory. What portion is like that of the Lord's people. What stores of heavenly blessings showered upon us while *pilgrims* in the world's wilderness! manna from the skies, water from that "Spiritual Rock which follows us," even Christ! Blessed are they who have a part in his covenant-promise! What can they not hope for? What may they not daily enjoy? All is purchased; all is promised, all is given, freely, fully, "without money and without price." "If God spared

not his Son but freely gave him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us ALL THINGS." "ALL THINGS are yours:" "Blessed is the people that is in such a case; yea blessed is that people whose God is the Lord."

But in looking back, we have to feel not only gratitude but *sorrow for sin*. As each year adds to our blessings, so it adds to the black catalogue of sins. How many such has the past year witnessed! How many of our good resolutions made in sincerity have been broken again and again. When humbled under a sense of deepest guilt, we have risen again in hope for the future, how soon have our hopes been destroyed by the recommission of evil! What struggles between the flesh and spirit have been declined and given up! But the catalogue of our iniquities who shall name? Sabbaths have been mis-spent and wilfully dishonoured. Opportunities of public worship neglected and despised. Prayers both public and private, have been cold and formal; the word of God little perused, or read to quiet conscience and hurried over without profit. How have the ministrations of the blessed Spirit of God been undervalued, and his all-powerful aid been left unsought! How many opportunities of usefulness have been passed by unimproved: how much time mis-spent; how many days wasted in busy idleness or cold and listless selfishness. How often have the Lord's commands been directly broken; instead of living to him who died for us, how much have we lived to ourselves. How dead are our affections; how grovelling our pursuits, how sensual our aims. "We are all as an unclean thing; and all our righteousnesses as FILTHY RAGS." "O Lord, to us belongeth confusion of face, because we have sinned against thee: yea all Israel have transgressed thy law, even by departing that they might not obey thy voice."

"Alas! from such a heart as mine  
 What can I bring him forth,  
 My best desires are full of sin,  
 My all is nothing worth."

How much do others see that is defective in the servants of

II.—*Substance of a Sermon on John, xvi. 7.*

“Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you.”

The residence of Jesus with his disciples was an extraordinary and invaluable privilege enjoyed by them. How vast the condescension he displayed in wearing the veil of flesh, and becoming the associate of erring, mortal men! How blessed for the disciples to have Christ, “in whom dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily,” in whom divine wisdom, power and purity became incarnate, as their companion, so near and on such terms of intimacy that they could consult him, on all occasions, for instruction, direction or consolation. Israel, under the Mosaic dispensation, could hold communion with God only through the medium of sacrifices, and of priests, themselves without the veil. If then Moses said of them, “What nation is there so great, who hath God so nigh unto them, as the Lord our God is in all things that we call upon him for?” then what may not be said of the vastly superior privileges of the disciples. Christ had intimated to them that this privilege was about to be taken from them, and on hearing this, “sorrow had filled their heart.” vs. 5, 6. To comfort them, Christ told them the truth, revealed to them the true reason, and real intent of this so afflictive dispensation. The revelation of the truth proved the merciful design of the dealings of God. And such is the case with all the affections of believers, for though they “seem for the present not joyous, but grievous,” yet the event shows that “all things work together for good to them that love God.” The great event that was to more than compensate for the loss of Christ’s personal presence was the descent of the Holy Ghost, by whom Jesus can be “with all his disciples alway, even unto the end of the world,” which he could not have been in his bodily presence. Let us consider, then, some of the great blessings which the Comforter bestows.

1. *Consolation.* This is suggested to us by the very title under which he was promised. Consolation was indispensably and immediately necessary to the disciples after the death of Christ. So long as they were in a dejected and desponding state of mind, they could not recommend the gospel, either by their example or their preaching. But when the Spirit enlightened their minds, taught them the real intent of the Saviour’s sufferings, and the nature of his kingdom, and assisted their faith to grasp the fact of his exaltation, and the certainty of their future prospects, then began they “with great power to give witness of the resurrection,” and their mission told with

mighty efficacy on the multitude. Not less necessary are the Comforter's influences to us, who are believers, in the present day. Our blessed Saviour is not with us in person; our trials and temptations, difficulties and discouragements, conflicts and obstacles, are numerous and painful; no native strength can prevent us from dejection. But if the Spirit deign to bring the word of Christ to our remembrance, apply the promises, and shed on us his consoling influences, our own comfort will be but a part of the benefit which will flow from it. Our holy joy will excite gratitude; gratitude will stimulate zeal; and the result may be that we shall be not only blest, but made a blessing.

2. *Instruction.* Jesus positively promised this blessing as the effect of the Spirit's advent. "He shall teach you all things." John, xiv. 26. "He shall guide you into all truth." ch. xvi. 13. This He does to those who receive him, He opens their understandings to comprehend the word; he awakens their consciences to feel its edge; above all, he inclines their hearts to submit to its authority: thus taught, they attain to a saving knowledge of the "things that belong to their peace." Of such it is written, "Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things." 1 John, ii. 20. Learned critics may study the language of Scripture, may seek out illustrations of its meaning, and settle its literal signification, but if they have not the Spirit of Christ they cannot apprehend its true force or know its proper influence. They will not become acquainted with the "love of Christ which passeth knowledge;" which is, in extent, beyond all finite powers of comprehension, nor less, in its nature, far above the understanding of any unrenewed intellect. Though the language of Scripture is simple, yet there are in its meaning depths, which itself informs us, "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive." "But," says the apostle in the succeeding verse, "God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God." 1 Cor. ii. 9, 10.

3. *Sanctification.* They who accept the grace of God in Christ, are renewed in the spirit of their mind. They love what once they hated; they hate what once they loved. The law against which they once rebelled, they now approve as "holy, just and good." They were alienated from God, but they now long for the enjoyment of his presence and favour, as "the hart panteth for the water brooks." Their great hindrance in attaining what they desire is the "law in their members," the inordinate passions and affections of the flesh. Against these they have to struggle, and the Spirit is their

helper in the contest. So it is written, Rom. viii. 13—"If ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live." "The righteousness of the law is fulfilled" in those, and only those, who "walk after the Spirit." See vs. 3, 4. He "strengthens the inner man with might," and, being all-powerful, enables the weakest believer to expel the "strong man," and to "put off the old man." Through him, the heart of the believer becomes the habitation of God," (Ephes. ii. 22,) where he is enthroned as supreme. He becomes in us the "Spirit of adoption," "bearing witness with our spirits that we are the children of God," and so elevating us above the manners and maxims of the world. He opens divine subjects with light and power,—takes of the things of Christ and shows them to us, and whilst, by His aid, we "behold as in a glass the glory of the Lord, we are changed into the same image, from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord." 2 Cor. iii. 18.

4. *Supplication.* Prayer is a duty so imperative, a privilege so important, that it is of the greatest moment that we should avail ourselves of its advantages by performing it aright. The Scriptures have so clearly revealed our relationship to God, and have so cordially invited us to the throne of grace, as children to a Father, that it would seem it must be easy to pray aright. Better experience however tells us otherwise. When we would draw near to God, our hearts are so backward, so ignorant, so slow to believe, that all our natural strength is unequal to the duty. How blessed then that the Divine Spirit condescends to be in the followers of Christ the "Spirit of grace and supplication." Of which we have the most cheering assurance in Rom. viii. 26, 27. "The Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought; but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God." What a lovely picture this of those who "pray with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit!" Ephes. vi. 18. Here is the Holy Spirit in the heart of the weak believer, inditing the fervent and acceptable petition; and there is the Searcher of hearts looking down upon the scene, and detecting and approving the suggestions of the Spirit, amidst all the infirmities of the suppliant saint. To Jesus alone are we indebted for that mediation which has opened for our prayers a way of access to the throne of God; and to the Spirit alone for that wisdom, grace and holy influence, through which our prayers are "according to the will of God."

5. *Fruitfulness.* "Herein," said Jesus, "is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit." John, xv. 8. This may be ac-

complished as our character exhibits the "fruits of the Spirit," and bears the image of Christ, so that others may glorify God in us. It may also be accomplished as we lead others to the sacred fount, where our own souls have been cleansed. How great the honour of so doing! How large the benefit conveyed! To "convert a sinner from the error of his way," is to "save a soul from death," (James, v. 20,) to rescue it from everlasting pollution and perdition, and to introduce it to unfading bliss and purity, where filled with joy, and "clothed with humility," it shall for ever adore and enjoy the glories of its Redeemer and its Father. This, however, is not to be attained without the aid of the Spirit. If we be ministers of the letter only, "the letter killeth;" but if of the Spirit, the "Spirit giveth life." The sinner must be convicted "of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment," but this is a work which can be effected by the Spirit alone. No soul is brought into a state of safety, who has not been "born of the Spirit." John, iii. 5.

Jesus is worthy of our highest adoration for the work he wrought while still abiding in the world,—for the depth of his humiliation, for the intensity of his sufferings, for the perfection of his work, for the merits of his death: and does He not, then, deserve our warmest gratitude, that "when he ascended up on high, and led captivity captive, he gave unto men a gift" so unspeakably precious, to supply the lack of his personal superintendence and ministry?

J. P. M.

---

## II.—*On uncovering the head in Public Worship.*

I COR. xi. 4.—"Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoureth his head."

Although this passage has reference primarily to the mere externals of Christian worship, yet it has an object in view worthy of the highest aim of every child of God. The object is honor to Christ our living head. This object can be secured only by strict obedience, in spirit and act, to the command necessarily involved in this declaration. Nothing can be more dishonoring to Christ than disobedience to his will or substituting in the place of his plans some of our own. This course involves the double sin of insubordination to his will and of impeaching the wisdom of his requirements. It therefore becomes a matter of no trivial importance that we ascertain exactly what he would have us do, and in the spirit of humility yield implicit obedience to his will.

On this passage I have heard three opinions expressed among Missionaries with reference to its bearing upon the conduct of the native Christians of this country in the worship of God.

1.—“That it is a matter of very little importance whether the head or feet be uncovered so that some respect be shown to the worship of God.” To this it may very properly be objected that what the Holy Spirit thought important to reveal and cause to be recorded for the guidance of God’s people, is surely of importance enough for them to study and obey. If God requires us to show respect to his Son in one particular manner, it is impious in us to say that it is of no consequence whether we conform to his instructions or adopt some plan of human device. We ought then to investigate his word and ascertain clearly whether he has left this matter to be decided by circumstances, or whether he has himself laid down one uniform rule for all his people.

2. “That we are not to adopt the literal interpretation of this passage but take its spirit, which is to pay that respect to the Son of God in his worship which the customs of the country require to be rendered to superiors.” To this view there is this very serious objection, that it makes the spirit flatly contradict the letter. The letter says that the head should be uncovered. But this interpretation makes the spirit say that the head should be covered. Here is a plain and palpable contradiction. Can we believe that the will of God is so badly expressed in his word that it is necessary so positively to contradict the letter in order to arrive at the spirit? If this really be the case, how can we ever be sure that we have ascertained what is the spirit? Must we always make it contradict the letter? or are we left without any settled principles of interpretation? May every one interpret to suit his own theory, taking the letter when that suits, and the spirit, contradicting the letter, when that suits? But again this view is very objectionable, because it explains away and even contradicts a plain express declaration of God’s word upon no other authority than that of a Heathen custom. If there be any other authority for it, I have yet to hear it. If a heathen custom contrary to this passage is sufficient authority for departing from the plain literal meaning of it and adopting one directly contradictory, then why may not a multitude of other passages be disposed of in the same way on the same authority. Besides, when God not only demands our respect, but prescribes the mode in which that respect is to be paid, it is presumption in man to say that some other mode will do just as well—that so long as we observe the spirit of the requirement, the mode is of no consequence.

3. The third opinion is that, “as the Bible was written for the instruction of the whole world, and neither this passage itself

nor the context, nor any other passage contains any intimation that different interpretations of it are admissible, therefore we are bound to conform to the plain literal meaning of the passage." It will be admitted by all that some portions of the church are bound thus to interpret and practise. Where then is the *scripture* authority for allowing other portions of the same church to adopt a contradictory practice? Where is the scripture authority for making Heathen customs a rule of interpretation, or our authority for departing from the interpretation which is acknowledged to be binding upon those portions of the church where no such heathen custom prevails? Besides, the Apostle nowhere assigns, for the practice which he inculcates, the reason assigned by those who reject the literal interpretation of the passage, viz. that this is the mode of testifying our respect for superiors, therefore an opposite practice or the literal interpretation of the apostolic injunction would in this country be a token of disrespect instead of respect. Far different are the Apostle's reasons. Every one of them is fully as applicable to this country as to any other. Let us examine them.

1. The great object of the injunction set forth in this passage is honour to Christ. And it is expressly declared that every man *πας ανηρ* praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoreth his head, i. e. Christ, as appears from v. 3. Now this declaration is both universal and particular. It is not of that general kind as if the apostle had said all men. He says *every man*. But, if one man may worship God with his head covered without doing dishonor to Christ, his head, it is not true that *every man* who thus worships dishonours his head. Much less is this the case when whole countries may depart from this rule without incurring this guilt. But the Apostle wrote as much for Hindustán as for Greece; as much for Calcutta, as for Corinth. He wrote too under the dictation of that Spirit of truth who knew what were then, and what through all time would be the customs of every land for which he was dictating those instructions. And that Holy Spirit made no exceptions in favor of any custom or customs. He dictated the broad declaration that "*every man* praying or prophesying having his head covered *dishonoreth* his head." On the other hand, the Bible gives us no intimation that God regards the *covering* the head in his worship as doing honor to the head of the church. It allows of no exception to the rule here laid down. It gives no intimation that uncovering the *feet* is the proper mode of testifying respect to the *head*. An arbitrary custom may be practised with that object in view; but the rationality of the custom it is difficult to discover.

