

THE
CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

MARCH, 1850.

Religious Communications.

LECTURES ON THE SHORTER CATECHISM OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES—ADDRESSED TO YOUTH.

LECTURE XLVI.

We are now to enter on the consideration of the duties enjoined in the second table of the Decalogue—the duties that we owe to our neighbour and to ourselves. And it may be proper here to remark, once for all, that no precept of the second table can ever oblige us to set aside one of the first. Our duty to our Creator is superior to every other; so that, strictly speaking, nothing is, or can be a duty, which is dishonourable to him, or which interferes with the service or obedience that he requires. If, therefore, earthly parents, or magistrates, or other superiors, or laws, or usages of what kind soever, shall at any time urge you, my dear youth, to disobey or dishonour your heavenly Father, the Sovereign of the universe, your reply must be—“We must obey God rather than man.” Make your refusal as meekly and discreetly, and in every way as inoffensively as you can; but make it—make it firmly, and in the strength of God, maintain it even unto death. This is the principle on which Confessors have always hazarded their lives, and Martyrs have laid them down.

The first precept in the second table of the moral law, or the fifth

of the Decalogue, with its requirements and prohibitions, as stated in our Catechism, are as follows—“Honour thy father and thy mother; that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.”

“The fifth commandment requireth the preserving the honour and performing the duties, belonging to every one in their several places and relations, as superiors, inferiors, or equals:” And it “forbiddeth the neglecting of, or doing any thing against the honour and duty, which belongeth to every one in their several places and relations.”

I have placed the injunctions and prohibitions of this commandment together, and shall consider them connectedly, as being most favourable to the avoidance of repetition, and to a clear and full view of the duties to be explained and enforced.

We have in the precept before us a striking example of the specification of a single relative duty—that which children owe to their parents—as indicative of every other of the same class. That the precept ought to be thus considered is apparent; since all relative duties are made obligatory in the revealed will of God, and this table of the moral law was intended to epitomise them all, and the fifth commandment alone enjoins one of the most important of these duties, in a *positive form*—the others only spe-

branch of the human family, will be a source of deep regret.

Your memorialists are not disposed to occupy, unnecessarily, the time and attention of the legislature. They are aware that this subject has been long before the publick, and is familiar to most; but believing that the publick faith has been pledged to ensure to these Indians the peaceful possession of lands which they have held from time immemorial, and the national honour engaged to protect them in the enjoyment of all their rights, they will only observe, that dear to

their hearts is unbroken faith and unsullied honour, and they earnestly hope that no measure may be adopted, or permitted, likely to tarnish the national character; that righteousness only can truly exalt a nation; and that sin will not only be a reproach, but will assuredly be followed eventually by national chastisement and humiliation.

They therefore respectfully but earnestly request, that the Indians may be protected in the quiet and peaceable possession of their lands, and the full and secure enjoyment of all their rights.

Review.

JEFFERSON'S PAPERS.

(Continued from p. 85.)

As the work before us has already been pretty extensively circulated, and from the former high standing of its author, will probably be much read both at home and abroad,* we shall endeavour to give our readers as complete a view as our limits will permit, of his opinions on the all important subjects of morals and religion—touching but slightly, as already intimated, on other topics. It cannot but be a matter of considerable interest to the religious community in the United States, to know what were the sentiments of a man who received the highest honours which our country can confer, on subjects which, in the estimation of every Christian, are infinitely more momentous than any other. It must also be desirable for Christians to be able to judge, whether their patronage ought to be given to, or withheld from this publication. It was, moreover, while

Mr. J. lived, a matter of doubt with some, of inquiry with many, and even of controversy in certain places, what system of religion, if any, this eminent man had actually adopted. He must have intended to satisfy the world on this point, if, (as we have been told since we wrote the first part of our review,) he ordered this publication to be made exactly as it now appears. But whether this were so or not, the work is before the publick, and we feel that we have no need of an apology—unless it be to Christians, for putting so much profaneness on our pages—for the exhibition we are going to make of his creed in morals and religion. Our quotations shall be fair; and our readers will give to our remarks as much or as little weight as they may be thought to deserve.

