

The University of Maine

DigitalCommons@UMaine

Maine History Documents

Special Collections

1844

Impulses of Piety: a Discourse Preached to the Hammond Street Church and Society, in Bangor, February 18, 1844

John Maltby

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/mainehistory>



Part of the [History Commons](#)

This Monograph is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UMaine. It has been accepted for inclusion in Maine History Documents by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UMaine. For more information, please contact um.library.technical.services@maine.edu.

Pamp
4698

IMPULSES OF FIFTY:

A

DISCOURSE

PREACHED TO THE

HAMMOND-STREET CHURCH AND SOCIETY,

IN BANGOR, FEBRUARY 18, 1844.

By JOHN MALTBY, PASTOR.

BANGOR, February 21, 1844.

DEAR SIR:

Having listened to your morning Sermon of last Sabbath, with much interest, and believing the sentiments expressed well adapted to promote "pure and undefiled religion," in the Church, and elevate the tone of morals in Society, we request the favor of a copy for publication.

We are, Dear Sir, very respectfully, your obedient Servants,

J. C. STEVENS,
GEO. W. PICKERING,
JOHN McDONALD,
JACOB DRUMMOND,
AMOS JONES,
JOHN TRUE,
OTIS SMALL,
GEO. WHEELWRIGHT.

TO REV. JOHN MALTBY.

BANGOR, February 27, 1844.

GENTLEMEN:

The manuscript referred to in your note of the 21st inst., is at your disposal. The Sermon was hastily written, at the close of the week, and with no thought of any use of it, beyond my pulpit. I have felt at liberty, therefore, to make some verbal alterations, and to employ some additional illustrations. All modifications of sentiment have been carefully avoided. The notes have been added.

Yours very truly,

J. MALTBY.

TO J. C. STEVENS,
GEO. W. PICKERING,
JOHN McDONALD,
JACOB DRUMMOND,
AMOS JONES,
JOHN TRUE,
OTIS SMALL,
GEO. WHEELWRIGHT.

DISCOURSE.

1 PETER II. 2.

“As new-born babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby.”

1 JOHN III. 9.

“Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.”

IN the first of these passages, the natural birth, and the spiritual, are brought together in an implied comparison. “New-born babes;”—the expression makes you think of the infant, of the babe in Christ, and of both. You see the infant, just beginning to breathe and have natural life; and you see the young convert, just beginning to love God and have spiritual life. The intimation is, that in the two cases there are points of resemblance. The one has instinctive appetites or desires, and so has the other. The infant hungers, takes the aliment provided, and lives upon it. The babe in Christ hungers, takes the aliment provided, even “the sincere milk of the word,” and lives upon it. The infant has *many* desires;—so has the babe in Christ. The hungerings of the infant have an impulsive influence;—and so it is with the renewed mind. The hungerings and cravings felt, lead to corresponding seeking and doing.

Now my question is, whither do these appetites of the renewed mind tend? Where will the man go, who is led by them? What will he do?

At this point, the teachings of the second verse of the text come in. “Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he

is born of God." *His seed remaineth in him.* "There is," says Doddridge, "an immortal principle implanted in the heart." And the hungerings and thirstings which spring from it, the text tells us, do not lead to sin,—*cannot* lead to sin. They withdraw the soul from sin. They lead it away into the fellowship of holiness, to find its joy in the things of the kingdom of Christ.

Let there be, then, the *renewed heart*, and there will be also new impulses of longing, and of desire. As by an instinctive prompting, the soul will come into a new fellowship. It will transfer itself into new society. The man will be led in a new direction. Under the influence of gracious affections, he will forsake the paths of sin. He will not walk in them. Not, if you please, because any *specific law forbids*. His desires are not that way. His spiritual appetites—the new affinities of his soul, hold him to a new course.

IT WILL BE MY OBJECT TO SPEAK OF SOME OF THE THINGS WHICH THE RENEWED MIND, WITH ITS GRACIOUS AFFECTIONS IN EXERCISE, CAN NEVER BE PREVAILED UPON TO DO.

In the first place, *it can never be persuaded to live without habitual prayer*. It can never feel inclined to do it. Just as well might the hungry man feel inclined to live without food. Renewed by the Holy Ghost, the mind hungers after God. It waits for no law of requisition. Spontaneously, it aspires after him. New-born infancy waits for no law of requisition to bring it to its mother's breast. It is the motion of nature. To endeavor to preserve our life, is a matter of acknowledged duty; but who waits for the precept? Who eats, and drinks, and sleeps, simply because he is required to do it? There is an instinctive prompting. The precept all apart, inherent promptings of desire move us.