2. The next argument of the Apostle is equally plain, explicit and of universal application. "For a man indeed *ought not to cover* his head (i. e. in the worship of God) for as much as he is the image and glory of God." Now if this be a good reason why a Greek "ought not to cover his head," it is equally a good reason why a Hindu ought not to do the same thing, for it is equally true of both. The reasoning of the sacred record is entirely irrespective of country or customs or times. It refers back to the creation of the father of our race, who was made in the image of God. It was true with reference to him, he ought not to cover his head in the worship of God for he bore the image of God. But if it was true of him, it must be of his children and his children's children to all generations, so long as the reason lasts. No fault of theirs can justify them in departing from the line of duty given to their father for him and his posterity. The rule is binding wherever the reason exists, and the reason exists in every son of Adam. But if it be objected that man by the fall has lost that image, therefore the reason does not now exist, and to reason from it is fallacious; it may be replied;—1. This sort of reasoning makes one sin good reason for committing another. Man was bound while in the image of God to obey this precept, but he violated another precept of the law, and by doing so lost that image, therefore he may violate this also. This would give as large liberty as any sinner could ask. It would be offering a premium for sin. 2. Besides, if it exonerates the Asiatic from obedience to this or any other precept, it equally exonerates the European for the very same reasons. But it is admitted that the European "ought not to cover his head" in the worship of God. Therefore the conclusion is inevitable that without an express exception in his favor, the Asiatic "ought not to cover his head" while engaged in the same act. And 3. It is of no force in the case of real Christians in any part of the world; for the lost image is reproduced in them, and the reason restored. Eph. iv. 20, 24: Col. iii. 9, 10.

3. The third argument adduced by the Apostle is that decency requires that a woman should be covered and the man uncovered in the worship of God. It is a dictate of nature. "Judge in yourselves," he says, "is it comely (*πρέπον* or decorous) that a woman pray unto God uncovered? Doth not even nature itself teach you that if a man have long hair, it is shame to him? But if a woman have long hair it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering?" It is not said that the custom against which the Apostle was arguing was contrary to the custom of that country or time; but that it was contrary to propriety. It is not said that they were taught this by tradition, but by nature *φύσις*. Corrupted as man is, it is almost, if

not quite impossible for us to learn from the actual practice of mankind what are the teachings of nature on many points. There is no uniform practice. Consequently on a point where nature teaches any thing, diversity of practice proves that the dictates of nature are disregarded or perverted. But where God, who gave us one nature, and thoroughly understands the nature he created speaks, his word settles the question. No counter custom, even though it were absolutely universal, can ever prove that to be a dictate of nature which God's word declares is not, or that not to be a dictate of nature which he declares is such. But the inspired record here teaches us that it is a dictate of nature that a woman should be covered and a man uncovered, for the woman has long hair given for a covering, but it is a shame for a man to allow his hair to grow long. It is utterly unbecoming in him who represents the image and glory of God to appear in his worship adorned the same as she who represents the glory of the man. In the worship of God the image and glory of God should be made conspicuous, but the glory of man should be concealed. No reasoning could be more appropriate, clear and conclusive. And this reasoning is equally applicable to all countries and all ages.

4. The last argument of the Apostle on this question contains a positive prohibition of the practice against which he was writing. It is addressed particularly to those, who, rejecting all his other arguments, might still be disposed to contend for the practice he had been condemning. "But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God." As though he had said if any one will obstinately persist against all reason in introducing such a custom, let him know that no such custom is allowed in any of the churches of God, Asiatic or European. Here the Apostle interposes authority against the conduct of any whom he may fail to influence by his arguments. "We have no such custom." We, the Apostles, have allowed or sanctioned no such custom, neither have any of the churches of God allowed or sanctioned it. It is not to be found any where in any of our assemblies of worship, and no one has a right to come and disturb the peace of the church or mar the purity of her worship by contending for any such innovation. Now so far as the argument of this verse is concerned, it continues good as long as the basis of it remained unaltered, viz. that the churches of God had no such custom. So long it was wrong to introduce any such custom. The question then arises, is the force of the reason at all abated by the sin which destroys the fact on which it was founded? Does the sinful introduction into the church of error in doctrine or in practice entitle that error to retain its ill gotten place in

the church. If not, then the argument remains the same now as when the Apostle employed it. No such custom has ever been lawfully admitted into any of the churches of God, therefore no one has a right, without authority from the head of the church, now to introduce or admit any such custom.

No provision is made here or in any of the other arguments of the Apostle for differences of customs. The reasons are equally applicable to all ages and all countries. The law is plain, simple and explicit, and the reasons by which it is enforced are drawn from the nature of man and his relations to the God he worships. That nature and those relations are universal and perpetual. Had God left his people with the general instructions that they were to do "all things decently and in order," we then should have been allowed the desired latitude of interpretation. But this is not the case. His word is as express about the *mode* of showing the respect due to the head of the church as it is concerning the *nature* of it. And the arguments for that *mode* are of such universal application, as to admit of no latitude in the interpretation of the instructions given concerning it.

Besides, there is a natural propriety or fitness in uniformity in the worship of God. It is exceedingly unseemly and disorderly to see a congregation engaged in the worship of God, some with heads covered, others uncovered, some with caps, some with turbans, some with hats, (for the principle will allow a European hat as well as an Asiatic turban, should a native Christian retaining his native habits find it convenient to wear a hat,) and some with bare heads. And then what security have we that those who set aside the *mode* of testifying the respect due to Christ, which is prescribed in the Bible, and adopt one of human invention, will continue to render even that respect? Is there no danger that God will give up such persons to their own wisdom to deny him the reverence he demands altogether until he come down upon them with his heaviest judgments? It is a notorious fact that those who have been thus taught to substitute a heathen custom for an appointment of God's house, are not long in learning to dispense with external respect for the Saviour of sinners and enter the house of God and engage in its holy services with head and feet both covered, thus publicly doing a dishonor to Christ, which would not be tolerated even in a heathen temple. There is danger then in departing from God's word even in what some may call small matters. And in this case it is a danger not in theory, but one which has been realized both in the pulpit and in the congregation. When we see such results of such a departure from God's word it is time for all concerned to take the alarm and

return to the prescribed mode of honoring our divine head. It is time for those who bear rule in the house of God to pause and think whether they have not incurred his righteous displeasure in permitting such a departure from his word. It is time to return to the old paths. They are safe. But we are not certain of safety in the new untried ones of man's device.

Φιλαγαθος.

---

III.—*Uncovering the head in Public Worship, not necessary.*

As every thing pertaining to the outward form and development of Christianity in India has its measure of importance, either on account of its intrinsic value or its incidental bearings, it is highly desirable that it be exhibited to the natives with as much of uniformity in its aspect, and as far as possible divested of points which make it repulsive to them:—this I say, of course, with respect to matters in themselves indifferent.

I have observed for years with some concern that there is a great diversity in the practice of native Christians at different stations, in N. India especially, in the habit of uncovering their head, or feet, as a mark of respect for persons and places, as when they assemble for religious worship, &c. In some places I see them retain the Asiatic custom of uncovering their feet at such times. In others I see them adopt the European habit, and uncover their heads. And in other places they uncover both, and in others again they uncover neither. This has arisen, I have no doubt, from the fact of Missionaries and others who have, in a great measure, the shaping of the habits of native Christians in their hands, esteem it too unimportant a subject to merit any interference; and so it is in itself. But as it will eventually lead to disputings and alienations among themselves, and as it must have an important influence in rendering Christianity unpalatable to the native community, who are far more observant of such matters, and far more likely to form their estimate of Christianity from such things, than we are, it becomes a subject of importance, that a wise and judicious course be adopted, and pursued with as much uniformity as circumstances will permit. It is admitted, I think, by all parties who reflect upon the subject that it is necessary that the one or the other ought to be observed as a mark of respect for God's house and ordinances, and that they who have learned to go to the place of public worship without taking off either their hat or shoes, have acquired a habit of irreverence for the place, and for him who is worshipped there, which needs to be corrected.

But when the subject has begun to assume such importance in the estimation of Missionaries and others as to elicit conver-

sation, it is found that there are diversities of opinion amongst them as to which habit it is proper for native Christians to adopt. I have myself seen native Christians deeply puzzled to know what to do. They had been instructed and their habits formed by one, who taught them to retain the habits of their country in things which are in themselves indifferent, both with a view to their own comfort, and to avoid throwing unnecessary stumbling blocks in the way of natives in reference to their taking a candid and favourable view of the requirements of Christianity. They have been met and severely reprimanded by another party who felt the necessity of, and insisted upon, their conforming their practice to that of Europe, as essential to Christianity. Thus they have been brought to a stand, with a Lion before them, and a Bear behind, and they all uncertain as to which way they ought to turn. I confess that, after all the attention which I have been able to give to the subject, during a period of 10 or 12 years, during which it has been before my mind, my impression is that it is a wise, and safe, and suitable course to allow our native brethren to retain the dress, and modes and habits of their country in all things which involve neither sin, nor improper allusions to subjects in themselves sinful. Every habit or custom which is sinful Christianity ought to set itself to correct. And in doing this Christianity will have enough to do without setting about also to mould and new form habits in themselves indifferent.

The reasons which have led me to this opinion I will state as briefly as I can. They are 1st.—That the mode of showing respect for persons and places being, in its origin, a mere conventional thing, it is a matter of entire indifference in itself whether it be done by uncovering the head or the feet.

2nd. It being the fact, as is generally known and acknowledged, that natives of India (and of Asia generally, I believe,) do regard it as the sign of a person's being in disgrace, or out of favour, to have his head stripped naked, it is not wise nor well advised to impose authoritatively, a foreign custom on them involving the outward sign of disgrace, where no disgrace is intended, and where it must of necessity impose additional hindrances in the way of natives embracing the outward profession of Christianity.

3rd. The two forms or modes of expressing respect, are the counter parts to each other; as the one rises, the other must go down; they cannot both be adopted and carried forward together. If we insist on teaching our native Christians to show respect by uncovering their heads, we must allow them the privilege of keeping their *shoes* on, or consent to impose on them "a burden which neither we nor our fathers could bear." And by

insisting on their stripping their heads as a mark of respect to us and our worship, we involve them in trouble and inconsistencies with their countrymen. For the habit of stripping the head when with us, and the feet when with them, will lead them frequently to violate the one custom or the other; and not unfrequently to the neglect of them both. I have myself known numerous instances in which natives, both Muhammadans and Hindus, have had a desire to attend our places of public worship, but were deterred from coming, as they avowed, by the impression that we would insist on their taking off their *pagris*. We know how solicitous they are to induce us to show respect for their places of worship by taking off our *shoes*. And we know how reluctant we are to do so. Now, if this reluctance on our part were strengthened by the fact of the taking off our shoes being in itself, in our estimation, a mark of degradation, how much more strongly would our hearts revolt at being forced to do it. It is an object with us to induce the natives to come to our places of worship, and see, and hear, and learn for themselves. Then why should we hedge up the way of access to them by insisting on ceremonial observances which we know to be repulsive to them?

Hitherto it has been a favourite and successful argument in favor of Christianity, and we have constantly been in the habit of assuring the natives, that religion does not consist in the food, or dress, or conventional manners of a people, but in the state of the heart and affections being right towards God. And they feel the force of this argument. Then why should we place in their hands the means of proving that we do, after all, insist upon outward, ceremonial observances, and that we will discipline or repudiate a man whatever may be his faith, and character, if he does not learn to lean in the right form?

4th. That it is more entirely in accordance with the spirit of Bible teaching, to fall in with the customary mode of the time and country. It is satisfactorily evident from the incidental allusions to the subject, in the Bible, that it was the custom of the Israelites (and I suppose of nearly all oriental nations) to keep their heads covered, and show respect for persons and places by uncovering their feet; whilst sorrow and shame were strongly set forth by uncovering the head. Thus Moses and Joshua were respectively directed to take off their shoes when they were suddenly introduced to the presence of the Divine being, at a time and in a place where they were not expecting it. This incidental notice of the subject is natural and quite in place, if we understand it to have been the customary mode of showing respect for the person or place by taking off the shoes, and that in the confusion of mind incidental to their being

surprized, and almost overwhelmed, by finding themselves in the immediate presence of Jehovah, and in actual converse with him, when they thought themselves only looking on some strange phenomenon in the desert, or conversing with a fellow-mortal whom they had incidentally met, far away from any sanctuary, or place of worship. Whilst the thing is unnatural, and unaccountable on the supposition that taking off their shoes was not a customary and understood mode of showing respect.

Again, how surely would it have grown into a custom from that time if it had never been heard of before! *God* said "take off thy shoes from thy feet, for the ground on which thou standest is *holy* ground." Would not Moses, and Joshua, ever afterwards remember and instinctively take off their shoes when they found themselves standing on *holy* ground? And would not the Priests, and people too, feel the necessity of taking off their shoes when they came on holy ground? And what earthly influence could prevent the practice from *growing into a custom* from that time?