It is our lot to belong to that class of men which Mr. J. detested above all others upon the earth, not excepting even kings and nobles—a class remarkable for taking *texts* when they write or speak. We must notwithstanding continue our old habit, only changing our subjects from sacred to profane—a change which we make with extreme reluctance. We have never before taken, and

* We have heard, but cannot vouch for the truth of the statement, that the first edition of six thousand copies is disposed of, that a second is in the press, and that one also is about to be published in London.

hope we shall never again have occasion to take, such a text, from which to branch out our observations, as is exhibited in the following extract from a letter to a youth, in regard to a course of study. Mr. J. says, "I enclose you a sketch of the sciences to which I would wish you to apply, in such order as Mr. Wythe shall advise: I mention also the books in them worth your reading, which submit to his correction." After mentioning the Italian and Spanish languages, he writes—

"3. *Moral Philosophy.* I think it lost time to attend lectures on this branch. He who made us would have been a pitiful bungler, if he had made the rules of our moral conduct a matter of science. For one man of science, there are thousands who are not. What would have become of them? Man was destined for society. His morality, therefore, was to be formed to this object. He was endowed with a sense of right and wrong, merely relative to this. This sense is as much a part of nature, as the sense of hearing, seeing, feeling; it is the true foundation of morality, and not the TOKAON, truth, &c. as fanciful writers have imagined. The moral sense, or conscience, is as much a part of man, as his leg or arm. It is given to all human beings in a stronger or weaker degree, as force of members is given them in a greater or less degree. It may be strengthened by exercise, as may any particular limb of the body. This sense is submitted, indeed, in some degree, to the guidance of reason; but it is a small stock which is required for this: even a less one than what we call common sense. State a moral case to a ploughman and a professor. The former will decide it as well, and often better than the latter, because he has not been led astray by artificial rules. In this branch, therefore, read good books, because they will encourage, as well as direct your feelings. The writings of Sterne, particularly, form the best course of morality that ever was written. Besides these, read the books mentioned in the inclosed paper: and above all things, lose no occasion of exercising your dispositions to be grateful, to be generous, to be charitable, to be humane, to be true, just, firm, orderly, courageous, &c. Consider every act of this kind, as an exercise which will strengthen your moral faculties, and increase your worth.

"4. *Religion.* Your reason is now mature

enough to examine this object. In the first place, divest yourself of all bias in favour of novelty and singularity of opinion. Indulge them in any other subject rather than that of religion. It is too important, and the consequences of error may be too serious. On the other hand, shake off all the fears and servile prejudices, under which weak minds are servilely crouched. Fix reason firmly in her seat, and call to her tribunal every fact, every opinion. Question with boldness even the existence of a God; because, if there be one, he must more approve the homage of reason, than that of blindfolded fear. You will naturally examine, first, the religion of your own country. Read the Bible then, as you would read Livy or Tacitus. The facts which are within the ordinary course of nature, you will believe on the authority of the writer, as you do those of the same kind in Livy and Tacitus. The testimony of the writer weighs in their favour, in one scale, and their not being against the laws of nature, does not weigh against them. But those facts in the Bible which contradict the laws of nature, must be examined with more care, and under a variety of faces. Here you must recur to the pretensions of the writer to inspiration from God. Examine upon what evidence his pretensions are founded, and whether that evidence is so strong, as that its falsehood would be more improbable, than a change of the laws of nature, in the case he relates. For example, in the book of Joshua we are told, the sun stood still several hours. Were we to read that fact in Livy or Tacitus, we should class it with their showers of blood, speaking of statues, beasts, &c. But it is said, that the writer of that book was inspired. Examine, therefore, candidly, what evidence there is of his having been inspired. The pretension is entitled to your inquiry, because millions believe it. On the other hand, you are astronomer enough to know, how contrary it is to the law of nature, that a body revolving on its axis, as the earth does, should have stopped; should not, by that sudden stoppage, have prostrated animals, trees, buildings, and should after a certain time have resumed its revolution, and that without a second general prostration. Is this arrest of the earth's motion, or the evidence which affirms it, most within the law of probabilities? You will next read the New Testament. It is the history of a personage called Jesus. Keep in your eye the opposite pretensions, 1. of those who say he was begotten by God, born of a virgin, suspended and reversed the laws of nature at will, and ascended bodily into heaven and 2. of those who say he was