So of the man renewed, with his gracious affections in exercise. "My soul followeth hard after thee."

"Were I in heaven without my God,

"Twould be no joy to me;

"And while this earth is mine abode,

"I long for none but thee."

Secondly, the renewed mind, under the influence of gracious affections, *can never come into love with "the course of this world."* The objects in which it most delights are not there. Its happiness is found, not there, but in another direction. All its inward promptings of desire and hope, are in another direction. To have fellowship with the course of this world, then, it must forego its most cherished preferences. In some strange way it must come to choose and love what, with its new affections in exercise, could awaken only grief and repugnance. Its highest interest found in the kingdom of Christ,—its joy, its delight there, and yet in fellowship with a world that turns its back upon that kingdom! Its supreme affection placed on God,—loving him more than every thing else, and yet in fellowship with a world that says, "Depart from us; for we desire not the knowledge of thy ways"! With livelier wonder than ever filled the mind of Nicodemus, we might ask, 'How can such a thing be?' "What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?" Delivered from the power of darkness, and translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son, how can the renewed mind love the society of that darkness out of which it has been translated? Can it, with all its new affinities, turn back and find congenial fellowship there? It cannot be. Why, clip the wings of the woodland dove, and shut her up to the company of your domesticated fowls. In the midst of them is she not lonely? The place, the company, the prevailing habits, are not her choice. Give her a new set of affinities, and of sympathies, and her feelings of repugnance may cease;—then she may coalesce, and love her new condition. So you must smother the gracious affections of the renewed mind, before it can come into love and fellowship with the course of this world.

I come, therefore, to a third particular: As the renewed mind can never come into love with the *course of this world*, so, in the due exercise of its gracious affections, it *can never*

so love a worldly mind, as to warrant the matrimonial connexion. There may be the love of friendship, the love of benevolence, the love of an earnest and anxious desire for the eternal welfare of the unrenewed mind. But that there can be, between two individuals whom religion has separated—the one having the peculiar desires and longings of the new-born soul, and the other being a stranger to them,—that there can be between these, sympathies so responsive, a fellowship so complete, that, according to the Poet,

—————"heart shall meet heart,
 "Each other's pillow to repose divine,"—

this, it is conceived, is quite impossible.

The question of marriage between a believer and an unbeliever, is one of deep and solemn interest. It is a question with which my mind has long been burdened. Whether the gospel has a rule in the case, and what that rule is, are points not now up. I am speaking of things which the renewed mind, in the exercise of its gracious affections, can never be expected to do. And this third topic presents one of them.

It is not at all denied, that the impenitent individual may have many desirable endowments; and that he may be, therefore, an object of high interest. He may have a cultivated intellect, a good taste, a delicate sensibility, a desirable address, lively conversational powers, and all these blending with gentle and winning manners. And yet it shall be true, so long as piety sways your mind, and he is a stranger to it, that he cannot so meet the wishes, and so reciprocate the aspirations of your heart, as to render marriage suitable. Will you, then, turn away, and in contrast with this brilliant example, refer to some christian, in whom these qualities do not appear, and impatiently ask, "Am I to love here?" "*Can* I love here?" Who has claimed that you can. Surely not I. You are not turned over to the cold possibility of loving a Vandal, or a Boor, because it is found that you cannot love an unbeliever. You may come into a condition, (it is at least supposable) where you shall not be able to love any one. Not because of any prohibitory law, but because you nowhere meet with the requisite attractions.

The contrast you bring up has, therefore no bearing in the case. I am speaking simply of *one* defect, in the qualities of your friend, which must embarrass and hinder the conjugal affection. That other defects may have the same influence is not denied or doubted. Our bearing towards each other, then, is this;— You say, and very justly, that certain things in the disposition, habits, and social qualities of an individual, are indispensable to engage your affections. I am only saying, as a parallel case, that since you have piety, you will feel something else to be indispensable also. You say that, trained intellectually and socially as you have been, it has become impossible for you to love, with a true conjugal affection, where the qualifications alluded to are not possessed. And I say, in turn, that, trained *religiously* as you have been—having come to be exercised with the peculiar desires and longings of the christian, it is impossible for you to love, with a true conjugal affection, where *piety* is not possessed.