Again, as to uncovering the *head*. Aaron and his surviving sons were forbidden to uncover their heads, or show the customary signs of sorrow, on the death of Nadab and Abihu. Afterwards the general law was established that the high Priest should not uncover his head or defile himself on the occasion of the death of his nearest relations. Now what could be the force or meaning of such a regulation as this, if it were not the usual practice of the people of Israel to keep their heads covered on ordinary occasions, and to uncover the head as the symbol of sorrow, and bewailing a misfortune?

Ezekiel was commanded (see chap. xxiv. 17) to "bind the tire on his head, and his shoes on his feet" at the time when his own wife's death was the symbol of woes about to be poured out upon his people. On the occasion of the heaviest earthly calamity that could befall him, he was not permitted to uncover his head, or show the usual sign of sorrow. And, by *putting on his shoes*, he was required to profane, as it were, the very place, and thus make a strong impression on the minds of his people, of the profaneness of their position and character. He was required neither to show sorrow for the occasion, nor respect for the place, in the customary manner, in order to induce them to inquire what was the reason for this unusual course, and give occasion to point out the profaneness of their position and the heinousness of their sins.

And I suppose if the old Testament were looked over with a view to this, a score of places would be found where allusions are made, bearing on the face of them this general aspect. On a subject of so small inherent importance, it is not to be ex-

pected that much would be said in the way of direct legislation. An occasional allusion to the fact, for the purpose of illustrating something else by it, is all that we should expect to find in the Bible. But the general drift or bearing of the Old Testament, as well as of the statements of travellers who have revisited the countries of the Bible, goes to show that the command to Moses and Joshua on the two occasions incidentally noticed, naturally fell in with the customary mode of the time, and country, in showing respect for places deemed sacred.

But here we are met by the passage in the 1st Epistle to the Cor. 11th chapter, where Paul teaches that "every man praying or prophesying having his head covered dishonoureth his head." This however, admitting that it has reference to the ordinary, head-dress of the man, does not come at all in collision with my position, as to the teaching of the Bible. It merely shows that both Apostles and Prophets were directed to show respect for persons and places *in the mode which the education and habits of the people whom they were instructing had taught them to understand and appreciate*. Customs which had any thing sinful in them, were sternly rebuked by the Bible writers, wherever found. But modes of showing mere respect or reverence, which had nothing either *moral* or *immoral* in them, were alluded to just in the form in which the education and habits of a people had prepared them to appreciate the instructions given. In *Asia*, where the people were accustomed from their infancy to see respect and reverence exhibited by keeping the head covered, and uncovering the *feet*, the Prophets used these habits as occasion offered for the inculcation of religious truth. In *Europe*, where all the habits and education of the people accustomed them from their infancy to see respect and reverence shown by uncovering the head, and keeping the shoes on, the Apostle, in imitation of the Prophets, uses this habit for the illustration of religious truth, and the inculcation of correct moral habits.

Thus the whole weight of the teaching of both Prophets and Apostles, so far as the Bible brings them to our notice, goes to show that we should not, in a matter of indifference in itself, attempt to drag the natives of this country away from habits and allusions with which they are familiar, and force them, across the path of nature, to learn European habits, which have in *their* lands just the contrary meaning from what they have in *Europe*.

But again, I feel satisfied that a fair examination, and an enlightened and consistent interpretation of the passage will show that Paul, in that passage, did not refer to the *ordinary* head-dress of the man at all, but to a covering of long hair, or

a veil, which gave him an effeminate appearance in a promiscuous assembly.

What is the drift of the Apostle's teaching in the passage, or the point which his mind was labouring to reach? Was it to establish as a universal principle that it is in itself, and in its own nature, a *sin* for any one of the male sex to appear before God, in worship, with any thing on his head? Was it not rather a point of *morals*, growing out of the habits of the people to whom he wrote, which he wished to guard?

From this passage, and many others in which he alludes to it, we see intimations that there were tendencies to a relaxed state of morals in the promiscuous assemblies, where *men* and *women* were accustomed to assume promiscuously the office of public teachers, and exhibit what they understood to be supernatural gifts. Paul saw that there were tendencies, on the part of their *women*, as they became familiar with that sort of public exhibition, to throw off their veils in public assemblies, to put off that modesty which is the ornament, and protection of their sex, and put on a masculine, bold, unfeminine aspect and manner. Here an injury was done to their modesty, and morals, and to the tone of morals in the church. Hence he lays it down as a principle, in his instructions to Timothy, that he did not "allow the *woman* to assume the office of public teacher," but enjoined her to "learn in silence." If any divine communication, or supernatural gift were, at any time, bestowed upon her, she was to make it known with all the modesty which belongs to her sex, and not imagine that she was at liberty to put off her veil, and her modesty, and put on the *man*, and set out in competition with the other sex in the office of public teaching. She was never to forget the different relative position which God had given her in society, and that her influence is to be exerted and exhibited in a different way from that of the other sex. Hers is to be a modest, veiled influence. And while she retains her modesty and her veil, and exerts her influence in the way which God has designed for her, she has her full measure of influence in society. But whenever she puts off these and attempts to assume an influence in the line of the male sex, she suffers by it, and public morals are also injured by the attempt.

God has placed *man* and *woman* in such a relationship to each other that "the man is the *head* of a woman." Then if she breaks over that relationship so far as to put off her modesty, and assume *his* position, she "dishonours her head"—she disgraces him, and injures herself. Then he follows it with a sort of "reductio ad absurdum," that if she put off the emblem and ornament of her sex, "let her be shorn and shaven," and be

the *man* outright—let her take the dress and appearance of the man, if she assume his position and duties. But if it be disgraceful for a woman to be shorn and shaven, like a man, let her retain the covering and dress of a woman. But the *head* of the *man* is *Christ*—the woman is not his head. The woman is his inferior in point of constituted relationship, and public office. Then if the man put on an *effeminate* aspect, or dress, and manner, in a public meeting, or place of public resort of the church, he *dishonours* his *head*—he disgraces his position and character *as a man*. He dishonours Christ, degrades himself, and does an injury to the female sex, and to the Church of God. Hence he says, “Every *man* praying or prophesying having his head covered, i. e. with long hair, or a veil—with a *womanish* covering—dishonoureth his head.” Not that it is *sinful* in itself for him to appear before God with any thing on his head, for that would reflect blame upon God for having caused the hair to grow long upon his head, and thus involving him, of necessity, in *sin* whenever he may happen to be left without the means of cutting his hair, a charge which is very unlike the ordinary teaching of Paul. But that any thing on the part either of the male or the female, which tends to obliterate the distinction in the dress and outward appearance of the male and female sexes, which God has taken pains to establish, and preserve with care, does an injury to public morals, and is therefore what the Old Testament calls “an abomination to the Lord.”

Putting this construction on the passage we can see clearly the drift of the Apostle’s argument, and understand the cause of his solicitude ; for we see that he had a delicate and most important point of morals to guard. And we maintain the tone of consistency in the teaching of the Old and New Testaments, on a point of admitted importance. The Old Testament taught that “The *woman* shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a *man* ; neither shall a *man* put on a *woman’s* garment : for all that do so are abomination unto the Lord thy God.” And the morals of the churches in gentile cities in the days of Paul clearly indicate that the same distinctions needed carefully to be kept up.

This distinction is referred to with emphasis in the 14th verse —“Doth not even nature itself teach you that if a *man* have long hair it is a shame unto him ?” (he does not say that if a man have a *hat* or a *pagri*—the dress of a *man* upon him, it is a shame unto him.) “But if a *woman* have long hair, (the costume of a woman) it is a glory to her ; for her hair is given to her for a covering.” Be it remembered that the Apostle does not once in the whole discussion make the slightest reference to hat or turban. He speaks of hair, a covering of long

hair, a veil, &c. the proper covering of a *woman*, but does not once name the hat or head dress of a man. If I am not mistaken Donnegan and other Lexicographers inform us that it was a habit partially prevalent at Athens for the young men of wealthy families to wear their hair long. Probably Paul saw tendencies at Corinth to fall into the same practice, and felt the necessity of checking it. Some are stumbled with the apparent force of the term "nature itself" in this passage, and think that it must have reference to some innate, deeply seated principle which lies far deeper than the influence of mere education, or conventional usage, and teaches that it is in itself a sin for a *man* to appear before God with any covering on his head. But if this be the right interpretation then has nature failed in every quarter of the world, and in every age to perform this necessary teaching, and lodge this salutary conviction in the human heart. For nature has not taught, apart from the influence of education, in any land, that it is wrong for a *woman* to cut off her hair, and that it is equally wrong for a *man* not to cut his off.

But nature, and common sense, and observation—and especially where these are enlightened by the word of God—have taught that it is important that a distinction be observed in the *outward* costume and appearance of the sexes, and that public morals suffer wherever it is not observed.

Let this distinction be lost sight of in any country, or any state of society, and let it become a common and a recognized thing for male and female to appear in public in the same outward costume, and see how soon it will begin to tell on the tone of public morals.

Look at the liberties which were taken in the church at Corinth, even after this Epistle was in their hands, where it was thought to be among the liberties which the gospel brings, that "a man should have his own *father's* wife," and see if it were any more strange than that, if a woman, somewhat in the habit of public speaking, should think it proper for her to lay off her veil and assume a little more of the appearance of a man, and if there were *men* too who thought it admissible for them to imitate in some respects the dress and habits of the woman?

Look at the state of society in Europe and America even now, where all the influence of the Bible, and all the aid of public opinion in the highest state of refinement to which the human mind has ever reached, cannot prevent females from traversing the country, holding public meetings, lecturing with a masculine tone and manner in promiscuous assemblies, and some of them publicly trying to prove that the institution of *Marriage* itself is but a bit of priestcraft, designed to deprive the sexes mutually of liberties which God has granted them:—

and look at the state of *Asia*, where *men* are found every where wearing their hair *long*, after the manner of *women*, and in their general dress and manner aping the dress and appearance of women, and see if there was any thing strange, or incongruous in the Apostle's guarding an infant church, just emerging from a state of heathenism, against tendencies of the same kind.

Again, to make the drift of the Apostle's teaching to have reference merely to the *ordinary head dress* of the male in this passage, introduces a wrong principle into Biblical interpretation, which turns the mind away from a delicate and deeply important point in morals, and throws it back for an ultimate reason upon an arbitrary and incomprehensible divine fiat, making it some way or other sinful in itself for a man to appear in the presence of God with any thing on his head, and without having learned the *European mode* of showing respect for persons and places, a principle which makes the Quaker who should go into the church and sit down with his hat on, as certainly guilty of a *heinous sin* as if he had defiled his neighbour's wife. Is this in keeping with the character and teaching of Paul?

The interpretation which I have been advocating for the passage, teaches that it may be possible for a Quaker, under the influence of an education which has gone in that direction from his infancy, to go into the church and participate in its exercises with his ordinary head-dress on, without positive sin on that account. But that if he should go into the church and stand up and officiate in a costume that leaves it doubtful whether it is *he* or his *wife*, i. e. whether it is a *male* or *female* who thus officiates in a promiscuous assembly, he then commits an offence against the purity of the morals of the church, and consequently a sin against God. And a sin too which the education and common sense of an ordinary Christian congregation would teach them to perceive and resist.

Now, if this interpretation be just—and I have some confidence that to most persons who are willing to give it a calm and candid investigation, and not make their first impressions be also their last, it will commend itself as a just and fair interpretation—then it leaves no one solitary reason, drawn from scripture, why we should insist on drawing away our native fellow Christians from an innocent habit of their country, and constrain them to adopt the conventional usages of Europe, to the scandal of their own countrymen, and at the expense of imposing additional burdens on them, and additional hindrances in the way of Christianity, where there are confessedly hindrances enough already.

I know I shall here be met by the assertion that native Christians have adopted this habit of their own accord, without

any teaching or urging on the part of Europeans, &c. This is in a sense true, and yet it is not a fair representation of the subject. Native Christians have in some places acquired the habit of uncovering their heads when they enter a place of worship without much of oral teaching in the matter, but it has been under the *impression* that Christians require it of them, just as Hindus and Muhammadans insist on their uncovering their feet when entering *their* places of worship. When they were first acquiring the habit of frequenting a place of Christian worship they observed every thing they saw with anxious closeness. They saw the devoutness of manner with which Europeans uncovered their heads, and without any oral instruction they inferred that this is a *part of Christianity*, and that it would forfeit the favor of Europeans, if they should not conform to the usage which they saw current when they first entered the house of God; and they have naturally continued the custom. And I suppose many of them have become so familiarized to it as scarcely to feel it a burden. But they are not all so. And I apprehend few of them would be so if they were frankly told by Europeans that *they* do not consider the *uncovering the head*, on the part of Asiatics, any more really a sign of respect for the house of God, or any more acceptable to God himself, than the uncovering the feet. They would then very generally, and very soon, show that they felt themselves relieved of a heavy burden, and also that they occupied a better position with their countrymen, when they could assure them with confidence, that Christianity does not insist on the abandonment of any custom in itself innocent, and which involves no allusion to any thing in itself sinful—and that it sits as easy, and suits as well with an Asiatic costume as with a European one.