a man, of illegitimate birth, of a benevolent heart, enthusiastick mind, who set out without pretensions to divinity, ended in believing them, and was punished capitally for sedition, by being gibbeted, according to the Roman law, which punished the first commission of that offence by whipping, and the second by exile or death *in furea*. See this law in the Digest, Lib. 48. tit. 19. § 28. 3. and Lipsius, Lib. 2. de cruce, cap. 2. These questions are examined in the books I have mentioned, under the head of Religion, and several others. They will assist you in your inquiries; but keep your reason firmly on the watch in reading them all. Do not be frightened from this inquiry by any fear of its consequences. If it ends in a belief that there is no God, you will find incitements to virtue in the comfort and pleasantness you feel in its exercise, and the love of others which it will procure you. If you find reason to believe there is a God, a consciousness that you are acting under his eye, and that he approves you, will be a vast additional incitement: if that there be a future state, the hope of a happy existence in that, increases the appetite to deserve it: if that Jesus was also a God, you will be comforted by a belief of his aid and love. In fine, I repeat, you must lay aside all prejudice on both sides, and neither believe nor reject any thing, because any other person, or description of persons, have rejected or believed it. Your own reason is the only oracle given you by heaven, and you are answerable not for the rightness, but uprightness of the decision. I forgot to observe, when speaking of the New Testament, that you should read all the histories of Christ, as well of those whom a council of ecclesiasticks have decided for us, to be Pseudo-evangelists, as those they named Evangelists. Because these Pseudo-evangelists pretended to inspiration, as much as the others, and you are to judge their pretensions by your own reason, and not by the reason of those ecclesiasticks. Most of these are lost. There are some, however, still extant, collected by Fabricius, which I will endeavour to get and send you."—Vol. II. pp. 216—218.

Here surely are some very singular directions, in relation to a system of reading, study, and thinking, for a youth who was probably yet in his minority. He is not to study Moral Philosophy, because he will understand it as well, or perhaps better, without study, than with it; and "the writings of Sterne"—full of a sickly *sentimentality*, and with a

mixture of not a little both of profaneness and obscenity—are declared to "form the best course of morality that ever was written."* We are naturally led to suppose that Mr. J.'s morality was of a piece with that which he recommended to his young friend; and we know of no evidence to falsify such a supposition. We are not however disposed to deny that the moral sense, or conscience, is always a part of the human constitution. But we have been accustomed to think, that, like every other part, it needs a very careful direction and cultivation. It consists in a perception of right and wrong in human action, and in self-approbation if the right is pursued, and of self-condemnation if the wrong is not avoided. But conscience always depends on the *understanding*, for ascertaining what is right and what is wrong; and for want of a just guidance it is found, in instances innumerable, to take the one for the other. Those bloody persecutions and private assassinations, which have so often taken place under the influence of a false religion, and which Mr. J. justly execrates, were mostly perpetrated by those who thought that in these very acts they were "doing God service." Their consciences, so far from condemning, justified and applauded them. An erroneous conscience or moral sense, as Mr. J. would readily enough admit in the instances to which we have just referred, is one of the most fearful instruments of mischief that can be

* We readily admit that the sermons of Sterne contain many just sentiments handsomely expressed. But his sermons compose but a small part of his "writings," which Mr. J. commends in mass. That mass is chiefly made up of his *Tristram Shandy*, *Sentimental Journey*, and *Letters*; and whatever wit and humour these may contain, they disgraced him as a clergyman, and the course of his life confirmed the disgrace. No *priest* who had written and lived as became his character, would, in Mr. J.'s opinion, have been the author of the best system of morality that was ever composed.