It is not denied, I repeat, that there may be a strong interest felt. The christian parent feels not only a strong interest, but a fervent love, towards his impenitent child. The christian brother loves his impenitent sister. But let it be remembered, these natural affections, based on the relations of consanguinity, are not the *conjugal affection*. And if they were, it would only remain to say—what all, of adequate experience, know to be true,—that between the believing and the unbelieving members of a family these affections are embarrassed. Strong they may be,—strong they should be; but they are embarrassed. And they can be perfected, they can come into their full and perfect play, only when there shall come to be the fellowship of piety. And the believer, in his intercourse with the engaging and attractive unbeliever, in whom he feels a strong interest, will find his attachment embarrassed, for want of fellowship in the things of christian experience. The choicest feelings of his heart, he will find after all, are not responded to. He will go home, therefore, after a social hour with his gifted and accomplished friend, in pain. He was obliged, in his conversation, either to leave out the things he thought most of, or by speak-

ing of them, to produce a significant silence. And his remembrance of the gushing *social* fellowship experienced, serves but to make the want of the higher *religious* fellowship the more palpable, and the more painful.

That there are instances, in which the believer and the unbeliever, in wedded life, share large measures of conjugal bliss, is not doubted. They are adapted to make each other happy; and to a great extent they do it. And yet to a great extent they fail to do it. They will tell you, or *one* of them will, and the more earnestly as his faith is in higher exercise, that in all the highest interests of his pilgrimage, he has to walk alone; that it is through a part of the circle of his thoughts only that he has fellowship; that on the things most dear to his heart—the sacred things, the “*pearls*” of christian experience, his musings must be solitary; that in laying up his treasure in heaven, which after all he feels is the great business of life, his lot is to labor alone. “What part hath he that believeth with an unbeliever?”

Let it be so, then, that there is nothing among the qualifications of an individual to meet the peculiar emotions and aspirations of a pious heart, and there will be a vacancy. There will be a void, which no combination of social charms can fill. And from the sight of that void, the spiritual mind, in the due exercise of its spiritual graces, will start back. It is the *gracious* exercises of the renewed heart, that are held most dear, that are most cherished, that long most earnestly for the communings of a kindred spirit. And however gifted and accomplished any individual may be, if he cannot reciprocate these, if he cannot come into the fellowship of these gracious exercises and affections, so that here especially “heart shall meet heart,” he will try in vain to awaken in the bosom a true conjugal love.

It seems, then, a sound and warrantable conclusion, that the believer, when his spiritual affections are duly in exercise, when piety has the ascendancy and sways his mind, can never be expected to become so attached to an unbeliever, as to render marriage suitable. It is only when his piety has become comparatively dormant, when he has backslidden, and

his carnal mind for a season has gained the ascendancy, leading him to "confer with flesh and blood," that he can come into such affinity and fellowship with an unbeliever, as to desire the Banns of Wedlock.*

In the fourth place, the renewed mind, with its gracious affections in exercise, will *never prefer the pleasures of display, to the pleasures of doing right*. Some men love display in their own persons; some in their families; and some in both. To this they seem ready to make every thing bend. Right and wrong are shadows; *appearances* are the substance. "Dum vivimus, vivamus,"† pretty well describes their case. "The life to come,"—"the life to come,"—it sounds distant. "*The life that now is,*"—this it is, that wakes a responsive echo in their souls.

Some parents, evidently, think more of marking their children with worldly consequence, than of religiously training them to be disciples of Jesus Christ. The moral duty, that binds them to the religious training of their children, they neglect. They do not delight in it. The great and engrossing endeavor, in which they find pleasure, is to usher them into the world with marks of distinction. But this is an error the renewed mind may be expected to avoid. To pursue a course so mistaken, while its gracious affections were alive, would be to belie itself; would be to contradict its strongest convictions, to forego its most earnest desires, to dry up its choicest pleasures.

There is the case of men who have become disabled in their business. Their creditors have claims upon them which they cannot now meet. Yet they hold on to their former style and habits of life. To live as before, maintaining their former rate of expenditure, as if nothing had happened, affords them

* It is supposed to be equally true, that the unbeliever will never become so attached to the believer as to desire marriage, so long as the believer appears distinctly and unequivocally in his true character. Let the young lady, to whom an impenitent person is proposing to pay his addresses, uniformly receive him in her distinctive character as a christian; let him perceive that, in his visits and conversation, religion is to be a prominent theme; let him see that she has become so the impersonation of piety, that there remains no opportunity to love her without loving religion, or to espouse her without espousing religion, and it is confidently believed that the sentiment alledged would prove true. It is only when the believer leaves religion behind, and comes out under the play of social qualities and attractions, that the unbeliever finds his attachments drawn upon, and his feelings enlisted.