A few there are who are puffed up with vanity in the thought that aping the manners of Europeans makes almost “*sáhib log*” of them. *They* would very probably feel disappointed in the removal of that which gives them the highest claim they possess to share in the manners and the honours of the “*sáhib log*.” But Christianity will never owe much of her honours to this class, whatever be the outward mode which they may adopt for showing respect in her sacred assemblies. Nor would it be dealing fairly with Christianity to take the wishes of such as the standard by which to form the manners of the Church in Asia.

I have little doubt that the inherent energy of Christianity and a general European influence have power enough to accomplish the change ultimately, if it be generally resolved upon, and persisted in with unanimity. But what is to be *gained* if it should succeed? After generations of toil and struggle,

and thousands of natives prevented from ever visiting a Christian assembly, who otherwise would have been frequently there, where is the gain? And what the necessity for toiling so long and working up the ocean into tempest “to waft a feather, or to drown a fly?” *Christianity* would not compliment us if all this could be done in a single generation, and without involving any evils. For she does not lay such emphasis on mere outward conventional modes and forms.

But I feel somewhat ashamed to have wasted so much of your time, and my own, in trying to establish a thing which the Apostle, after a very brief statement of the principle, refuses to waste time upon, and dismisses by saying that “If any man (after all) be contentious (and persist in breaking over the conventional rules of decency between the sexes) we have no such custom, neither the churches of God,”—leaving it to the common sense of the Christian people and their instinctive feeling of decency and propriety to correct the evil, while he went on to discuss others topics of deeper importance. I would gladly have followed the Apostle’s example also in this, but that I have fears that agitation in a wrong direction may make this subject, simple, and easy, and unimportant as it is in itself, to grow into one of confusion, and difficulty, amongst the native Christian communities in this country. I view the subject in itself as one of entire indifference as to which of the two modes be adopted, except so far as the adoption of one or the other tends to embarrass native Christians and to become a stumbling block in the way of other natives. I can cheerfully fall in with which ever may be finally settled upon, provided it be calmly and deliberately adopted, and carried out with consistency. But whatever be the ultimate turn which the question takes, it is of importance that European Christians take a calm, and enlightened, and liberal view of the subject, so that they may not incidentally throw unnecessary hindrances in the way of their native Christians.

W.

---

#### IV.—*The Sántál verb—a curiosity.*

To the Editors of the Calcutta Christian Observer.

GENTLEMEN,—For the gratification of the curious and edification of those who take an interest in comparing the various languages of the East, I send you for the *Observer* a specimen of a *Sántál verb*. That a rude and wholly unlettered tribe, like the Sántáls, should make use of a language so complicated, and yet so exact and precise, so very minute, and yet so perfectly regular

throughout all its multifarious forms and inflections, affords matter for just surprise. It is, in fact, anomalous. The *double conjugation*, for example, of all the active verbs, by which they are made to agree in number and person with both the agent and object, or in other words, the nominative and accusative cases, is, so far as the writer's knowledge extends, without a parallel. One hundred and eleven distinct forms, or inflections, in a single tense, and five hundred and three, in a single mood, may well startle the learner of a new language! Nor are these mere imaginary forms, every one is distinctly understood, and the greater part are in constant use. The DUAL, for instance, never fails of being used, whenever two persons are either speaking, spoken to, or spoken of. The writer has often been amused and delighted to remark the exactness and precision with which even small children use these various forms.

The pronouns, in a separate form, are seldom used, the sense being distinctly marked by the verb. For example, *Dále'-le-kánái*, he strikes us; can only agree with a nominative in the third person singular, and govern an accusative in the first person plural; and so throughout, each form of the verb marking distinctly the number and person of both its agent and object. The accompanying Paradigma will afford a pretty clear view of the subject, and it is hoped that those of your readers, who reside in the vicinity of the Sántáls, will be at the trouble of comparing this specimen with what they hear spoken around them, and let the result be known. Such a course would tend to facilitate the preparation of a Sántál grammar, which has now become a desideratum.

Before I close, I would not omit to mention, with devout gratitude, that our efforts for the enlightenment of this long despised, long neglected people, the SANTALS, have not been wholly in vain. Two promising youths, members of our school, together with three Hindu converts, were baptised, on a profession of their faith in Christ, the last Sabbath in August. Several others for a time appeared very encouraging; but the opposition raised on the baptism of these two, seemed to throw them back. A few lads have also left the school, for the same reason. Still, all have not forsaken us, and the good work will we trust continue to advance.

The new Missionary we were, last year, given to expect, has not as yet appeared amongst us. Our hopes, however, though deferred, will, we trust, ere long be realized.

I remain,  
Your's sincerely,

Jellasore, Orissa, Nov. 16, 1847.

J. PHILLIPS.

*Paradigma of the Sámtál verb in the Active Voice, Indicative Mood, in which the verb is varied to agree with both its nominative and accusative cases in number and person. The verb Dálle, to strike, may be thus declined, in the present Tense, namely :*

	Accusative Singular.			Accusative Dual.			Accusative Plural.			Singular.	Dual.	Plural.
	1.	2.	3.	1.	2.	3.	1.	2.	3.			
N. Sing.	1. Dálo'-kánáin, I strike myself,	Dále'-me-kánáin, " you,	Dále-kánáin, " him or her.	Dále'-liŋ-kánáin, I strike us two,	Dále'-ben-kánáin, " you two,	Dále'-kin-kánáin, " them (two.)	Dále'-le-kánáin, I strike us,	Dále'-pe-kánáin, " you,	Dále'-ko-kánáin, " them.	Dál-kánáin, I strike it,	Dál-kin-kánáin, " them (two.)	Dál-ko-kánáin, " them.
	2. Dál-liŋ-kánám, Thou strikest me,	Dálo'-kánám, " yourself,	Dále-kánám, " him.	Dále'-liŋ-kánám, Thou strikest us two,	Dále'-ben-kánám, " you two,	Dále'-kin-kánám, " them (two.)	Dále'-le-kánám, Thou strikest us,	Dále'-pe-kánám, " you,	Dále'-ko-kánám, " them.	Dál-kánám, Thou strikest it,	Dál-kin-kánám, " them (two.)	Dál-ko-kánám, " them.
	3. Dál-liŋ-kánái, He strikes me,	Dále'-me-kánái, " you,	Dále-kánái, " him.	Dále'-liŋ-kánái, He strikes us two,	Dále'-ben-kánái, " you two,	Dále'-kin-kánái, " them (two.)	Dále'-le-kánái, He strikes us,	Dále'-pe-kánái, " you,	Dále'-ko-kánái, " them.	Dál-kánái, He strikes it,	Dál-kin-kánái, " them (two.)	Dál-ko-kánái, " them.
N. Dual.	1. Dál-liŋ-kánálin, We two strike me,	Dále'-me-kánálin, " you,	Dále-kánálin, " him.	Dálo'-kánálin, We two strike ourselves (two),	Dále'-ben-kánálin, " you two,	Dále'-kin-kánálin, " them (two.)	Dále'-le-kánálin, We two strike us,	Dále'-pe-kánálin, " you,	Dále'-ko-kánálin, " them.	Dál-kánálin, We two strike it,	Dál-kin-kánálin, " them (two.)	Dál-ko-kánálin, " them.
	2. Dál-ni-kánáben, You two strike me,	Dále'-me-kánáben, " you,	Dále-kánáben, " him.	Dále'-liŋ-kánáben, You two strike us two,	Dálo'-kánáben, " yourselves two,	Dále'-kin-kánáben, " them (two.)	Dále'-le-kánáben, You two strike us,	Dále'-pe-kánáben, " you,	Dále'-ko-kánáben, " them.	Dál-kánáben, You two strike it,	Dál-kin-kánáben, " them (two.)	Dál-ko-kánáben, " them.
	3. Dál-liŋ-kánákin, They two strike me,	Dále'-me-kánákin, " you,	Dále-kánákin, " him.	Dále'-liŋ-kánákin, They two strike us two,	Dále'-ben-kánákin, " you two,	Dále'-kin-kánákin, " them (two.)	Dále'-le-kánákin, They two strike us,	Dále'-pe-kánákin, " you,	Dále'-ko-kánákin, " them.	Dál-kánákin, They two strike it,	Dál-kin-kánákin, " them (two.)	Dál-ko-kánákin, " them.
N. Plural.	1. Dál-liŋ-kánále, We strike myself,	De'-me-kánále, " you,	Dále-kánále, " him.	Dále'-liŋ-kánále, We strike us two,	Dále'-ben-kánále, " you two,	Dále'-kin-kánále, " them (two.)	Dálo'-kánále, We strike ourselves,	Dále'-pe-kánále, " you,	Dále'-ko-kánále, " them.	Dál-kánále, We strike it,	Dál-kin-kánále, " them (two.)	Dál-ko-kánále, " them.
	2. Dál-liŋ-kánápe, You strike me,	Dále-me-kánápe, " you,	Dále-kánápe, " him.	Dále'-liŋ-kánápe, You strike us two,	Dále'-ben-kánápe, " you two,	Dále'-kin-kánápe, " them (two.)	Dále'-le-kánápe, You strike us,	Dálo'-kánápe, " yourselves,	Dále'-ko-kánápe, " them.	Dál-kánápe, You strike it,	Dál-kin-kánápe, " them (two.)	Dál-ko-kánápe, " them.
	3. Dál-liŋ-kánáko, They strike me,	Dále-me-kánáko, " you,	Dále-kánáko, " him.	Dále'-liŋ-kánáko, They strike us two,	Dále'-ben-kánáko, " you two,	Dále'-kin-kánáko, " them (two.)	Dále'-le-kánáko, They strike us,	Dále'-pe-kánáko, " you,	Dále'-ko-kánáko, " them.	Dál-kánáko, They strike it,	Dál-kin-kánáko, " them (two.)	Dál-ko-kánáko, " them.

Here are, in the present Tense Indicative mood, 108 distinct forms of the verb, a few of which, however, are such as would seldom, if ever be used. There are three other forms which might be included though they more properly belong to a *middle voice*; as, Dálo'-kánái, He strikes himself, Dálo'-kánákin, They two strike themselves. Dálo'-kánáko, They strike themselves, giving a total of, at least, 111 distinct forms! In the accusative singular, the *kán* is often dropt, as Dále'-me-áin, I strike you, instead of Dále'-me-kánáin, the more regular form. It will be remarked that nearly all these inflections of the verb, so far as it regards number and person, are modifications of the different personal pronouns, which are as follow, viz, SINGULAR *I*, I; *ám*, thou; *nuni*, he or she. DUAL *álin*, we two; *áben*, you two; *hunkin*, they two. PLURAL *ále*, we; *ápe*, ye or you; *hunko*, they. The same agreement of the verb, with the accusative it governs, obtains throughout the remaining Tenses of this, as also of the other moods. The following examples of the four remaining Tenses of the Indicative mood are all in the third person *accusative singular*, thus :

	1.—THE IMPERFECT TENSE.	2.—THE PERFECT TENSE.	3.—THE PLUPERFECT TENSE.	4.—THE FUTURE TENSE.
N. Sing.	1. Dále-kedeáin, I struck him.	Dál-ákáde-áin, I have struck him.	Dál-lede-áin, I had struck him.	Dál-e-áin, I shall strike him.
	2. Dál-kede-ám, You struck him.	Dál-ákáde-ám, Thou hast struck him.	Dál-lede-ám, Thou hadst struck him.	Dál-e-ám, Thou shalt strike him.
	3. Dál-kede-ái, He struck him.	Dál-ákáde-ái, He has struck him.	Dál-lede-ái, He had struck him.	Dál-e-ái, He shall strike him.
N. Dual.	1. Dál-kede-álin, We two struck him.	Dál-ákáde-álin, We two have struck him.	Dál-lede-álin, We two had struck him.	Dál-e-álin, We two shall strike him.
	2. Dál-kede-ábeh, You two struck him.	Dál-ákáde-áben, You two have struck him.	Dál-lede-áben, You two had struck him.	Dál-e-áben, You two shall strike him.
	3. Dál-kede-ákin, They two struck him.	Dál-ákáde-ákin, They two have struck him.	Dál-lede-ákin, They two had struck him.	Dál-e-ákin, They two shall strike him.
N. Plural.	1. Dál-kede-ále, We struck him.	Dál-ákáde-ále, We have struck him.	Dál-lede-ále, We had struck him.	Dál-e-ále, We shall strike him.
	2. Dál-kede-ápe, You struck him.	Dál-ákáde-ápe, You have struck him.	Dál-lede-ápe, You had struck him.	Dál-e-ápe, You shall strike him.
	3. Dál-kede-áko, They struck him.	Dál-ákáde-áko, They have struck him.	Dál-lede-áko, They had struck him.	Dál-e-áko, They shall strike him.

