

9030/14 17

The Nation:  
Its Relations and Duties to God.

---

A SERMON

PREACHED IN

THE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,

PITTSBURGH, PA.

ON THANKSGIVING DAY, NOV. 24, 1859.

BY

REV. WILLIAM M. PAXTON,  
Pastor.

PITTSBURGH:

PRINTED BY W. S. HAVEN, COR. MARKET & SECOND AND WOOD & THIRD STS.

1859.

PITTSBURGH, November 25th, 1859.

REV. WILLIAM M. PAXTON:

*Dear Sir*—Believing that the excellent and appropriate Sermon preached by you on Thanksgiving Day is peculiarly adapted to the present condition and wants of the community, and that the cause of Christ, and the best interests of society, will be promoted by its circulation, the undersigned most respectfully and earnestly solicit a copy of the same, for publication.

Very respectfully and truly yours,

JOHN A. CAUGHEY,	JOS. W. SPENCER,
ROBERT S. DAVIS,	S. G. DUNLAP,
JOHN D. M'CORD,	D. ROBINSON,
JNO. A. RENSHAW,	A. M. WALLINGFORD.
SAM'L. REA,	

---

PITTSBURGH, December 2d, 1859.

GENTLEMEN:

The Sermon which you request for publication, was prepared in great haste, under the pressure of many duties; but if you think that it is calculated to do good, I do not feel at liberty to withhold it.

Yours, very truly,

WM. M. PAXTON.

To Messrs. JOS. W. SPENCER, S. G. DUNLAP, D. ROBINSON, A. M. WALLINGFORD, JNO. A. CAUGHEY, and others.

## SERMON.

---

“How much owest thou unto my Lord?”

LUKE xvi. 5.

THESE words, you remember, occur in the parable of the Unjust Steward. It is not my purpose to explain the parable, or to enforce the lesson of individual responsibility; but to use these words as a stand point from which we may take a larger outlook upon our country's blessings, and estimate the obligation of these American States to the Gospel.

We are assembled this morning, in obedience to the call of the Chief Magistrate of this Commonwealth, to unite (as he expresses it,) “in praising God for His excellent greatness, and loving kindness toward us.” But, in order to perform this duty aright, we must first recount our mercies, estimate our obligations, calculate our indebtedness. “HOW MUCH OWEST THOU UNTO MY LORD?” What is the relation of this State or Nation to God, and how

much do we owe Him? This question is all the more apposite upon the present occasion, not only because the answer to it is calculated to deepen our gratitude and intensify our praise; but also because it touches one of the most important questions which now occupies the public mind, and upon the proper decision of which depends some of our dearest rights as Christians, and our fondest hopes as Patriots.

To this inquiry, "HOW MUCH OWEST THOU UNTO MY LORD?" when put to the State or Nation as a *body politic*, there are many ready to answer, "WE OWE HIM NOTHING." The state, say they, has nothing to do with religion; government being a social compact, conventional in its origin, and human in its principle, is properly restricted in the sphere of its operation to the outward material and secular interests of its subjects; and can, therefore, sustain no moral relations, and be influenced by no religious obligations or considerations whatever. The Constitution of the United States, they argue, was intended exclusively for *civil* purposes, and therefore does not contain even an allusion to the existence or providence of God. Hence, a commentator upon the Constitution, advocating this divorcement of religion from the government, says: "It was impossible to

introduce into the Constitution even an expression of gratitude to the Almighty for the formation of the present government.”

This whole theory of government—making civil society a mere conventional arrangement, originating in human device—is (as I shall show in the sequel,) false in its foundation principle, and evil in its tendencies; because it loosens the ties of human responsibility, and by ignoring God and His law, induces social and political atheism. But ruinous as it is, the theory has nevertheless become current, and is now embodied in the popular cry, “Keep religion out of politics;” “The government has nothing to do with religion.”

Planting themselves upon this principle, the opponents of the Sabbath say, that our government does not acknowledge God, and that therefore we owe Him nothing in the way of recognition or allegiance; that the state, as such, has no right to pass *Sunday laws*, and that all enforcements of this kind are violations of constitutional rights. Upon the same principle, the Romanists contend, that as the state is designed solely for civil purposes, it has no right to authorize the recognition of God, or the reading of the Bible, in its public schools.