† While we live, let us live.

more pleasure than they can get from discharging their duties to their creditors. They live on accordingly, and at an annual expense rising twice, three times, four times, as high as the measure of a strict and economical necessity. This, again, is a mistake, which a man with a renewed heart, and with gracious affections duly in exercise, will not run into. No part of the parade of life will be so dear to him, as the discharge of his moral duties. Let *this* man become disabled in his funds, and he will at once reduce his personal and family expenditures. He will not stop at the limits of what are commonly called the comforts of life. He will go further ;—he will lop off expenses, till he shuts himself up, and his family, to the narrower limits of the *necessaries* of life. To him, *right and wrong* are great ideas. They are not shadows ; they are not circumstances ; they are the great things of life or death to the soul. Give him the fellowship of the one, and the avoidance of the other, and his desire is answered ; he has his portion—even “ durable riches and righteousness.” Now the greater amount of just debt he is enabled, by these retrenchments, to discharge, gives him a higher pleasure, than could possibly be distilled out of all the display and equipage which wealth, or the affectation of wealth, could afford.

And when a man can pursue the opposite course, living in a large way, on funds that ought to go at once to the discharge of righteous debts, it may be known, and with the highest certainty, that his mind, if it has ever been renewed, has swerved from its spirituality ; that gracious affections are not duly in exercise in his soul ; and that himself is not in a state of acceptance with God.

I have time, in this connexion,* to mention but one thing more. In the fifth place, a man with a renewed mind, and under the influence of sanctified affections, can *never transform MORAL obligations into merely LEGAL ones*. So to confound

* Something further, of a kindred nature to these topics, may be offered hereafter. At least, it was the preacher's original intent to do this ; but sickness has prevented. It is hoped, should it be done, that what is here said, may prepare the minds of his people to attend, with increased carefulness and profit, to whatever may be added.

these, and so to bribe his own spirit, that, when the *legal* obligation is discharged, it shall seem, in his conscience, that the *moral* one is of course cancelled also,—this is quite beyond his reach.

The Bankrupt Law, made and provided by the Congress of the United States,* has been to my mind the source of great anxiety, not to say of dread. My anxieties have arisen, not so much from the obvious provisions and professed object of the law, as from the incidental and unavoidable openings, it must present, to fraud and knavery. Perhaps the law was as wisely conceived, and as effectually guarded, as it could be. Perhaps it is entitled to wash its hands of all the iniquities that may have been perpetrated under it. Still, that it should present *temptations* to fraud, was inseparable from its very existence.

Now what I want to say is, that neither the Congress of the United States, nor any government on the face of the earth, can *touch* the *moral* relations of debtor and creditor at all. These are relations, which governments have nothing to do with, unless it be to sanctify them. The claims of the creditor upon the debtor, as a thing of conscience, is what governments can neither blot out nor modify. After all the legislation that you can apply, there these claims stand, just as they were before, equally righteous, equally obligatory.†

* Gone though it is, its fruits remain.

† It may be said by some, that as the Constitution of the United States gives Congress the power to make Bankrupt Laws, and as the Constitution was adopted by the people—they freely consenting to subject themselves and their property to its operation, a Bankrupt Law, duly enacted, and duly applied, must be final—must, by common consent, have the effect to cancel all existing obligations, and set the debtor free. All this is plausible, but is it not sophistical? True, the people adopted the Constitution, and the Constitution invests Congress with the law-making power in this matter. But I have two questions to ask, before I can see that the law operates to absolve the debtor's conscience, and free him from further duty to his creditor.

The first is a question of interpretation. The people, it is said, adopted the Constitution; and in so doing they virtually engaged, that when a Bankrupt Law should be enacted, they would submit to its operation, and take the consequences. Now my question is, did they mean that they would submit to the operation of the law in the radical sense just claimed, or only in the limited sense taken of it in this discourse? Every man must answer for himself; but how any other than one answer can be given I see not.