V.—*The Hindu Memorial.*

It is impossible for us to say what the Honourable Court of Directors may reply to the document styled "*The Hindu Memorial*," which has appeared in some of the newspapers, during the past month; or whether they will reply to it at all. But this we can safely say that the document itself is one of the most extraordinary which any body of men, laying claim to be possessors of common sense, could well have prepared and forwarded to their political superiors. We have read it again and again, and are prepared to show that, throughout, it is full of misrepresentations and mis-statements of fact, which cannot be accounted for, otherwise than by supposing that those who have drawn it up, as well as those who have appended their names to it, are equally the victims of unfounded prejudice, and gross ignorance of historical fact. Great allowances ought to be made for our Hindu fellow-subjects, in such circumstances. We are fully prepared to give full scope to every palliation which a review of their position and the facts of the case can suggest; but when men resolve to go up to their acknowledged rulers for the purpose of memorializing them in regard to measures, which they affirm to be of such moment as to involve their "political equality with their fellow-subjects," we should expect them to come forward, with, at least, a fair statement of matters of fact, and fair and legitimate inferences from the statements and conduct of the party which they represent as *opposed* to their rights and privileges. We do not hesitate to state, advisedly, that in the document before us there are abundant evidences to bear us out in affirming, that the memorialists exhibit both a most culpable ignorance of real facts, and a tendency to misrepresent facts which they cannot but be acquainted with, such as can scarcely be accounted for after all the allowances which charity is willing to make for men whom we know to be the blind victims of superstition and prejudice.

The memorial has been characterized as "well written and temperately expressed." It has been stated that "their request is reasonable enough,"—that what "is asked is no more than what a just and enlightened government will do, unprompted and unsolicited." Now we are not either the partizans or opponents of the government: neither are we the advocates or the accusers of the Marquis of Tweeddale. We cannot well say what the orders of the Court of Directors, to which the memorial refers, are. Neither do we know whether or not the Honourable Court have issued a secret order "strictly prohibiting their servants throughout the country from discussing religious matters with the natives, or in any way attempting to convert them from the

creed of their fathers." We are not *now* either advocating the introduction of the Bible into Government schools and colleges, nor discussing the policy of the Court of Directors towards their Hindu subjects on the one hand, or towards their Civil and Military officers on the other hand. We however venture to say that if the Court of Directors promulgate any such order as that now alluded to, we trust it will be followed by every man, in their service, who values liberty of conscience, and reveres the sacred truths of the Bible, forwarding his resignation to headquarters immediately. But be that as it may: we are not now intending to enter upon these points; nor upon that other, involved in a careless assertion lately put forth in a daily paper, where allusion has been made to the rights of the Hindu "community, endangered by the proceedings of the Christian Missionaries." Although there is something like a challenge to discussion in such assertions, we do not at present grapple with them; we have now to deal with the memorial and with that only, and we allege that the causes of grievance referred to in it are without foundation, and that facts are, by it, misrepresented.

In the first paragraph, they speak of the proceedings of the Government of Madras as "indicative of a settled design to subvert the Hindu religion in order to substitute the Christian faith." This passage must have been penned not only by men ignorant of what Christianity is; but by those who have looked only at misrepresentations of the actual circumstances which occurred at the Madras presidency, shutting their eyes to statements on the other side which have again and again been laid before the public. We venture to affirm that nothing has occurred at Madras under the Marquis of Tweeddale's administration which can, without departure from truth and fairness, be characterized as "indicative of a settled design to subvert Hinduism in order to substitute the Christian Faith." Had there been the least manifestation of any such spirit, all true Christians would have been the very first to have denounced the proceedings as contrary to the doctrine and spirit of the Bible. Such a method is not, and never was, the method of disseminating the Christian faith, and to assert, nay more, even to suppose, that such an idea ever entered into the mind of the nobleman who is Governor of Madras, or into that of any member of his Council, is perfectly preposterous. The language is so ridiculously inappropriate, that we are almost tempted to suppose that the memorial is the production of some wag who wished to palm a hoax upon the credulity and the fears of the rājās and bābus who signed the Memorial. Such an intention on the part of the Noble Marquis, as that imputed in the Memorial, were morally impossible. We believe him to be a Christian man, and

desirous of walking according to the light of Scripture, so far as he has been enabled to see his duty ; but nothing could be farther removed from the conduct prescribed to the readers of the sacred page, than any attempts to promulgate Christianity either by force or by fraud. None but those who are utterly ignorant of the principles of the Christian religion could ever be induced to entertain such a proposition. But the plain fact is simply this, that we find no proceedings of the local government which can, with any degree of fairness, be represented as indicative either of violence or intolerance towards Hinduism. The charge is completely without foundation.

In the second paragraph there is a statement of the Memorialists' most grateful acknowledgments "to the Honourable Court," for the orders passed in consequence of the Marquis of Tweeddale's education minute, in which he approved of the Bible being used as a class-book in the Government schools and colleges of the Madras Presidency. We are not at present called upon to say whether or not the Court of Directors had sufficient grounds to pass the orders alluded to. We think the question might be discussed with propriety ; but we do not now enter upon it. The question to be considered at present is the following. Is the Memorial consistent with fact, and harmonious with itself? The broad principle announced by the Memorialists is avowed to be that "of perfect religious toleration, compatible only with non-interference on the part of Government with the religion of the people." But if a ruler invite all, who choose, to read and study what he believes to be the word of God, accompanying the invitation with the assurance that none shall be forced to do so, by the infliction, in any way, of pains or of penalties ;—and this is neither more nor less than the substance of the Marquis of Tweeddale's minute on education so much commented on ; wherein, we ask, is there any intolerance, any violation of conscience, or any interference with the religion of the people, either overtly or covertly, which each individual among them may not obviate or effectually check, if he but put forth the exercise of his own volition. We *do think* that to hinder any one, either young or old, from reading the Bible, when they themselves desire to do so, would be positive intolerance ; but, to permit those who desire and choose to read the Bible to have an opportunity of doing so, and to prevent their being forcibly hindered from either reading, or studying it, believing in it, or obeying its precepts, is most certainly toleration in its true sense. Did the much discussed minute propose any thing beyond the free exercise of a deliberative choice? Did it say that every one who entered a Government school or college should, as a standing rule, study the Scriptures with a view to becoming a Christian, and

that those who refused to do so should be punished accordingly? No Hindu will venture to affirm that such was its import. Had it been so, the charge of intolerance might have been raised. But the minute proposes no such rules. It trenches not on the religious freedom of any man, because it simply proposes that those pupils who choose may have it in their power to read the Bible. Under the present system this freedom is not permitted. Neither can a conscientious Christian teacher speak of the truths most dear and consolatory to his own soul, even though the pupils should wish to hear him. Nor can the pupils, even when desirous of knowing the facts and truths of Scripture, have an opportunity of studying the record which contains them. If a charge of intolerance must be made, let the candid and reflecting man decide, whether it can with justice be poured forth against a proposal which opens facilities for those who seek for information, regarding the most important truths which can be unfolded to the mind of man; or be laid at the door of a system where all is fettered by limitations and restrictions, and which, while laying the axe to the root of Hindu superstition, professes to observe a careful neutrality and non-interference.

We venture to affirm that it is utterly impossible for the Officers of Government to devise any system of education consistent with the present advanced state of knowledge, which can be designated a system of non-interference. Light must always interfere with the gloom of darkness, and if the torch of true religion be shaded, and obscured by the devices of man, so that its refulgent beams may not directly pierce the surrounding darkness, yet will the light of science and history, albeit they bring not perishing sinners to God, leave few votaries to the false deities of man's devising. It is one grand proof of the utter weakness of the abettors of the reigning superstition, that, when of late devising plans and systems for the overthrow of Christian Institutions, they could only fall back upon some way of communicating knowledge, less efficient than that which is carried out into daily practice, in these Christian seminaries. Non-interference there cannot be, the practice of our enemies bearing testimony. Truth must flow forth upon the nations. If obstructed in her legitimate channel, she will accumulate her energies, and burst all the barriers of man's devising, carrying conviction home to the minds of the most sceptical, and sweeping all the obstructions of superstition and narrow-minded prejudice into the abyss of oblivion.

The Memorialists assert "the constitutional right of every subject of the British Crown to follow whatever religion he may choose." We most cordially say, Amen. This is a grand principle. Would to God that the Hindu and Musalmán communi-

ties, and every section of the Christian Church would fairly, fully, and conscientiously act upon it. We can perceive nothing in the minute of the Governor of Madras that contravenes it. And when the Hindu Memorialists talk of "innovations, the tendency of which is to deprive them of their political equality with their fellow-subjects, except at the sacrifice of their faith," we must say that they appear to us to complain without the infliction of injury. They assume the undignified position of those who shout with alarm at the grotesque evolutions and imagined gigantic dimensions of their own shadows. Can it be possible that all this outcry about injured rights, and deprivation of political equality, is called forth by a proposal of a Christian nobleman, who gives his conscientious opinion on a great question, in words of the following import:—"It seems well that all the pupils at the schools and colleges supported by Government should have it in their power to peruse the word of God, if they choose to do so; but none of the benefits, otherwise accruing from our Seminaries shall be withheld even from those who may refuse to avail themselves of the opportunity to read the Bible." This, we take it, is the substance of the minute; and, however objectionable the minute may appear to many, on various grounds, assuredly the charge of intolerance, deprivation of right, endangering of privilege cannot lie against a proposal, which not only was never carried into operation, but which, even although carried into operation, would have left every one to follow his own choice and the dictates of his own conscience.

But what shall be said of the fifth paragraph, wherein it is coolly asserted that "the popularity and stability" of the British rule in this country has been owing to "its having been always conducted in faithful accordance with those principles of equal toleration which the Memorialists assert." And yet the great object of the Memorial is to denounce the Marquis of Tweeddale's minute, on the introduction of the Bible into schools supported by Government. Let the Memorialists search and see what the practice of Government has been, ere they speak so confidently. We do not dispute the title of Government to the thanks of its subjects for the spirit of toleration which it has exhibited. If the Government has even erred in this respect, the charge might be raised, on the ground of intolerance toward the teachers and preachers of the gospel, who, until lately, were under the necessity of seeking for asylums in the foreign settlements not under British rule. But we do not now enter upon this question. We however, assert that, if the Government deserve the praise of its Hindu subjects for equal toleration, then the introduction of the Bible into schools and colleges, without making it imperative upon every pupil, or upon any pupil, to

read and study it, is not a violation of toleration ; because it is notorious that the Government of this country have acted, in several instances, upon the principle of supporting schools for the education of natives, where the Bible was regularly used as a class-book. We could adduce proof of this very easily ; but we need only allude, at present, to the statement made by one of the Honourable Company's chaplains, in the Town Hall, at a recent meeting of the Church Missionary Society. He said, in substance, that, although at the present time much noise was made about the introduction of the scriptures into public schools, he had for some time superintended a school where the Scriptures were read every day, and meanwhile drew his salary from Government. So that, clearly, the Government are either not tolerant, or the encouraging of Bible reading in schools supported by them is no infringement of toleration.

As to the asseveration, not verbally made, but plainly implied, that the Governor of Madras, in the capacity of a representative of the British crown, has "violated a solemn pledge," were it not that the charge is made by men whose own statements leave no doubt that they have been carried away by mere prejudice, and have taken no care to make themselves familiar with the real state of the matter referred to, we should be inclined to characterize it in strong language. As the case is, we simply ask the Memorialists, when the solemn pledge alluded to was made? who made it? and what is it? Then will we be fully prepared to discuss the question whether or not it has been violated by the Nobleman now Governor of Madras.

The Memorialists have not, we feel confident, when drawing up their document, consulted that portion of their countrymen now very frequently designated "Young Bengal." That section of the community, somewhat buoyant in intelligence, and vapoury in forwardness, would never have permitted such a historical solecism as the assertion "that the intolerance of the Musalmán princes of India was the main cause of their overthrow, and every where induced the Hindus to lend willing assistance to the British forces." But not only is this assertion made, but the Honourable Court are told that they "must be aware" of it. We hope the present Directors, of the Honourable the East India Company of merchants, are not ignorant of the history of that celebrated company of sovereign merchants whose affairs they conduct. How will they be refreshed by the information that Clive's force *was powerfully assisted by the aid of Bengálí bábus* ; whose energies were aroused into activity by the intolerance of the Nawab Seraj-ud-Dowlah, until they were ready to do battle for a new species of invaders ! How will the Hon'ble Court be delighted to learn, on the authority of certain

rájás, merchants, bankers and baniyás of Bengal, that all that has ever been written about the Mahratta wars, about Scindia, Holkar, the Peishwa, and the worthies of Rájputána, is a pure fiction, got up, perhaps, by some ambitious and unscrupulous British Generals, who had the audacity to characterize certain flying skirmishes, with scattered bodies of Mogul guerillas as grand victories over Hindu Princes! Verily at this rate a new Mill's History of British India must be got up; or correct annals must be formed from the hitherto unknown documents and unexplored records found in the archives of Burdwan, Nuddiya, or Shabha Bazar;—the Great Duke must be taken to task, in the evening of his glory, regarding the despatches announcing the battle of Assaye;—and we must institute a strict inquiry into the Marquis of Hastings' administration and the generally received account of his achievements. Even Mahárájpur and Punniár must come into question: and we must ask ourselves how it happens that Puna, Ajmere, Nagpore, Bhurtpore, and Gwalior itself are occupied by British troops!