Joining upon this point, in happy affinity with the Romanists and the opponents of the Sabbath, the Mormons and the advocates of "Free Love" maintain that the state has no right to enforce its present law of marriage. The idea, say they, that marriage can only legally exist between one man and one woman, is a distinctive peculiarity of the Christian system. It is not derived from any analogy in nature; it is not legitimately inferred from any peculiarity in our physical constitution; nor is it necessitated by the requirements of social propriety or expediency. It is a law, they affirm, which derives its authority from the Bible, and its prevalence from the usages and appointments of the Christian church. This being the case, they maintain, that to require obedience to such a law is to enforce religion, and thereby to interfere with the rights of conscience. What right, they ask, has a government which does not recognize any religion, to enforce a *purely Christian law*? The question is pertinent, and if this theory of government be true, unanswerable; for, if we have no right to enforce the observance of the Sabbath, then surely it is inconsistent to adopt and enforce the Christian law of marriage.

Upon this very same platform, we find the Deist and Atheist objecting to the administration of oaths, and to the enactment of laws for the punishment of vice. An oath, say they, is the most direct recognition of God—in his existence and providence—and of a future state of retribution. What right, they inquire, has a government which is purely human, and has nothing to do with religion, to require an oath, which is the most emphatic indorsement of religion.

But the Atheist, with entire consistency, carrying this principle still further, objects to all penal enactments for the suppression of crime. A government, he argues, which is purely secular in the sphere of its operations, and does not acknowledge a God, has no right to adopt and enforce the Moral Law. By the Constitution, I am guaranteed the most ample liberty as to religious opinion. Now, as an Atheist, I ignore God, and repudiate the Decalogue, and you violate this guaranteed immunity in my religious belief, if you compel me to obey it. If you reply, that these laws are enforced not upon the ground of their divine authority, but because they promote the best interests of society, he readily answers, that the received opinion about the best interests of society comes from the same source

from which the law does—the Bible—but in his judgment, such laws obstruct the regeneration of society, and that in this opinion the Constitution promises him toleration; but instead of this, the state re-enacts, and requires, under pains and penalties, obedience to a moral code which he rejects as evil. This, he complains, is an interference with his *conscience*, and a violation of his *constitutional liberty*. And so it is, if this theory of government is correct. If the state has no right to enforce the sanctification of the Sabbath, the Atheist may with great justice complain of the enforcement of the other statutes of the Decalogue, against theft, adultery and murder.

Here, then, you perceive, is a theory of government far reaching, and revolutionary in its results. Can it be true? Is it so, that as a State and Nation we owe nothing to God? Are you, as Christian citizens, willing to sit still, and permit such a principle to be forced upon you? If it is allowed to prevail in one case, as for example in regard to our Sunday laws, then what shall hinder the extension of the principle to the abolition of our penal code, to the overthrow of the marriage relation, to the suppression of days of public thanksgiving, to the ex-



trusion of God and the Bible from our system of public education, indeed to the obliteration of every feature and semblance of religion from the whole contour of our political organism.

These principles, too, are rife in many quarters. They are promulgated in their most specious guise by a portion of the public Press; they are seriously advocated by able counsel before your Supreme Court; and they will be strenuously pressed by infidel zealots and moneyed corporations upon the Legislature of the State during its present sessions.

A question involving so much, and reaching so far, demands our serious consideration. Putting away all that is local and circumstantial in its issues, let us look only at the principles involved.

To you, then, as Citizen Representatives of this State and Nation, I put the question—

“HOW MUCH OWEST THOU UNTO MY LORD?”  
Or in other words, WHAT IS THE RELATION OF THIS STATE AND NATION TO GOD, AND WHAT AND HOW MUCH DO WE OWE HIM?