My second question is this;—Suppose they did entertain the ultra view in question,—Suppose their intent, in the Constitution, was to provide for a Bankrupt Law that should reach the debtor's conscience and cancel his obligations *morally* as well as *legally*, and that this on all hands was to be the understanding;—did they not do an *unwarrantable* thing? According to this idea, they invested Congress with power to take the property, indefinitely, of a private citizen, without his consent—not for an authorized governmental purpose, in which case they need not ask his consent—and transfer it to another private citizen, with no reference to an equivalent. The men who adopted the Constitution could do this for themselves, if they saw fit; they could surrender to Congress,

The *legal* relations of debtor and creditor, are within the reach of governmental enactments. The claims of the creditor on the debtor, as a thing of law, governments can vacate. They can set the debtor free. But when they have done this, he still is held; his conscience is as strictly holden as before. There he is,—vacated though the legal claim may be—there he is, under a *moral* obligation to his creditor, as complete, in all its elements, as though the law had not been touched. From that obligation, the *creditor* can discharge him, on the principle that it is his right to ‘do what he will with his own,’ amenable only to God. If it is his pleasure to give up the claim, it is competent for him to do it, and the debtor is free—his conscience is free. Otherwise he is bound. Legislate as you will, he is bound. Rehearse the story of his calamities as you will, he is bound. Legislation cannot release him;—neither can earthquake, fire, or storm, by land or sea, stripping him ever so nakedly, release him. The obligation lives, and circulates through all the channels of his accountable spirit. It covers him, and his entire ability, through all the changes that ability may, by any contingency, undergo. If he conceals his ability, he sins. If he lessens his ability by needless expenses, either for himself or his family, he sins. If he neglects to increase his ability, in every warrantable way, the sooner to discharge his duty, he sins.

Now there are men, who will have it—so bleary-eyed have their spirits become—that when they are absolved from *legal* claims their *consciences* are of course no longer held. Their

without limitation, their right to hold private property; but could they do it for others—for posterity? The citizen's right to hold his own property is the real question involved. This right an individual may sell or give away, as he pleases. A score of men may sell it, or give it away, or surrender it to the will of the majority, because it is their right to do what they will with their own; but can they do it for their neighbors, their children? A man may sell himself, if he will, but can he sell the generations of his descendants? The men who came over the waters, and who here lifted up their voice, and demanded of the world the Right of Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness, were not the men to put the knife to the throat of their own demand. They were not the men to invest Congress with a power to vacate, at their own discretion, the righteous claims of the creditor upon the debtor, with the understanding, that it was to reach the debtor's conscience, and be final. This would be tantamount to a governmental power that should transfer private property from one citizen to another, at discretion, without consent, and without an equivalent. Grant that this were done by the men who demanded of the world the Right of Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness, and before they had reached their graves, their children would have made the same demand of them.—The Bankrupt Law was made, not to pay a man's debts, but to enable him to pay them; or else it was an insult to the moral nature of man.

idea is, that the Bankrupt Law, regularly applied, not only puts them out of the reach of their creditors, but really frees them from obligation, as actual payment would do. Not so does the man of a sterling and unblenched integrity, view the case. Not so at all, as I understand it, does the Law itself view the case. And, emphatically, not so at all does the man of a renewed mind, in the exercise of gracious affections, view the case. Far, far be it from him, so to confound *legal* obligation with *moral*, as to suppose that, with the blotting out of the one, the other is cancelled also. And *his* object, in resorting to the Bankrupt Law, is not to free himself from obligation to his creditors, but to put himself in a way to meet this obligation. He frees himself from the external obligation, only that he may the more effectually comply with the obligation felt and recognized within. The external obligation, his creditors—all jealous of each other, would be likely ever and anon to enforce, so as to break up his plans of business, and disable him from doing, in the way of payment, what otherwise he would succeed the sooner to do. His aim, therefore, in freeing himself from the external obligation, is that he may the better do his duty: that he may the sooner obey that obligation, which lives within; which is written upon the conscience of his renewed spirit; which binds him as with a sacramental oath; which is indestructible as his immortal nature; and which can be satisfied and appeased, whether in time or in eternity, only by being discharged.

And the Law itself, as I have intimated, is supposed to have the same view of the case. At least I would charitably hold myself to put that construction upon it. It proposes to discharge the debtor from his legal liabilities, so that his creditors may not annoy him by a frequent and untimely interference. It gives him his discharge, that he may have opportunity to go on, and do what, if he has a pure conscience, he will feel, after his discharge no less than before, that he *must* do,—nay, *must* do? Rather that it is his *privilege* to do. I say *privilege*; for the man who does not feel it a privilege, to be put in a way to pay his equitable debts—to be put in circumstances where, by rigid self-denial, and by straining every nerve, he may become able

to do it, is not fit for a place "on the Exchange"; *much less is he fit for a place in the CHURCH OF GOD.* God forbid, that the world should be cursed, and blighted, with the morality of men who pay their debts because the laws require it—because an external force compels them to it. Far be the thought from all our minds, that any such man, be his reputation and his professions what they may, can have claim to be regarded as a christian—a man renewed by the *Holy Ghost*, AND BEARING THE IMAGE OF GOD.