But in conclusion, we ask, seriously, are the Hindu rájás and bábus of Bengal prepared to carry out into practice the grand principle asserted by them at the beginning of the fourth paragraph of their memorial. Fine words are often mere empty sounds. We want consistent practice on the broad principles of real toleration. Are the Memorialists ready to unite with us in carrying out this principle which they boldly and unblushingly assert? If so, they have turned to a new page in their history, and the difficulties against which many a true inquirer is now struggling will be removed. It is our honest belief that the fear of persecution, in one form or another, is now preventing many from candidly entertaining the question, whether the Christian Religion be not of God? and we know for certain that some who are not only almost, but altogether persuaded to be Christians, are held back by the pressure of surrounding circumstances, and the fear of impending difficulties. Perhaps the existence of such difficulties is intended for some great end under the overruling power of an all-seeing Providence. We have no doubt that such is the case. But although we may, even now, say "it must needs be that offences come;" yet when we remember that nothing can escape the penetration, the justice and the power, of Him who shall preside at the great day of final reckoning, we cannot but add:—"Woe to that man by whom the offence cometh." We therefore call upon every man, whose signature is appended to this Memorial, to carry into effect the principle which in the eyes of the public, and in the presence of their acknowledged Rulers, they have avowed. "To him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin." And

may we not also say that they who affirm a grand principle of action and fail to act upon it, are laying themselves open, not only to the charge of inconsistency, but of hypocrisy. Let not this be the result of this public avowal, on the part of those who assume to themselves the office of being leaders of the Hindu community of Bengal.

An overstatement of grievances injures even a good cause.

An avowal of principles, not acted upon, must bring the parties involved into deserved contempt.




---

### Missionary and Religious Intelligence.

---

#### 1.—MISSIONARY AND ECCLESIASTICAL MOVEMENTS.

**DEPARTURES OF MISSIONARIES.**—We regret to announce the departure of several brethren from the Upper Provinces. The Rev. W. Smith of Sagra, Benares, returns to England: Mrs. Scott of Futteghur, the Rev. J. Rankin of Agra, and the Rev. W. Porter of Ludiana, brethren belonging to the American Missions, are returning to their native country.

We are happy to announce the arrival of the Rev. W. Wilkinson, junior, in the *Queen*. Mr. Wilkinson is the son of the Rev. W. Wilkinson of Simla, and like his respected father, is in connection with the Church Missionary Society.

#### 2.—THE CALCUTTA BIBLE ASSOCIATION.

The Annual Meeting of this Association was held at the Town Hall on Friday, Nov. the 26th. Dr. Duff took the chair; after prayer the chairman followed with an address respecting the origin and the object of the Bible Association. Twenty-five years ago, it occurred to some good and virtuous men, lay as well as clerical, that it was not enough that we should have a *producing* but also a *distributing* Society, which should give out what the parent institution brought forth. Hence the origin of this Society, which received the designation of the Calcutta Bible *Association*, to mark it as distinct from the Calcutta Bible *Society*, the business of the two being different, though their object, in reference to the dissemination of the word of God, was one.

The Rev. T. Sandys next read the report, which being intended for publication by the Association itself, need not be noticed here further than that it showed that there have been 3669 Bibles distributed by the Association during the current year; and that the funds collected within the same space aggregate 1520 Rupees. The expenses from this and the balance that resulted last year, have left a surplus of 720 Rupees.

Mr. Wylie moved the adoption of the Report.

“That the Report now read, be adopted; and that it be printed and circulated among the friends of the Association for their information, and for their encouragement in the dissemination of the Word of God.” This was seconded by Mr. Archibald Grant, and carried unanimously.

The Rev. Mr. Cuthbert proposed the second Resolution, as follows: “That while, at all times, it is the incumbent duty of Christians to do what in them lies, towards the intelligent and wisely regulated dissemination of the Word of God among the spiritually ignorant, a specially urgent call to the discharge of this duty in this city and neighbourhood arises from the wide spread diffusion of antichristian principles and the open outbreak of violent hostility to the Bible and its sacred verities.” The Rev. Mr. Ewart seconded it.

The Rev. Mr. Wenger then read the third Resolution :—“That deeply impressed with a sense of the utter impotency of all mere human efforts for the conversion of sinners or the edification of saints, this meeting humbly recognizes the duty of earnestly imploring the Great God for the *effusion of the Spirit* of all Grace to render its efforts against unbelief in all its forms effectual, and to ensure the growth of personal holiness among the friends of the Bible cause.”

Mr. Wenger, speaking of the inefficacy of human efforts in such an undertaking, without the divine assistance, referred, like the preceding speakers, to infidelity among young Bengal, and then went on to state that there was infidelity also among the “English population that had taken root in Calcutta.” The only remedy he saw for this was the dissemination of the word of God. In commenting upon the authenticity of the Bible he gave the following narrative. Some time in the last century, Frederick the Great entertained a numerous party of friends at a dinner, and the subject turned upon the Bible, which all, except one who showed displeasure in his looks but remained silent, scoffed at, and ridiculed, as apocryphal. Frederick perceived the looks and silence of the man that was offended, and called upon him to prove, with all possible brevity, the authority of the work which the others were deriding. The reply was suited to the command, in all respects :—“Your majesty,” said the party called upon—“Your majesty, **THE JEWS.**” This was a convincing answer ; for the Jews are a living witness to the truth of the Bible, and in their present circumstances and past history have fulfilled some of its most striking prophecies.

The Rev. Mr. Keane then addressed the meeting. Dr. Duff said it would be indecorous to submit the motion for the opinion of the meeting ; because it embodied a doctrine of faith ; and, therefore, requested that all should yield assent to it in humbleness of heart.

The Rev. Mr. Sutton proposed “that the following friends of the Association be appointed a Committee for the management of its affairs during the ensuing year. *Committee.*—Rev. C. C. Aratoon, Rev. D. Ewart, Messrs. H. Andrews, M. D’Rozario, E. Edmond, C. Kerr, B. Lazarus, J. Muller, Rev. J. Parker, Rev. T. Smith. *Messrs.* R. J. Rose, J. A. Schorn, J. W. Smith, J. Stanley Bolst, J. Waller. *Secretaries.*—Rev. T. Sandys ; C. N. Cooke, *Cash and Minute Secretary.*”

The Rev. Mr. Pearce seconded the motion ; and in doing so simply recommended that, in pursuance of the constitution of this Association, the members of the Committee, although laymen, should assist their clerical brethren in the distribution of the Bible, which, he saw from the Report, had not been the case during the past year.

Dr. Duff, in putting the resolution reverting to what had fallen from Mr. Wenger in reference to infidelity among the “English population that had taken root in Calcutta,” spoke strongly of the Sabbath-breakers, who went, some on river excursions, and others boar-hunting and pig-sticking on the day set apart by God for his worship. They were a scandal to the natives, “lovers of cruel, inhuman sport,” “robbers of God’s privileges,” “violators of their great Benefactor’s laws.” He had heard an untutored native in the parts which Englishmen invade for their sport, say that if he could but dare provoke the wrath of the *Sahibs*, he would go forward and tell them that they could not be acting in conformity with the scriptures they professed to regard as their guide. A pilferer of his neighbour, a violator of truth, a receiver of bribes, would not be admitted to the intercourse of men, according to the rules of civil life, unless he had repented and made restitution ; and yet, forsooth, we must deal with the breakers of God’s own laws in private, and in whispers, not speak out our feelings in public. What was this, but a miserable connivance with their misdeeds, a flagrant compromise of our religious sentiments. There should be no such delicacy,—no such tempor-

zing. As Christians, as beings doomed for immortal happiness, which would be forfeited by participation in guilt in this mode, we should firmly refuse to hold intercourse with the profaners of God's ordinances, until, like outcasts in civil life, they amend their conduct, and follow the faith prescribed to them by the rules upon which their creeds had been established.

---

### 3.—CHURCH MISSION AT MEERUT.

Extract of a letter from the Rev. M. Lamb :—

"I have written to you before about my munshi, that I had great hopes of his becoming a Christian some day. For some time back he has given up all Hindu practices, and attended our Hindustáni services, and I have had frequently very important conversations with him upon many passages of Scripture, and about Christianity. About six weeks ago he voluntarily confessed to me, that he believed in Jesus Christ and loved him, and was quite certain that no one would go to heaven except he believed in him. Since this he has had great conflict in his mind about baptism, knowing that it was necessary, but could not get over the difficulties connected with it. However, as we were to have three other baptisms on Wednesday, on that day he said he wished to be baptized. He had felt very unhappy for two or three weeks, but since he has been baptized, he says he never felt so happy before."—*Cal. Christian Intelligence*.

---

### 4.—MIRZAPORE MISSION CLOCK.

Last year the Rev. R. C. Mather on his return to India brought out a large English Clock for the steeple of his church at Mirzapore. This Clock has just been fixed up. It has two dials, the one facing the east, the other the west. Each dial is four feet in circumference. One of them is glass, fixed to a frame of iron made in England, and at night by means of a strong light placed behind, the time is observable as clearly as in the day. The striking apparatus of this Clock was made at Mirzapore, as well as a second dial. A Bell weighing four maunds has just been ordered from England; it is expected that its sound may be heard at two miles distance. The Clock has now been going well for three months. The native Clock maker through whom it was put up and who added the striking apparatus, is able to make others should any one favour him with an order.—*Khair Khwah i Hind*.

---

### 5.—BAPTISM AT THE SCOTCH KIRK.

It is our joy to record an interesting service, which took place in St. Andrew's Church, on Wednesday evening. A Musalmán youth, named Ely Bux, about 25 years of age, then publicly abjured the faith of his ancestors, and was received into the Church of Christ by baptism.

The following brief statement of facts, connected with his religious history, strikingly shows the power and the sovereignty of Divine Grace. About 4 years ago he heard a Missionary preach, by the roadside, in Calcutta: and, though he then learned little, yet there he acquired his first knowledge, and his first impressions of the truth as it is in Jesus. He was arrested, and awakened to inquiry. A native Catechist, of the Baptist denomination, finding him in this state, gave him a copy of the Hindustáni Bible. The donor has since gone to his rest above, but his gift continued to be the young Muhammadan's only counsellor and teacher for 3 years following. Unacquainted with any Missionary, it was not till 7 or 8 months ago, that he obtained

any human instruction. And this he has derived from Bipra Charan Chakrabartí, a Catechist of the Church of Scotland's Mission, in Cornwallis Square, to whom he made himself known. During the last 2 months, he has been under a course of preparation for baptism, by the Rev. Dr. Charles, who, both in private and when the lad came to make public profession of his faith, employed the Catechist as interpreter. After renouncing the Qurán, and all his former superstition, and declaring his firm adherence to the Revelation of the Gospel, Ely Bux was baptized in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, in presence of a very large congregation of natives and Europeans.—*C. C. Advocate.*

---

#### 6.—BAPTISMS AT JELLASORE.—FROM THE REV. J. PHILLIPS.

Last sabbath I had the privilege of baptising five happy converts, three of the number had for several years been nominal Christians. We trust they are now such in reality. The remaining two are Santál youths belonging to our school. They only broke caste about a fortnight previous to their baptism. Several of the other Santál lads have appeared deeply interested, as well as a number of the villagers, but have not as yet obtained strength to forsake *all* for Christ. The opposition raised among the Santáls by the conversion of these two youths, serves at present to deter others, a number of whom we had thought not far from the kingdom of Heaven. It is now evident that a Santál, equally with a Hindu, must be counted an *outcaste* among his own people, whenever he renounces his former superstitious and embraces the faith of Christ.

We have two or three other candidates who will, probably, soon be admitted to the church. Quite a number of our heathen neighbours frankly, and in some instances feelingly, confess their full conviction of the truth of Christianity, and their desire to embrace it, while the *fear of man* prevents them from coming to an open rupture with all their former connexions.—*Oriental Baptist for Nov.*

---

#### 7.—MADRAS:—BAPTISM OF FIVE HINDU GIRLS.

In the Hall of the Free Church Institution, on the evening of October the 20th—baptism was administered by the Rev. J. Anderson to the five Hindu girls who were received into the Institution for residence in April last; and one of whom, *Muniatha*, was then taken by *Habeas Corpus* before the Supreme Court. Several ladies and gentlemen were present, besides the usual congregation on Wednesday evenings. It must have been truly gratifying to the friends of female education among the Natives to see so many caste girls, not only to some extent educated, but also apparently converted. We think our brethren have reason to be encouraged in their attempts to bring the young females of Madras and its vicinity, as well as those of the other sex, under Christian instruction. They are not alone in their labours, nor even in their success. At the close of his address on the occasion, Mr. Anderson, according to the report in the *Native Herald*, said, "Beloved friends, these are the *first fruits* from among the Native females of *caste* in this part of India." This is certainly an oversight. It should have been the first fruits from the schools in connexion with the Scotch Free Church. Our Scottish brethren have themselves previously baptized at least one caste female.

If by "this part of India" is meant Southern India, as generally is usual in this form of speech, *hundreds* of caste females have even within a few years been baptized; but if Madras only be intended, some at least have of late been received into the Christian Church, and scores since Christian Missions

were first commenced. This does not make the present accession less a matter of thanksgiving, but it would be a wrong impression for the public abroad to receive, that conversions in this part of India have not hitherto reached the caste females. We have the happiness of recording in our present number the baptism of a *bráhmání* at Salem, who renounced caste; and though many of the native females in the church of Southern India endeavour to uphold this branch of Hinduism, it is not now allowed, we believe, in any communion. Even at Madras there are some females of high caste families who have, like the Hindu girls over whom we would heartily rejoice, renounced caste as well as received baptism. The Lord increase them a thousand-fold.—*Madras Christian Instructor*.