The relations of a thing are determined by its nature. To ascertain, then, the relation of a nation to God, we must understand first, *what a nation is*. “A nation is not a mere aggregation of individuals,

a bare collection or collocation of men, women and children, having no other than personal relations to each other, and to God." "There may have been," says another, "a million, and there might have been many millions of men gathered together out of all civilized lands, at the world's great industrial exhibition at London; but that million, or those millions of men, were no nation." A nation, properly speaking, is an organism, with a unity of existence and life distinct from all others, and from the individuals of which it is composed. "A nation," says the same author, "is a people permanently united together in certain relations and by bonds of union, *as one body*." Hence a nation has both *unity* and *personality*. This is recognized by nations themselves in their dealings with each other, and in all their sovereign acts. A declaration of war, or a treaty of peace, binds every individual of both nations. Now in this *personal unit* the sovereignty of a nation is vested, and manifests itself in constitutions, laws, in matters of peace and war, in governments and governmental acts. *But whence are these powers of government derived?* That they are vested in, and exercised by the nation as a *body politic*, is plain; but whence do these powers come?

This is the great question, and just here is the point of divergence between the two leading theories of government. The one, is the CHRISTIAN THEORY ; the other, the SOCIAL COMPACT, or more properly, the ATHEISTICAL THEORY (for the absolute negation of religion is Atheism). Let us consider each of these theories, and the answers which they respectively give to the inquiry of the text.

*First.* THE SOCIAL COMPACT THEORY maintains (as we have already shown), that government is purely human in its origin—a conventional arrangement, by which each individual gives up so much of his natural liberty as may be necessary for the good of the whole ; that the power of the government is therefore derived from the nation itself, which can have no relation to any higher power, and therefore no moral character, no moral responsibility. The answer, then, which this theory gives to our question is, that the nation, as such, sustains no relation to God, and of course owes Him nothing.

If this theory is adopted, the effect will be deplorable. The public journals are already warning us of the practical result. We can have no Sabbath recognized by the state, for it sustains no relation to the God of the Sabbath. Public business of all

kinds must continue without interruption ; the offices in every department of the government must be open ; our courts of law must remain in session, and our state and national legislature must proceed with their deliberations upon the Sabbath just as on other days. As a consequence, all Christians will be excluded from official connection with the state. No God-fearing man can sit upon the tribunal of justice, for in administering the law of the nation he is violating the law of God, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy." For the same reason, no Christian can be a lawyer, or a representative in the state or national councils, or a public officer of any kind ; and "the whole legislative, executive and judicial power of the state and nation will be thrown into the hands of Jews, Infidels and Atheists." "Not religion, but irreligion will be the necessary qualification for posts of trust and power." In one word, the simple effect will be to disfranchise all the Christians in the land.

This theory of government has been fully tested as to its practical operation, and the Reign of Terror in France was the result. It was a practical attempt to divorce religion from the government, and in doing so to extinguish it altogether. Full well was it

known to the authors of that dark conspiracy against God and man, that they must tread out the last spark of gospel light, before their purposes could be accomplished. A crusade against the restraints of law and the moral obligations and securities of mankind could not be undertaken whilst the Gospel of Jesus Christ had any hold upon the responsibilities or faith of men. Hence they cried, "Down with it," "down with it even to the ground." And what was the result? History has not a page of more unrelieved or unmitigated blackness than that which tells the tale of the First French Revolution. Never were the powers of evil let loose upon society with such fierce and unbounded license. God was divorced from the nation—cast out from His seat upon the affections and allegiance of the people, whilst demon with demon, and passion with passion, contended for the vacant throne.

If, then, such is the answer, and such the practical operation of the answer which the one theory gives to our question, let us now turn to the other.

"HOW MUCH OWEST THOU UNTO MY LORD?" The CHRISTIAN THEORY answers, "*Everything.*" He is the great King, Lawgiver, Protector and Judge of Nations. Civil government, so far from being a mere

social compact, originating in human device, is, *as to its principle*, ordained by God, and *derives its powers* from Him, and Him alone. Its *relation* to God is that of dependence and subordination to His providence and law, and its *obligation* is that of recognition, allegiance and practical obedience. The proof of this theory to the Christian, and indeed to all who believe the Bible, is at once clear and positive.

In the 13th chapter of Romans, from the 1st to the 7th verse, the Apostle states and expounds this doctrine with a distinctness that precludes all doubt:

*“Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be, are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God.”* Vss. 1st and 2d.

From this it is plain that civil government is, as to its *principle*, no matter what may be its form, of divine appointment.