Out of many that might be named, I have mentioned five of the things which the renewed mind, with its gracious affections in exercise, will not do. Let your thoughts turn back upon them. Ponder; pray; get your spiritual vision clear; and then come to the question—I know it will make you tremble, yet come to the question;—How far are we, members of this church, clear in these matters? How far are we "without spot, and blameless," before God? I speak of the members of the Church. "For what have I to do, to judge them that are without?" I have, indeed, to feel a deep solicitude for them. I have, as Christ's ambassador, most earnestly to beseech them to become reconciled to God. I have, as a man at the altar, most anxiously to pray for them. But "what have I to do to judge" them. It is ours to "judge them that are within." "But them that are without, God judgeth." "And sooner or later," says Doddridge, "he will testify his awful displeasure against them." I repeat the question, then, how far are the members of this church clear in these matters? Shrink not from the assize. Does your heart condemn you? Remember God is greater than your heart, and knoweth all things. He knows how many things there are in your history, which your hearts have forgotten, yet which stand against you, and enter into the sentence of your condemnation.

If the positions in this discourse are true, are we not, in the first place, painfully driven to this reflection, as the most charitable view that can be taken in the case of many, *that their*

piety is low, even to the point of doubtfulness. The affections of the renewed mind, if indeed they have them at all, are exercised only at intervals, and to a limited extent. So smothered are they at times, as to leave the individual free, to follow the world, to be unequally yoked, in various ways, with unbelievers, to make a figure in life with gains ill-gotten or ill-retained, and to a lamentable extent to conform to the ways of the ungodly. Are we not driven to the reflection that their piety is questionable? Would not Paul, even in the exercise of that charity "which hopeth all things," feel obliged to say, "I stand in doubt of you."

But in the second place, are we not driven, in respect to some, to a more painful reflection still—even "*that they are not of us.*" Full of the anxious thoughts which this subject starts up in our minds, how oppressed we are with those words of the Saviour, "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven." He that saith "Lord, Lord," is the professed disciple. Not every one of these, says the Saviour, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven. Are we not shut up to the conviction that it is so? Call up again the thoughts we have had; carry them, as a test of character, through the circle of this church, and say if dark and boding fears do not start up, as to the prospects of some at least, who, if they are not "disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy," are yet endeavoring to "serve God and Mammon."

In the third place, does not the subject carry our reflections even to more painful lengths? Besides leading us to the afflictive thought that the piety of many is low, even to doubtfulness; and to the more afflictive thought, that *some* have no piety at all; does it not carry us farther, and make the number of graceless professors *large*? Does it not carry us along into the gloom and shade of those darker words of the Saviour, "*Many* will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name"? to whom he will say "I never knew you." Dis-

appointed at the Day of Judgment! Many disappointed! O let any other hope fail me;—let *every* other fail;—but let not the gate of heaven reject me. Let all earthly prospects melt away;—let life become waste, as a desert swept by the scorching Sirocco; or drear, as a rock mid-ocean, where the lost sea bird rests its weary wing;—but my *hope of heaven*,—let that abide. Strait, and narrow, and thorny, be the path of my pilgrimage, if needs it must; but when the judgment shall be set, and the books opened, let the voice to me be, “Come ye blessed of my Father.”—Disappointed at the Day of Judgment! *Many* disappointed! And who shall they be? Backslidden professor, inconsistent professor, irregular professor, slumbering professor, worldly professor, ambitious professor,—six, out of the two hundred and seventy five members who compose this church? And will you all be of that number? Let me tell you, when once you have reached the fatal goal, “your backslidings will correct you.” ‘Sin will find you out’; and ‘you will find sin to be hateful.’ O listen; in the brief interval of opportunity now passing, and before your light shall be forever put out, *listen*. A voice from heaven calls after you. It is the voice of forbearance; it is the voice of love. The same voice which says, “Cry aloud, spare not, show my people their transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins”; says also, “why should ye be stricken any more”? “Come now, and let us reason together; though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.” REPENTANCE! forbid that this voice should be in vain.

As we go to our homes, let this be our prayer;—“Deliver my soul from the wicked—from men of the world, which have their portion in this life, and whose belly thou fillest with thy hid treasure.” Let me “behold thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied, when I awake with thy likeness.”