imagined, both to its possessor and to the community in which he has influence. And is this a faculty that requires but "a small stock of reason" to guide it? It is a perverted conscience that leads men to "call evil good and good evil, to put darkness for light and light for darkness, to put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter." A conscience either misled, or "seared with a hot iron," in the bosom of the atheistical philosophers of France, sent host after host of innocent victims to the axe of the guillotine; and when their own turn came to suffer, it carried a number of them there, in some instances with the most stupid apathy, and in others with the most revolting levity. This faculty, after being perverted or dormant, sometimes indeed awakes and recovers its rectitude and its force, when the infidel comes to look death in the face; and then it lacerates him, as in the case of Voltaire, with scorpion strokes and stings. But in other instances, the infidel and blasphemer is so given over "to strong delusions to believe a lie," that he looks forward to his leaving the world without apparent dismay, professes to be waiting and wishing for his dissolution, talks of heaven and happiness beyond the grave, and at last has "no bands in his death." No, verily—Conscience is not, what it is often called, "God's Vicegerent," till it is enlightened and guided by reason and revelation, pacified by the sprinkling of atoning blood, and influenced by the Spirit of grace—Then, and then only, is "the voice of conscience the voice of God." We are well aware with what contemptuous sneers these remarks will be regarded, by all the disciples of the infidel school. But we write not for them, but for those who have not yet renounced the God of their fathers; and especially to guard our youthful readers, against the detestable sophistry and pernicious delusions of those "who lie in wait to deceive,"

But if Mr. J.'s directions in reference to morality are bad, those which relate to religion are, if possible, still worse—they are absolutely appalling. He sets out—and this is his usual manner—with some excellent remarks on one side of the important question; but it is only that he may gain an advantage, to bear with all his force on the other side,—the side of error and infidelity. His first four sentences, after he introduces the subject of religion, are worthy of all approbation. But who would suspect, without the fact before him, that this was only to prepare the way, to say to an unestablished youth—"Question with boldness even the existence of a God." This shocking dictum of Mr. J. is, in our judgment, not justified, nor even softened, by the reason which, in artful language, he assigns for delivering it—"because, if there be one [a God] he must more approve the homage of reason, than that of blindfolded fear." Is there then no alternative, we desire to know, but either to "question with boldness even the existence of God," or to offer him "the homage of blindfolded fear?" Are not the evidences of infinite wisdom, power, and goodness, which every where surround us, so abundant, clear, and impressive, and so strongly indicative of a great, benevolent, and intelligent First Cause, that a youth, and especially a studious and reflecting youth, who has reached to the verge of manhood, has no need "boldly to question even the existence of a God?"—nay, can he do this without the most daring presumption and impiety? We certainly think not. Yet we trust we would be as far as Mr. J. from teaching that the worship of our Maker should be "the homage of blindfolded fear," or not, in any respect whatsoever, "a reasonable service." We would teach studious youth, and so have we taught them often, to examine well the objections of the Atheist, and to consider, *carefully and reverently*, the proofs of the being and perfect-

tions of God. But we have always maintained, that an investigation, *so conducted*, could not fail to result in a *rational, satisfactory, and unwavering conviction*, that there is a God, most worthy, not of a blind-folded, but an enlightened and filial fear, and a cheerful and delightful worship. We assuredly have never put the supposition, as Mr. J. has done, that the candid inquiries of our pupils might "end in a belief that there is no God," and if so, tell them notwithstanding, "you will find incitements to virtue in the comfort and pleasantness you feel in its exercise, and the love of others which it will procure you." What kind of *virtue* that is which an established atheist may possess, or what may be the comfort or pleasantness of his feelings, or what the love of others it will procure, we suppose that Mr. J.'s friend and correspondent Volney, could better tell than we—We belong to the proscribed class of "ecclesiastics;" and we admit that we are, and hope we ever shall be, ignorant and unbelieving in all these particulars.