Verses 3d, 4th and 5th:—*“For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: for he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain:*

*for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake."*

Whilst government is of God, the form is of men. God has never enjoined any one form of government as obligatory upon all communities, but has simply laid down certain principles applicable to rulers and subjects under every form in which governments exist.

Verses 6 and 7 :—*"For this cause pay ye tribute also : for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues : tribute to whom tribute is due ; custom to whom custom ; fear to whom fear ; honor to whom honor.*

But in still more express language God challenges the prerogative of headship over the nations as peculiarly his own : *"By ME, kings reign and princes decree judgment."* *"By ME, princes rule, and nobles, even all the judges of the earth."* By this language He not only asserts his supreme kingship, but his immediate agency in the details of government—in commissioning rulers and judges. The Scriptures are full of His dealings with nations in their distinct national capacity. He creates them, and *"deter-*

*mines the bounds of their habitations.*" He governs them with supreme authority, setting up one and casting down another. Speaking to Israel, He says: "*I am the Lord your God, the Holy One, the creator of Israel, your King. I gave Egypt for thy ransom, and Ethiopia and Seba for thee.*" "*For your sakes I sent to Babylon and brought down all her nobles, and the Chaldeans, whose cry is in their ships.*" He here speaks as the only Potentate, holding nations at His absolute disposal.

But it is unnecessary to multiply proofs. God is, and *will be* acknowledged as the Governor among the nations. The doctrine is not only scriptural, but if time permitted, it might be easily shown that it has been held by the wise and great in all ages of the world. This doctrine, notwithstanding the infidel clamor about the neutrality of the Constitution, was manifestly held by our patriot fathers and the framers and sages of the Republic. The whole history of the Revolution is one continuous record of prayers and thanksgivings, of solemn fastings and humiliations, of appeals to Divine Providence and the God of Armies. "The Fathers of the Republic," says a historian, "knew nothing of politics, except through and by religion. In the councils, or in the



tented field, in colloquial or congressional assemblies, everywhere, religion and politics went hand in hand.”

Oh, shame upon the men who would divorce religion from that government to which it has been wedded by the prayers and cemented by the blood of their patriot sires. The Declaration of Independence opens with an expression of their desire to assume that “equal station among the powers of the earth, to which the laws of nature and of nature’s God entitle them” (thus recognizing Him as the God of Nations), and closes with an expression of their reliance upon Divine Providence, in which confidence, they pledged to each other “their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.”

One of the first acts of Congress, after the government was established, was to instruct the committee on commerce to import twenty thousand Bibles. Did this look like divorcing religion from the government, or as if they thought that the Bible had nothing to do with politics?

Judge Story in his Commentaries upon the Constitution of the United States says: “Probably at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, the general if not the universal sentiment in America was,

that Christianity ought to receive encouragement from the state, so far as is not incompatible with the private rights of conscience, and the freedom of religious worship." Again he says: "An attempt to level all religions, and to make it a matter of state policy to hold all in equal indifference, would have excited universal disapprobation, if not universal indignation."

Now from all these proofs, it is manifest beyond doubt, that the popular clamor for the extrusion of religion from the government is not only contrary to the word of God, but in direct violation of the principles which underlie our national organism, and the views and feelings of those who purchased liberty, for the sake of religion, at the expense of toil, treasure and blood. The simple fact is, that our civil institutions, springing from the religious principles of our ancestors, are so interpenetrated and moulded by religion, as the generic and formative influence from which they receive their whole contour and expression, that it is impossible, without violence, to separate the one from the other. But even if such unnatural disunion were possible, then the other proofs which I have adduced show that it would be utterly impracticable; for if civil

government is an ordinance of God, deriving its power from Him alone, then it manifestly follows, that to separate religion from the government would be the act of an executioner who severs the *body politic* from its *living head*; it would cut off the state from the fountain of its life and power, and it would take from the judicial and executive arm the authority by which it wields its influence and enforces its decrees.

In one word, to ignore God, and divorce religion, is to take our position as a government in that anti-christian confederation (described in prophecy) of nations and "kings of the earth who set themselves, and rulers who take counsel together, against the Lord, and against his anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us." And what shall be the result? The Spirit of Truth forewarns us, "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision. He shall speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure. He will break them with a rod of iron, and dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel."

