

LIBRARY OF  
THE  
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY  
AT  
THE

# RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

## EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

DEVOTED TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMATION, AS SET FORTH IN  
THE FORMULARIES OF THE WESTMINSTER DIVINES, AND  
WITNESSED FOR BY THE

ASSOCIATE SYNOD OF NORTH AMERICA.

REV. JAMES MARTIN,  
*Editor and Proprietor.*

### VOLUME XV.

---

Thus saith the Lord, stand ye in the ways and see and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls.—*Jer. vi. 16.*

---

ALBANY:

PRINTED BY HOFFMAN & WHITE.

1838-9.

Recd. 1718.55  
v. 15

1838-1839

THE  
**RELIGIOUS MONITOR,**  
AND  
**EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.**

---

JUNE, 1838.

---

**MINUTES**

*Of the Associate Synod of North America, at their Meeting in Philadelphia, May 23, 1838, and continued by adjournment, being their Thirty-Seventh Annual Meeting.*

The Synod met pursuant to adjournment, and was constituted with prayer by the Rev. Abraham Anderson, Moderator.

**MEMBERS PRESENT.**

[Those members whose names are marked thus (\*) were not present at the opening of Synod.]

*Of the Presbytery of Cambridge.*

**MINISTERS.**

Mr. Stalker,  
Dr. Bullions,  
Messrs. Miller,  
Anderson,  
A. Gordon,  
Goodwillie,  
Pringle,  
D. Gordon.

**ELDERS.**

Messrs. Nicolas Robertson,  
James Lourie,  
Gilbert Robertson,  
John McClelland,  
Adam Darling,  
William Gilkerson,  
George Smith,  
Andrew Martin.

*Of the Presbytery of Albany.*

**MINISTERS.**

Mr. Stark,

Dr. P. Bullions,  
Messrs. Martin,  
Campbell,  
Blair,  
\*Graham.

**ELDERS.**

Messrs. John Edwards,  
Robert Crookshanks,  
James Maxwell,  
James Smeallie,  
John A. Gilmore,  
\*John Elliott.

*Of the Presbytery of Philadelphia.*

**MINISTERS.**

Messrs. John Adams,  
Smart,  
Webster,  
Wm. Easton,  
\*McGill,  
\*McNaughton.

**ELDERS.**

James Wilson,

Joseph R. Dickson,  
Wm. S. Young,  
\*Samuel Johnston,  
\*Ezekiel Bullock,  
\*Wm. Morris,  
\*Thos. C. Collins.  
*Of the Presbytery of the Carolinas.*

MINISTERS.

Messrs. White,  
Thompson,

ELDERS.

Jesse Scott.  
*Of the Presbytery of Miami.*

MINISTERS.

Messrs. Heron,  
\*Templeton,

\*Wilson,  
\*Wallace,  
\*Kendall,  
\*Adams.

ELDERS.

Messrs. George Galloway,  
\*Archibald Collins.

*Of the Presbytery of Muskingum.*

MINISTERS.

\*Messrs. Walker,  
\*Hanna,  
McKee.

ELDERS.

Messrs. Thomas McCall,  
Robert Taggart.

*Of the Presbytery of Ohio.*

MINISTERS.

Messrs. Patterson,

\*Douthett,  
\*Goodwillie.

ELDERS.

Hugh Arthurs.

*Of the Presbytery of Chartiers.*

MINISTERS.

\*Dr. Ramsay,  
Messrs. Beveridge,  
\*McElwee,  
\*Rodgers.

ELDERS.

Messrs. Samuel Livingston,  
James Reid,  
\*John McNary.

*Of the Presbytery of Alleghany.*

MINISTERS.

\*Dr. Bruce,  
Messrs. Blair,  
\*Scroggs,  
\*Galbraith.

ELDERS.

Messrs. Wm. Bell,  
\*Wm. Bruce.

*Of the Presbytery of Shenango.*

MINISTERS.

Messrs. D. McLane,  
\*France.

ELDERS.

Messrs. James Mason,  
\*Barnard Gilliland.

*Of the Presbytery of Stamford.*

None.

Mr. Ferrier, a minister without charge, was also present.