There is the semblance of much impartiality in Mr. J.'s directions, relative to the study of religion and the pretensions of the Bible. Yet it is palpably plain that he thinks the whole ought to be rejected; indeed he says explicitly, in the winding up of his advice, "your own reason is the only oracle given you by heaven," and adds the favourite infidel dogma, "you are answerable not for the rightness, but uprightness of the decision."* Into the Deistical controversy we, of course, cannot now enter at large: we shall, however,

* We are not to be here understood as saying, that the leaning of Mr. J. is toward the denial of the being of a God, and the existence of a future state. His leaning, in regard to these points, seems to be in their favour—*What kind of a God, and what sort of a future state, he professed to believe in, will be seen before we finish our review—What he says of the birth and character of our Lord Jesus Christ, shall also receive due notice.*

presently show that the objections against revelation, brought forward by Mr. J. in this extract, are utterly groundless. But we cannot pass unnoticed his most unjustifiable insinuation, that the writers of the *spurious gospels*, or in his phrase, "those whom a council of ecclesiastics have decided for us to be Pseudo-evangelists," have as fair pretensions to inspiration as the apostles of our Lord and their companions, who wrote the accounts of his birth, life, doctrines, miracles, death, resurrection, and ascension. No man acquainted with the subject and possessed of a grain of candour, would insinuate this; and if not acquainted with the subject, his doing it is the more inexcusable. Jones and Lardner have shown, to the conviction of infidels themselves, who have read their works, that the spurious gospels are either forgeries altogether, or narratives of those who had received some true information, which they mixed up with much error; and that they are and ever have been considered by Christians generally, as destitute of all authority. If some of them gained a partial and temporary reception, they were speedily rejected by the whole church, except by a few gross hereticks, whom the church regarded with as little approbation as the spurious books to which they adhered.

In relation to "reading the Bible as you would read Livy or Tacitus," and "to what we are told in the Book of Joshua, that the sun stood still for several hours," we shall avail ourselves of the aid of Bishop Watson—a man who, in point of general erudition, was, to say the least, in no respect inferior to Mr. J., and in acquaintance with the subjects here discussed, immeasurably his superior. Our extracts will be taken from Watson's "Apology for the Bible," in reply to Thomas Paine's "Age of Reason, part the second;" and we think our readers will be surprised, as we cer-

tainly were, to find that if the Bishop had been replying to a part of the very quotation we have given from Mr. J., he could not have said any thing more direct and pertinent—It looks as if these authors wrote in concert. The volumes under review contain a number of Mr. J.'s letters to Paine, whom he always addresses with peculiar cordiality, and whom, as one of his letters now before us shows, a captain of a sloop of war was charged to "receive and accommodate with a passage back" to this country. Mr. J. was at this time President of the United States, and the letter concludes thus—"That you may long live to continue your useful labours, and to reap their reward in the thankfulness of nations, is my sincere prayer—Accept assurances of my high esteem and affectionate attachment." Yet we do not affirm that the striking similarity between some of the sentiments of Mr. J. and those of Paine, in impugning the Bible, arose from concert and communication on the subject. "Great wits jump in judgment," says the old proverb; and perhaps no other account than this is to be given of the agreement between this pair of Thomases—*par nobile fratrum*.

But it is time to hear Bishop Watson; and we wish our readers may look back to our long quotation, and mark the pertinence of his reply to the points to which we have referred. He belonged to the order of priests, whom both Mr. J. and his coadjutor Paine, always denounce in language of unmeasured abuse, and therefore he shall have liberty to say a few words on that point, before he proceeds to the others—What he writes, it will be remembered, is in letters addressed to Paine—

"In addition to the moral evidence (as you are pleased to think it) against the Bible, you threaten in the progress of your work, to produce such other evidence as even a priest cannot deny. A

philosopher in search of truth forfeits with me all claim to candour and impartiality, when he introduces railing for reasoning, vulgar and illiberal sarcasm in the room of argument. I will not imitate the example you set me; but examine what you shall produce, with as much coolness and respect, as if you had given the priests no provocation; as if you were a man of the most unblemished character, subject to no prejudices, actuated by no bad designs, not liable to have abuse retorted upon you with success."