Such, then, we believe, is the true relation of this Nation to God; it is the *relation of a subject to his*

*Lord; and as a consequence we owe Him public official recognition, hearty grateful allegiance, and practical submission to His providence and laws.*

Having now ascertained our personal relation as a Nation to God, let us endeavor to estimate our obligations as a Nation to His *religion*.

I therefore put the inquiry of the text a second time—"HOW MUCH OWEST THOU UNTO MY LORD?" What is the indebtedness of these American States to *the Gospel*? How much of all our privileges, blessings and distinctions, do we owe to religion? As inheritors of this noble patrimony; as dwellers under the shadow of an equal law; as enriched with a commerce, which allies us with the most distant extremities of the earth; as honored in the great brotherhood of nations for our literature, our science, our vanguard position in all the ennobling arts of life; as rich in agencies for promoting the physical and moral happiness of all classes of people; as enjoying a liberty of thought and conscience, free as the winds that sweep through our mountain gorges; as holding a position of ascendancy, and exercising a governing power over the opinions of other nations, which controls in a measure the

issues of the world—for how much of such blessings are we indebted to the religion of the Gospel?

Let me answer, in a few particulars.—

1st. *We owe to the religion of the Gospel the original occupation and settlement of this land.*

On the shore of New England, Plymouth rock stands as the record of the occupation of this broad heritage in the name of religion, and as “the memorial of separation from the hoary iniquities of the old world.” As, in imagination, we see the knees of our Pilgrim Fathers bowed around that “altar of national consecration,” we inquire, “whence came they, and what brought them to that rock-bound shore?” Ah! it was a stern religious necessity. It was love for a Gospel, which they could not enjoy under the pitiless reign of kings and priests. Crushed beneath the weight of “thrones and altars, welded together and heaped upon them,” they arose in the quickened majesty of outraged nature, and sought and found the liberty of the sons of God, beneath the shade of this boundless wilderness.

2d. *We owe to the Gospel the spirit of liberty which secured for us this heritage of freedom.*

As you have rejoiced in the immunities of our free

institutions, as contrasted with the thralldom of the old world, have you ever inquired whence this spirit of liberty came? *It came from the Gospel.* It was the spark struck by the Reformation, and as it entered into the deep spirit of man, and caught from breast to breast, and from land to land, thrones rocked, and the brows of tyrants turned to ashes. For centuries the spirit of liberty had been almost banished from the earth. The pitiless tyranny of priests had fettered the minds, and enslaved the souls, whilst the despotism of kings had reduced the bodies of the great suffering mass to a state of abject bondage. But, when Divine Providence restored the Bible, and the Divine Spirit opened to the people its "perfect law of liberty," mitred ignorance could no longer maintain its ascendancy over minds that understood the "liberty wherewith Christ had made them free." The distinguishing principle of the Reformation was, "*that the mind and conscience of the individual are responsible to God alone*"—THE PRINCIPLE OF INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY AND INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY. This great principle, originating in the sphere of religious experience, as the result of a new apprehension of the truth of God, wrought its first revolutions in the church; but as it was just as

applicable in the sphere of civil as in that of religious liberty, it soon began to work like leaven in the state. The mind and the conscience once disenthralled, social and political freedom must of necessity follow. Accordingly, as the outgrowth of this principle, came Cromwell, the Puritans, and the constitutional liberties of England, and then, as its fuller and higher development, the American Revolution, and this glorious Republic, with its vivifying and hallowing influence upon the world. To the Gospel, then, we owe the spirit that achieved our independence, and the luxuriant outgrowth of immunities which we now enjoy—the freedom of the press; toleration of opinion; liberty of speech; the elective franchise; the privileges of scientific inquiry and experiment; together with that rich bloom and ripe fruitage of Christian literature, which adorns and sanctifies the whole age in which we live.