---

#### 8.—DIVISION AMONG THE BRAHMANNS—THE BOY RAGAVOOLOO.

As might have been easily anticipated, the case of the boy Ragavooloo—he who, after reception and baptism at the Free Church Mission, fell back to the creed of his fathers—has excited commotion among the bráhmans, and caused a division among them. While one party—whether from interested motives or not, we are not prepared to say—are for receiving him into caste again, another resolutely oppose the measure on the ground of impracticability according to the *shástras*; but be this as it may, the case of Ragavooloo, and that of his parents and connexions and those in their association, is likely to go hard with them: they stand in jeopardy of being turned out of caste altogether, and brought to a level with the lowest of the Indian tribes. As an instance of the stir the conversion and apostacy of Ragavooloo has excited among the bráhmans, we give the following: it occurred at the Town Police Office on the morning of Saturday last, Major Clerk and M. Somasoodarum Moodeliar on the Bench. The Court was literally choked with a large number of bareheaded bráhmans, amounting to about fifty or sixty in the total: they were made to appear as defendants. The prosecutor in the case was a bráhman named Somanatha—father to the boy Ragavooloo; but as Somanatha's charge lay principally against one Kistniah and another, both bráhmans, the others were directed to remain without and Somanatha required to state his case. He said that he expended about two thousand rupees in his endeavours to recover his son from the premises of the Rev. Mr. Anderson, and that after he had succeeded in his attempts, and the boy was brought home, himself and others, his bráhmans sat and ate together with his son. Some days ago, one of his bráhmans, Venkiah by name, went to a well in a certain garden for the purpose of drawing water therefrom, but was prevented by the second defendant, who came up to, and struck him. This was not all, for the other bráhmans who appeared as defendants—all of them—were in the constant habit of annoying and disturbing the bráhmans of his party saying, that they had eaten with a *Christian*! He complained of the assault to Kistniah, the first defendant, who was headman of the caste, with a view to redress, but without any effect. Kistniah, in answer, denied his title to headmanship, and was proceeding to state that it was the duty of three or four to inquire into such matters as that complained of, when he was interrupted by Major Clerk, who said that he could not interfere in the affair, and added, that if the complainant required any assistance, it was optional with him to apply, or not, to the Chief Magistrate. The bráhmans left the Court.—*Madras Athenæum*, Nov. 2.

---

#### 9.—BOMBAY:—BRAHMANICAL STRICTNESS.

The Bombay *Prabhákar* reports that twenty-five or thirty bráhmans attended a Lecture on the Hindu Puráns called the *Bhágawata*, set on foot by

a Musalmán. Their brethren of the caste demanded not only an explanation, but an expiation; which they at first refused to give, alleging that the Lecture was first established by a Hindu of Gujarat. Afterwards, however, they were obliged to yield to the will of the "terrestrial gods," and swallow the horrific pill. This is another instance of ancient bráhmancial authority overpowering the *liberalism* of the rising race of bráhmans. It cannot, however, do so long.—*O. C. Spectator.*

---

#### 10.—ALLEGED CONVERSION OF THE RAJAH OF TRAVANCORE TO CHRISTIANITY.

A report was, some time ago, disseminated by the *Colombo Observer*,—that the rájá of Travancore had professed Christianity. The report is incorrect. With all his liberal sentiment, the rájá is far from being either martyr or confessor. The report, it is thought, originated with his own bráhmans, who would thus try to frighten him out of any approach to correct views on the subject of religion.—*Ibid.*

---

#### 11.—CEYLON:—THE TOOTH OF BUDDHA.

We hear that the "Tooth" which once either ornamented the "fauces" of Buddha or the jaws of some Erymanthean boar of Ceylon, and which to the disgrace of a Christian and enlightened nation has been retained by "watch and ward" (of England's troops under that "bugbear" called, "The Kandian Convention") was on Tuesday last handed over very quietly to the custody of the proper owners of so *precious* and *truthful* a relic. The connection of the Government of the Island with this absurd object of the senseless adoration of a barbarous race, must have been an object of contempt and obloquy in the eyes of all civilized Europe for the past generation, and we cannot but congratulate the local Government that they have at last been enabled to withdraw from all connection with the object of the most degrading superstition that ever disgraced any of the great and diversified family of man.—*Times, October 5.*

---

#### 12.—SINGAPORE.

The following account of Missionary operations in Singapore, is extracted from a communication of a Christian friend who lately visited the Island.

Rev. B. P. Keasberry, of the London Missionary Society, has been a long time at Singapore, and is labouring among the Malays, in whose language he is in every way qualified, and is no doubt doing much good amongst them. "The Kingdom of heaven cometh not by observation." He is the only Missionary in the whole Island, and has, beside a chapel where he preaches on the Sunday and Friday evenings, a Boarding School consisting of Malay boys placed under his sole management for a certain number of years, whom he clothes, feeds, and boards. He has about 28 boys under his care, two of them the sons of a neighbouring rájá, and the progress the boys have made is very creditable. The care taken to instill into them the sweet doctrine of love to God for Christ's sake, and instruct them in the scriptures as the *basis of their knowledge*, must develope fruit in due time. Family worship with the whole school is conducted every morning, when the elder boys read in Malay a portion of scripture and Mr. Keasberry explains it. They sing delightfully. The Society affords nothing towards its support, and it is kept up by local subscriptions. Mr. Keasberry represented the Malays to me as a very indolent race, having no desire to cultivate land, most difficult to rouse from their lethargic state, and content to obtain a livelihood by fishing. Desirous to be instrumental in waking them out of their long slumber, he is endeavouring

gradually, to create in them a taste for agriculture or some useful trade, and for that purpose he has a piece of land, a Printing Establishment, a Lithographic Press, and Book-Binding Establishment, all in active operation, under his sole daily superintendence, without any assistant. A number of his boys, as they grow up, follow out his advice by assisting in Printing or Lithographing, whichever they fancy. I believe the whole of his business in the three departments of work, is conducted by his pupils, with the exception of one of the Book-binders and two men in the Printing office. To show how much they love Mr. Keasberry, these boys could at any time obtain employment with the merchants for high salaries, but they remain with him and feel quite contented with a small salary, plainly showing that they have a knowledge of discerning between serving worldly persons and christians; and will not the Lord, by His marvellous grace, help all that are endeavouring, however faint their conceptions may be, to walk in the fear of God, and bring them in due time to feel their miserable state and accept of the finished work of Christ? It is the day of small things with Mr. Keasberry, but he can rejoice in having fruit from his labours, the church numbering altogether about 25 or 30 members, and some of his hearers are in a very hopeful state. I think it was Burder's saying, "The Lord commanded His servants to *be faithful*, not to be *successful*;" and laying hold of His promises, that strengthens hope, and wrestling with Him in prayer, a blessing must be the result. Mr. Keasberry very much needs a person qualified to instruct youth, and who would take the entire management of his school, a person possessing the love of God and the interest of Christ at heart, that would work with singleness of eye, "diligent in business, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord." The Society with which he is connected is willing to afford a liberal salary to such a person, if he can be found *on the spot*. Mr. Keasberry must feel the weight of so many duties very much, but as he mourns over the neglected state of so many villages and towns around the Island, and is very anxious to proclaim to them the "unsearchable riches of Christ," and which he now cannot do, unless to the neglect of his hopeful school, I hope some one may be raised by the Lord to help him. Mr. Keasberry used to have a Wednesday evening English service at the Mission Chapel, but as the Chaplain had chosen the same evening, for the same purpose, and in so small a community, Mr. Keasberry closed his. When I was in Singapore the Chaplain had also discontinued the meeting, and as a remnant of God's people is on the Island, and they feel the need of it, Mr. Keasberry has again commenced it. I must not forget to mention that Mr. Keasberry has a "helper" in his lovely pilgrimage, in Mrs. Keasberry, who is always employed in teaching the boys to knit and work in worsted during their *play hours*. This is voluntary work, and it was pleasing to see a number of the boys engaged in learning what may, some future day, be turned to advantage. This shows that they feel grateful for the love shown them in instructing them and taking care of them; and who would not devote their time to useful purposes when such ample reward as appreciating your motives and acknowledging them is bestowed; but when doing good in the hope of gaining a smile from our Father in heaven, oh what joy to work from love to Christ for what He has done for us! There is a school on the Island for female children supported by the "Society for Promoting Female Education in the East" and conducted by Miss Grant.—*Oriental Baptist*.

### 13.—CONVERSION OF A MUSALMAN AT AHMEDNUGGUR.

On the 15th of August, a young man named Daood, a Musalman, was received into the American Mission Church at Ahmednuggur, on the profession of his faith in Christ. He is a very intelligent young man, and has a good knowledge of English, having been employed as teacher in the Boys' Seminary at Ahmednuggur, with some interruptions, for three or four years

past. On the occasion of his baptism quite a number of Musalmáns were present and heard him declare his belief in the crucified Jesus as the only Saviour, and his determination to walk according to the precepts of the Christian religion. On his becoming a Christian he was forsaken by his widowed mother and his young wife, and by all his friends. Every exertion was made to induce him to forsake Christianity, or at least to return to his own people and conceal the fact that he was a Christian; but against all these attempts he was enabled to maintain a firm stand, and to say whatever be the consequence, he could not deny the Saviour or conceal his attachment to him. He has had frequent discussions with the Musalmáns of Ahmednuggur since his conversion, on the subject of Christianity, and it is believed that many have thus been led to hear the glorious truths of the Gospel, who before held themselves aloof from all intercourse with Christians. May those who have long loved darkness, now at length be made willing to receive the light and to believe in Him who is the light of the world.—*Dnyanodaya*.

#### 14.—MURDER OF THE REV. MR. LOWRIE.

The Rev. Walter M. Lowrie, who was a Missionary at Ningpo, had been appointed to meet with others, at Shanghai, to revise the translation of the New Testament into Chinese. He journeyed from Ningpo to Shanghai the latter part of May.

It being necessary for Mr. Lowrie to return temporarily to Ningpo, and as no other opportunity of going presented itself, he decided to return by the route he came. He left Shanghai on Monday, the 16th of August, by the canal for Cha-poo, being accompanied by his servant and another man, natives of Ningpo. He arrived on Tuesday morning the 18th, at Cha-poo, and immediately engaged one of the Chin-hae passage boats to convey him to that place. There being a very strong southerly wind, the vessel did not set sail until Thursday morning at 9 o'clock. When the boat had proceeded some eight or ten miles, they perceived a piratical craft bearing down upon them. As it approached Mr. Lowrie took a small American flag in his hand, and went on the bow of the boat. The pirates soon clearly manifested their intentions by firing upon the boat, and when alongside boarding it. There appears to have been some twenty or more men, armed with jingals, matchlocks, spears, and swords. The boatmen and native passengers being all very much terrified, concealed themselves as much as they could, while Mr. Lowrie sat down in the cabin watching the work of destruction, and gave them the keys of his trunk and boxes.

When the pirates began to tear up the floor to rummage the hold, Mr. Lowrie went on deck, and seated himself in front of the mainmast. As they had nearly finished the work of pillaging the boat, it appeared to occur to them that Mr. Lowrie would report them to the authorities on his arrival at Chin-hae; and the question was started, whether to kill him at once, or throw him overboard. This last being resolved upon, two of the ruffians attempted to execute the fell purpose; but not being able to accomplish it, a third joined in the murderous work, and they succeeded in throwing him into the sea. As the waves ran high, though he was seen two or three times, he soon sank to rise no more.

The Pirates proceeded to disable the boat by cutting its sails—taking away the rudder, &c., and then departed leaving it to the mercy of the winds and waves. As soon as the crew had recovered from their fright, they tried to fit up the boat to return to Cha-poo. Not being able to steer the vessel, they ran her on a low shore. Mr. Lowrie's servants reached Cha-poo in the evening, and immediately laid a statement of the affair before the Chinese authorities. Their depositions to these particulars were taken down, and the officers said they would take measures immediately to apprehend the guilty

perpetrators. The officers wished to detain the servants till these steps should be taken—but they said, they must hasten to convey the sad intelligence to Mr. Lowrie's colleagues at Ningpo. Being supplied with some scanty clothing and a little money, they started on Friday morning the 20th by land for Ningpo, where they arrived on Monday the 23rd.

On their arrival there, with this deeply afflictive intelligence, the matter was immediately laid before the Taou-tae, who promised to take instant measures for the apprehension of the murderers. Mr. Sullivan, H. B. M. Consul at Ningpo, proffered every aid his official station enabled him to render, and steps were taken to recover the remains if possible. In addition to the measures thus taken by the local authorities, the matter is now being laid before Keying by the American Charge d'Affaires; and it is to be hoped that those guilty of so unprovoked and wanton a murder will be brought to condign punishment.

The deceased was in no ordinary measure endeared to his fellow-men. He was a man of eminent talents and an accomplished scholar, an able minister of the Gospel and a faithful and devoted Missionary.—*China Mail*, September 16.