* * * * *

"As to your assertion, that the miracles recorded in Tacitus, and in other profane histories, are quite as well authenticated as those of the Bible—it, being a mere assertion destitute of proof, may be properly answered by a contrary assertion. I take the liberty then to say, that the evidence for the miracles recorded in the Bible is, both in kind and degree, so greatly superior to that for the prodigies mentioned by Livy, or the miracles related by Tacitus, as to justify us in giving credit to the one as the work of God, and in withholding it from the other as the effect of superstition and imposture. This method of derogating from the credibility of Christianity, by opposing to the miracles of our Saviour the tricks of ancient impostors, seems to have originated with Hierocles in the fourth century; and it has been adopted by unbelievers from that time to this; with this difference, indeed, that the heathens of the third and fourth century admitted that Jesus wrought miracles; but lest that admission should have compelled them to abandon their Gods and become Christians, they said, that their *Apollonius*, their *Apuleius*, their *Aristeus*, did as great: whilst modern deists deny the fact of Jesus having ever wrought a miracle. And they have some reason for this proceeding; they are sensible that the gospel miracles are so different, in all their circumstances, from those related in pagan story, that, if they admit them to have been performed, they must admit Christianity to be true; hence they have fabricated a kind of deistical axiom—that no human testimony can establish the credibility of a miracle. This, though it has been an hundred times refuted, is still insisted upon, as if its truth had never been questioned, and could not be disproved."

* * * * *

"You make yourself merry with what you call the tale of the sun standing still upon mount Gibeon, and the moon in the valley of Ajalon; and you say that "the story detects itself, because there is not a nation in the world that knows any thing about it." How can you expect that

there should, when there is not a nation in the world whose annals reach this æra by many hundred years? It happens, however, that you are probably mistaken as to the fact: a confused tradition concerning this miracle, and a similar one in the time of Ahaz, when the sun went back ten degrees, has been preserved amongst one of the most ancient nations, as we are informed by one of the most ancient historians. Herodotus, in his *Euterpe*, speaking of the Egyptian priests, says—'They told me that the sun had four times deviated from his course, having twice risen where he uniformly goes down, and twice gone down where he uniformly rises. This, however, had produced no alteration in the climate of Egypt; the fruits of the earth and the phenomena of the Nile had always been the same.' (Beloe's *Tran.*) The last part of this observation confirms the conjecture, that this account of the Egyptian priests had a reference to the two miracles respecting the sun mentioned in scripture; for they were not of that kind which could introduce any change in climates or seasons. You would have been contented to admit the account of this miracle as a fine piece of poetical imagery;—you may have seen some Jewish doctors, and some Christian commentators, who consider it as such; but improperly in my opinion. I think it idle at least, if not impious, to undertake to explain how the miracle was performed; but one who is not able to explain the mode of doing a thing, argues ill if he thence infers that the thing was not done. We are perfectly ignorant how the sun was formed, how the planets were projected at the creation, how they are still retained in their orbits by the power of gravity; but we admit, notwithstanding, that the sun was formed, that the planets were then projected, and that they are still retained in their orbits. The machine of the universe is in the hand of God; he can stop the motion of any part, or of the whole of it, with less trouble and less danger of injuring it, than you can stop your watch. In testimony of the reality of the miracle, the author of the book says—'Is not this written in the book of Jasher?'—No author in his senses would have appealed, in proof of his veracity, to a book which did not exist, or in attestation of a fact which, though it did exist, was not recorded in it; we may safely, therefore, conclude, that, at the time the book of Joshua was written, there was such a book as the book of Jasher, and that the miracle of the sun's standing still was recorded in that book. But this observation, you will say, does not prove the fact of the sun's having stood still; I have not produced it as a proof of that fact: but it

proves that the author of the book of Joshua believed the fact, and that the people of Israel admitted the authority of the book of Jasher. An appeal to a fabulous book would have been as senseless an insult upon their understanding, as it would have been upon ours, had Rapin appealed to the *Arabian Night's Entertainment*, as a proof of the battle of Hastings."