3d. *We owe to the Gospel all the ameliorating influences of benevolence*—our institutions for relieving the miseries and necessities of life; our agencies for promoting the physical and moral happiness of all classes of people; providing for the young, the old, the fallen, the outcast—for the poor a shelter, and for the sick a home. All this is peculiar to the re-

ligion of the Gospel. This principle of generous working benevolence did not enter into any of the systems of ancient philosophy, nor is its benign influence ever witnessed in actual life, save where that life has been either directly or remotely influenced by the religion of the Bible. Athens and Corinth, where ancient philosophy and religion received their ultimate development, contained no hospitals, no asylums, no public charities. Among the monuments of Rome's ancient magnificence, her love of show may be seen in her yet majestic amphitheatre; tottering columns tell of the might of her conquests; and the stretching aqueduct of her scientific skill; but where, amidst all these clusters of sublime decay, can be found the ruins of a hospital for the sick, an asylum for the blind, or a single inscription telling you "here misery found a home, here want a friend." No, these are Gospel triumphs, telling us how much we owe our Lord.

4th. *We owe to the Gospel our preservation from destruction in times past, and our hope of continuance in time to come.*

God, as the King of Nations, plants and destroys, builds up one nation and pulls down another. The law according to which He acts in so doing, He gives



us by the mouth of the prophet: "The nation or the kingdom that will not serve Him shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted." History shows how fully this law has been executed. The Canaanites, the Egyptians, the Babylonians, the Persians, the Grecians, and the Romans, would not serve God, and they have perished; have been utterly wasted. God in His providence made some of these kingdoms instrumental in bringing about each other's destruction. He prompted the Persians to destroy the power of the Babylonians—He raised up Cyrus, king of Persia, for this very purpose. He prompted the Grecians to destroy the power of the Persians, and the Romans to destroy the power of the Grecians. The simple truth, in the light of God's word, is this: "The kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ;" and those kingdoms that will not serve Christ must be destroyed, to make way for those that will. The kingdom of Christ will, sooner or later, swallow up all other kingdoms, and destroy every power and combination of powers arrayed against it.

Now, under the operation of this sure law of the divine administration, it is plain that nothing ever has, or ever will save a nation from destruction, but

the leaven of the Gospel permeating and sanctifying the mass.

It follows, therefore, under the operation of this law, that to religion we owe our preservation from ruin in time past, and our present position of prominence and ascendancy among the nations of the earth. This, too, is our hope for the future. Look into the pages of history, and you will not find a single nation that has ever fallen or declined, that has served God faithfully. Let, then, religion be deeply embedded in the hearts of the people, let it transfuse and vivify the masses of our population; let God be enthroned by public official recognition, as the Head, Lawgiver, Protector of the Nation, and let the government, as such, discharge its obligations of allegiance and practical service, and our country is safe—safe, because anchored upon that Rock against which the “gates of hell shall not prevail.”

In view, then, of all these considerations, “**HOW MUCH OWEST THOU UNTO MY LORD?**” Time would fail to tell. These are only a few of countless items in an inventory of indebtedness, which might be lengthened till numbers fail.

As a Nation, we owe him everything.

If, then, such are the obligations of America to the Gospel, *shall we divorce it?* After all that religion has done “to build up and bestow the foundations of our unrivaled immunities, shall it now be dismissed, like Hagar, into the wilderness, with a loaf of bread and a bottle of water to shift or die as she can?” In our supposed manhood, shall we now turn out the mother that has given us birth and nourished us to our present vigor? Oh, shame upon the mind that ever conceived the thought, and palsied be the arm that would perpetrate the deed.

Finally: If such are our obligations to the Gospel, how deep should be our gratitude, and how lively the song of thanksgiving, with which we this day recognize and record the multitude of our mercies. As we set up in conspicuous places the statues of heroes and patriots, who have deserved well of their country, thus upholding their memory, and inciting others to imitation; so should we, as it were, in the loftiest, securest apartments of the soul, erect mementoes of the gracious dealings of Providence, that our spirits, surveying these records of mercies, may be kept always attuned to praise. For such hallowed *mementoes*, how abundant are

the materials by which we are this day surrounded. Blessings in boundless profusion, and in richest variety, all clustering with memories of loving kindness, strew our pathway. Blessings so wide, so precious, so wonderful, that, as we inscribe the record, the eye moistens and the heart bounds with grateful exultation. Personal, domestic, social, national blessings, all coming to us in the channel of the GOSPEL, growing up to us under the shadow of the CROSS, and preserved and ministered to us this day, in their ripened luxuriance, by a *gracious and sanctified* PROVIDENCE. Surely,

“He hath not dealt so with any nation.”