#### 15.—AN ENQUIRER AFTER TRUTH.

*To the Editor of the Hindu Intelligencer.*

DEAR SIR,—That man is a "poor pensioner on the bounties of an hour"—a mere pilgrim in this "vale of tears"—that therefore it is the greatest folly, nay, madness, to allow its perishable objects to engross his thoughts and affections, is a truth, which, I believe, no one is prepared to dispute. It is an equally indisputable truth, that man is an heir—an expectant of eternity, destined to be the inhabitant of a land which knows no change, that therefore it is the part of prudence and wisdom to direct his desires and aspirations heaven-ward. Theoretically, perhaps, no truths are more readily admitted; practically no truths are more strangely denied. *Mortals* live as if they were *immortals*, and look upon this *passing world* as if it were a "*continuing city*." "Their inward thought is, that their houses shall continue for ever, and their dwelling places to all generations; they call their lands after their own names." He therefore is truly wise, and estimates things according to their proper value, who, knowing himself to be a temporary occupant of this evanescent earth, lays up (according to the beautiful language of the Christian Shasters) for himself treasures in heaven where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break not through nor steal. But perhaps no people are less aware that they are mere probationers of time, and who are more taken up with the things of this earth than my unhappy countrymen; and so, the Hindu youth who is otherwise-minded encounters no ordinary difficulties in prosecuting his inquiry after things that pertain to an unseen world. Those who are designated Young Bengal, ridicule him for his eccentricity as they style it; he meets with nought but censure from Old Bengal. The one class put him down as one beside himself for troubling his head with so unpopular and unfashionable a theme as religion: "Eat, drink, and be merry—that is the chief end of men," says Young Bengal. The other class call him impiously inquisitive, simply because from an honest desire to learn, he solicits information on subjects which they do not and care not to know. Do you wish to be a Christian? Are you wiser than your fathers? Do as they did and ask no questions," says Old Bengal. Thus discouraged and disappointed, what is the youthful but earnest Enquirer to do? To whom is he to apply on matters of religion? Then again—but all this may appear enigmatical to you; you are perhaps impatient to know why I write in this strain. Without any further preface, I shall briefly narrate my history:—

I am a youth of a respectable *Kaiustu* family. My father, having by dint of hard but honest labour, and rigid economy, acquired an independant fortune resolved upon bestowing on his children (we were two brothers) the blessings of a liberal education. In the spirit of this resolution, my brother (my elder by four years,) was placed in the Hindu College, and by a strange arrangement, the wisdom of which I could never perceive, I was sent to another school. But not to weary you, I shall pass over my earlier years. Suffice it to say, that my father having subsequently heard of the celebrity of the Free Church Institution, had me accordingly admitted there. My progress in English there was in a great measure facilitated by the excellent system of the Institution. The Bible, as a matter of course, was one of my class books: I cannot say I studied it with any greater interest than I did Euclid, Cowper, or any of my other class books. I could not however fail to become familiarised with many important scriptural doctrines, such as God is Holy and perfect—He made man in his own moral image—but man fell from his first estate—there is no man that doeth good, no, not one—sin is an abomination to the Lord—He will by no means clear the guilty—man, on account of his sins, is exposed to the Lord's righteous displeasure—the redemption of the soul is precious—man is redeemed not by such corruptible things as gold and silver, but by the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without spot or blemish, for God so loved the world, that he gave his only beloved son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life—there is no other Mediator, neither is there any other way of salvation. I had *learned* these doctrines, but I thought as a Hindu it was no concern of mine to *believe* them. I must however confess there were moments when the *reality* of the doctrines came home to my conscience with a force altogether irresistible. God is truly a holy Being; and I have abundant evidence that I am a sinful and polluted wretch—my thoughts, desires and affections are all sinful. I cannot, therefore, but be an object of abhorrence in the sight of a Holy God. Unless the soul be cleansed and purified, I cannot, I dare not hope to obtain admission into his holy abode, where nothing vile can possibly enter. How then is the soul to be cleansed and purified? were the reflections of my solitary hours. You will acknowledge, Sir, that they are the most awful and momentous reflections that can occupy the mind of a *rational* and *reasonable* being.

But wild and thoughtless companions and close application to other studies banished these solemn considerations from my mind; they however never wholly deserted me—though their visitations were “few and far between.” It was about this time that two or three lads in the Institution embraced Christianity. Great was the alarm this circumstance occasioned. Many parents withdrew their children; my father also caught the contagion; I was removed and placed in the Hindu College. But I must hurry on: I studied there only two years, when my brother (who had been for some time employed in a Government Office) was carried to that “bourne whence no traveller returneth.” I succeeded him in his business. As the *death* of this dearly beloved brother has given *birth* to my present feelings, permit me to make a few passing remarks regarding him. He possessed tolerable, I may say, respectable attainments. Poetry and Natural Philosophy, History and Mental Philosophy were his favourite studies. His attention (and I may add that of hundreds of native youth) was directed to the latter subject by attending the able, eloquent and deeply interesting Moral Philosophy Lectures of the learned Dr. Duff. Though not personally acquainted, he cherished the profoundest veneration for the Doctor. He was of a serious and contemplative mind; he never associated with Young Bengal, but held their principles and practices in the greatest abhorrence: nevertheless he was respected and esteemed by them and by all for his talents, but especially for his gentle and unassuming manners. He had the greatest contempt for the religion of our

country, but was far from entertaining Christian notions. He frequently read the Bible with me as it was my class-book ; and was often struck with its fine poetry and eloquence—its sublime yet simple language, but especially with its pure and exalted morality. One day while reading a certain passage, he suddenly exclaimed to the amazement of all present : “ Surely, surely this can be no human composition ; it is, it must be the word of God ! I must study it more seriously.” But this he never did ; for he was soon after laid on his bed of sickness which he was not destined to leave. If his life was amiable, his death was *horrible*. May I not be destined to witness another such death. Never, never can I forget the trembling and agitation, the anguish and despair of his last moments. Even now, while I write, his sighs and groans and piercing shrieks seem to ring in my ears ; and scenes and recollections vividly start up which I would fain for ever forget. He never spoke a word ; he was conscious he was dying ; but he knew not whither he was going—into what state he was entering. All before him were “ shadows, clouds and darkness.” Alas ! alas ! what miserable comforters are knowledge, and riches, fame and honour to him who is dying without having made any provision for his immortal spirit. His miserable death forcibly brought to my mind the lines of the poet—

That not with natural or mental wealth,  
Was God *delighted* or his *peace* secured ;  
That not in natural or in mental wealth,  
Was *human happiness* or *grandeur* found.

But I must be brief : the death of one so dearly-beloved, who had been the friend and companion of my childhood—of my youth, made, as may naturally be expected, a very serious impression on my mind. It roused me from my sleep of indifference and carelessness—it gave birth to thoughts and feelings which had hitherto no lodgment in my bosom. What shall I do ? How shall I *live* that I may *die* a *happy* and *peaceful* death ? were my anxious inquiries.

I should have mentioned that—excepting the religious instruction I had received in the Free Church Institution and which I had almost forgotten since my removal—from the first dawn of reason to this moment of my existence never did such words as God, Holiness, Heaven, Sin, Hell, Salvation, Judgment to come, sound in my ear either through my father or any relatives or friends. The death of my beloved brother directed my mind to these solemn, though to many, unpleasant subjects. I had read and studied the Puranic shāstras ; dislike and disgust were the only consequences. I once mustered courage to complain to my father of my spiritual destitution. What was the result ? I grieve to state—he severely rebuked me ! second consideration, probably, made him regret ; for he soon after introduced me to a personage who was reputed to be a man of profound erudition. I had but a few meetings at his house (which was the resort of many Pandits) for he so overwhelmed me with a volley of unintelligible and heterogeneous jargon about Idealism, Pantheism, and Polytheism, that I felt glad to discontinue my visits. Sir, you know my history ; what would you advise me to do ? This letter may provoke the ridicule, or contempt, or censure of some of your correspondents, but Sir, Is not the soul of inestimable value ? Is not Salvation desirable ? Is not heaven to be gained—Hell to be avoided ? Should you be pleased to notice this letter, you may bear from me again ; else this first communication will be my last.

In conclusion, I beg distinctly to state (and which you may have discovered ere this) that I am neither Old nor Young Bengal—but an humble though a sincere

ENQUIRER AFTER TRUTH.

13th November, 1847.

**A** ROMANIZED HINDUSTANI DICTIONARY, containing upwards of 20,000 Hindústání words with their renderings in English.—Price cloth bound, 4 Rupees. To be had also of Mr. NATHL. BRICE, Dinapore.

In this Dictionary the Hindústání words are expressed in the Roman character in accordance with the system now generally adopted in Romanized Hindústání publications.

---

**J**UST PUBLISHED, price eight annas, or five rupees for a dozen copies, *A Brief Memorial*, (reprinted from the *Free Churchman*) OF THE LATE REV. JOHN MACDONALD, ONE OF THE MISSIONARIES OF THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

“Whose praise is in the gospel throughout all the Churches.”—2 Cor. viii. 18.

Published by Carey and Mendes, 3½, Lall Bazar, and sold by Messrs. Thacker and Co., Messrs. Ostell and Lepage, Messrs. G. C. Hay and Co., and all Booksellers.

---

### APPEAL.

---

In the large heathen city of *Muttra*, where there is no other school, a vernacular one has been conducted for the last four years by the undersigned. To this he has lately added a High Hindí and an English school. A suitable building, books and teachers have been obtained, and funds only are now required to purchase school apparatus and meet part of the current expenses, until this small and now nearly empty station shall be refilled. Donations will be thankfully received by the Rev. T. PHILLIPS, *Muttra*.

---

### AGRA PROTESTANT ACADEMY.

---

WANTED, immediately, as HEAD MISTRESS of the Girls' department, a lady of the habits and acquirements necessary to afford such instruction to the pupils, as would be secured to them in a respectable seminary in England.—Apply to

E. G. FRASER,  
Secretary A. P. A.

*Agra, the 19th Nov. 1847.*

---

*Price One Rupee a copy, or Six copies for five Rupees.*

**T**HE FREE CHURCH CATECHISM, (issued by the Publication Committee of the Free General Assembly) with the *Scripture proofs in full*. Published by Messrs. G. C. HAY & Co. No. 56½, Cossitollah, and may be obtained through any bookseller.

---

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE BENGALI LANGUAGE in 2 Volumes, by the late Rev. W. YATES, D. D.—Edited by Rev. J. WENGER.

VOLUME I. containing a Grammar, Reader and Explanatory Notes, with an Index and Vocabulary, cloth-bound.—Price Rs. 5.

VOLUME II. containing Selections from Bengálí Literature. Cloth bound, Price Rs. 4.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

CALCUTTA AUXILIARY BIBLE SOCIETY.

*Contributions received from 25th November to 24th December, 1847.*

G. H. P. . . . .	Rs.	5	0	0
Dr. H. Clark, . . . . .		32	0	0
J. C. O. . . . .		3	0	0
A. H. B. . . . .		5	0	0
C. L. J. . . . .		2	0	0
W. Ritchie, Esq. . . . .		25	0	0
A. Stuart, Esq. . . . .		5	0	0
A. Swinton, Esq. <i>Mynpooree</i> , . . . . .		12	0	0
Rev. A. Hamilton, <i>One Quarter</i> , . . . . .		4	0	0

*Received through G. F. Brown, Esq. Bhaugulpore.*

W. S. Alexander, Esq. . . . .		50	0	0
F. W. V. . . . .		10	0	0
J. Dahan, Esq. . . . .		5	0	0
W. H. Broadhurst, Esq. . . . .		5	0	0
R. N. Shore, Esq. . . . .		5	0	0
G. H. Grant, Esq. . . . .		5	0	0
R. Ross, Esq. . . . .		5	0	0
J. G. Campbell, Esq. . . . .		5	0	0
J. Brown, Esq. . . . .		5	0	0
A. B. . . . .		5	0	0
M. G. . . . .		4	0	0
A. Grant, Esq. . . . .		3	0	0
H. C. Raikes, Esq. . . . .		3	0	0
H. Morrell, Esq. . . . .		3	0	0
J. M. Napelton, Esq. . . . .		3	0	0
A Friend, . . . . .		3	0	0
Another Friend, . . . . .		2	0	0
E. Poulet, Esq. . . . .		2	0	0
W. G. Don, Esq. . . . .		2	0	0
P. T. Onraet, Esq. . . . .		2	0	0
H. W. Beddy, Esq. . . . .		2	0	0
D. W. Sinclair, Esq. . . . .		2	0	0
C. D. . . . .		2	0	0
R. Smart, Esq. . . . .		2	0	0
R. P. & E. C. . . . .		2	0	0
W. A. Smith, Esq. . . . .		1	0	0
Two little boys, . . . . .		4	0	0
Anon. . . . .		8	0	0

W. BYRNE, } *Cash Secretaries.*  
 ARCH. GRANT, }

*Subscriptions received for Calcutta Christian Observer up to 24th December, 1847.*

W. H. Jones, Esq. . . . .	Rs.	10	0	0
Rev. D. Ewart, . . . . .		6	0	0
S. F. Seymour, Esq. . . . .		10	0	0
W. C. Fyfe, Esq. . . . .		6	0	0
Capt. Ramsay, . . . . .		10	0	0
G. Hill, Esq. . . . .		10	0	0
Rev. J. Lawrence, . . . . .		6	0	0
Dr. Eyre, . . . . .		10	0	0
Rev. John Mackail, . . . . .		6	0	0
Dr. H. Clark, . . . . .		13	5	0
Rev. Mr. Sutton, . . . . .		6	0	0
Rev. J. Innes, . . . . .		6	0	0
W. Maples, Esq. . . . .		10	0	0

NEW SUBSCRIBERS.

C. B. Lewis, Esq.

G. C. HAY & Co.

*Calcutta, Dec. 24th, 1847.*

*Publishers of the C. C. O.*