Mr. J. recommends to his *élève*, throughout the article, a part only of which we have quoted, a spirit of self sufficiency. To this most youth are of themselves sufficiently prone; it has ruined them by thousands; and it far oftener needs a rein than a spur. On all subjects, he advises his pupil to bring the reasonings and conclusions of men of the first powers and attainments to the bar of his own judgment, to pronounce on them at once, if we understand him, a sentence of approbation or rejection, and to act accordingly. Do we then say that youth should not be encouraged and exhorted to endeavour to form decisions of their own? Far from it—They ought to be earnestly counselled to examine every important subject with closeness, care and diligence, that in due time they may make up for themselves a sound and steadfast opinion; and in the mean time to be modest and reserved; to yield to the advice of the virtuous and experienced; and always to take the course which appears to be the safest. Respect for the judgment of those who have lived longer, and seen, and inquired, and thought, a hundred fold more than themselves, should be much inculcated. Often should they be cautioned against being carried away by first impressions and specious arguments; and reminded that the time will probably come, when many of their present notions will be renounced by themselves, as premature and utterly indefensible. In this way, we apprehend, a truly amiable, manly, and dignified character is most likely to be formed, and just and virtuous principles to be so radicated, that no-

thing afterwards shall be able to blast or shake them. Mr. J. does not tell us the titles or the authors of the books, which he promises to send to his young friend; but he intimates that they were in accordance with the advice that he gave; and if both together were not productive of serious and lasting injury to the youth who received

them, we think he must have made a wonderful and most fortunate escape.

We shall now proceed to notice in detail Mr. J.'s *avowed* opinions, as exhibited in this publication, on some of the most important topicks of religion and morals.

(To be continued.)

Literary and Philosophical Intelligence, etc.

Arrangement of Water Pipes in Streets.
 —The effect of temperature upon iron pipes, used for the conveyance of water, and also some other circumstances, have been investigated by M. Girard, who has arrived at the following conclusions:—1. According to the effect produced by change of season and temperature upon pipes of this metal placed in subterraneous galleries, they altered in length for each centesimal degree, (1.8 degrees of Fahr.) 0.0000985, a quantity of about 1.9th less than it would have been if they had not been confined on their supports by friction. 2. Although this effect is less when the pipes are put in the ground, it is still sufficient to occasion rupture, leakages, and other unpleasant accidents. 3. If the joints are not made by bolts, but one end of a pipe is inserted into the mouth of the next pipe, then the space for the interposed substance should be as small as possible, and the substance one which swells when in contact with water. 4. The length of the joints should be considerable, both to prevent the escape of water and the flexure of the system of tubes. 5. To insure tightness, the stuffing should be confined between a ring fixed to the end of the pipe, and a moveable ring sliding on the tubes. 6. That this precaution may be dispensed with by laying the pipes down in the coldest part of the season. 7. That pipes put into the ground should be supported, at intervals, by firm props of masonry, to prevent those inflexions which otherwise occur, and form ruptures. 8. That in large towns it is advantageous to place these pipes in subterraneous galleries, either such as are made on purpose, or else in the sewers. 9. That galleries have been tried advantageously for twenty years, and therefore should be resorted to, that those derangements of the pavement and inundations from broken pipes, which are consequent

upon the ordinary mode of proceeding, may, from henceforth be avoided.—*Le Globe.*

African Expedition.—Messrs. Richard and John Lander, the young men who are engaged by the British Government to explore the course of the long-sought and long-talked of Niger, and trace that mysterious river to its source, arrived at Portsmouth from the metropolis yesterday, to embark on board the Alert merchant brig, for the Western Coast of Africa. Mr. Richard Lander, who, it will be recollected, is the only survivor of all the missions of discovery of late years into Africa, and whose conduct under the lamented Captain Clapperton, has elicited such general and deserved applause, is about twenty five years of age, and although rather below than above the middle stature, is strongly formed, and looks as healthy and vigorous as if he had never quitted his native shores. Mr. Lander's brother, who is to be his sole companion in this difficult undertaking, is three years younger than himself, and is the compiler of his late "Wanderings in Africa," which are on the eve of publication; he is rather taller than his elder brother, but possesses a similar robust frame, and sound constitution. Both young men, we have heard, have great resolution, and are animated but by one principle, viz: to endeavour to accomplish their arduous task, or perish in the attempt. We sincerely wish these enterprising young men that good fortune which they themselves hope for; and we shall not only take great interest in their proceedings, but feel considerable pleasure in welcoming their safe return to their native shores.

Twenty Arab boys have lately arrived at the Central Schools of the British and Foreign School Society, Borough road. They were sent over by the Pacha of