Notice was given by the Moderator and Clerk of Cambridge Presbytery, that Dr. Bullions and Mr. Stalker were deposed, and the congregations of Cambridge and North Argyle refused a representation in Presbytery, being in a state of rebellion against their authority. Notices were also given by two members claiming to be Clerks of the Presbytery of Albany, that Dr. P. Bullions was suspended from the exercise of the ministry; Messrs. Martin and Campbell from their seats in Presbytery.

After some time spent in discussion respecting the Roll, it was on motion. Resolved, That the usual hour of meeting in the morning shall be 9 o'clock, of adjournment half past 12, and of meeting in the afternoon 3. Adjourned till 9 o'clock to-morrow morning. Closed with prayer.

*Thursday, May 24th.*

The Moderator having preached last evening from Matth. xxviii. 20—\*Teaching them to observe all things," &c. The Synod this day met, pursuant to adjournment, and was opened with prayer by the Moderator.

Members present as above, together with Messrs. Adams, Kendall, Templeton, Wilson and Wallace, ministers, Mr. Archibald Collins, ruling elder, of the Presbytery of Miami.

Messrs. John Adams and McNaughton, ministers, S. Johnston, ruling elder, of the Presbytery of Philadelphia.

Messrs. Walker and Hanna, ministers, of the Presbytery of Muskingum, Mr. Douthett, minister, of the Presbytery of Ohio.

Mr. D. McLane, sen., minister, and Mr. James Mason, ruling elder, of the Presbytery of Shenango.

Dr. Bruce and Mr. Joseph Scroggs, ministers, of the Presbytery of Alleghany.

Dr. Ramsay, Messrs. Rodgers and McElwee, ministers, Mr. John McNary, ruling elder, of the Presbytery of Chartiers.

Messrs. Wm. Bell, from Alleghany, and Ezekiel Bullock, from Carlisle, ruling elders, being present, were on motion, invited to a seat.

The minutes of yesterday's sitting were read and corrected.

Information was given by the Clerk of the Presbytery of Miami, that said Presbytery had suspended Rev. J. Adams until a charge pending against him be tried; against which act of Presbytery Mr. Adams had protested and appealed to Synod.

The following Resolution was then offered, and after discussion, adopted, viz :

*Resolved*, That whereas, information has been given to this Synod, that there are reports from two bodies claiming to be the Presbytery of Albany, all the members of Albany Presbytery present claiming a seat, be excluded from taking part in the business of this Synod, until the rest of the roll be made out, and that the case of that Presbytery be first taken up.

From this decision Mr. Heron craved his dissent to be marked. Dr. P. Bullions, together with Messrs. Stark, H. H. Blair, Goodwillie, Crookshanks and Gilmore protested against said decision. Dr. A. Bullions gave notice that he claimed his seat in Synod, and protested against his exclusion from a seat, for reasons to be given in.

On motion it was resolved that the reading of the minutes of last year be dispensed with, on the ground that they had been read and approved previous to publication.

Mr. Walker was chosen Moderator.

According to a resolution already adopted by Synod, proceeded to consider the case of the Presbytery of Albany. Papers connected with the case were read, but the documents not being all present, it was on motion, resolved to postpone the further consideration of the business till the commencement of the afternoon sitting.

Adjourned till the usual hour. Closed with prayer.

*3 o'clock, P. M.*

Synod met and was opened with prayer. Members present as above, together with Mr. William Morris, ruling elder from the Session of Baltimore. The minutes of the forenoon sitting were read and corrected. On the question of approving the minutes, a motion was made and carried to strike out the words "in the name of said Presbytery," in the protest of certain brethren, recorded in the minutes of the forenoon sitting. Against this decision the following members entered their protest, viz: Dr. P. Bullions, Messrs. Stark, Ferrier, H. H. Blair, Pringle, Edwards, Crookshanks and Gilmore.

Resumed the consideration of the case of the Presbytery of Albany. Some further documents were read. The members of the Presbytery of Albany were then partially heard, and the Synod adjourned till the usual hour to-morrow morning. Closed with prayer.

*Friday, May 25.*

Synod met and opened with prayer. Members present as above, together with Mr. France, minister, and Barnard Gilliland, ruling elder

from the Presbytery of Shenango, Mr. Galbraith, minister, William Bruce, ruling elder of the Presbytery of Alleghany, Mr. D. Goodwillie, minister of the Presbytery of Ohio, and Mr. A. T. McGill, of the Presbytery of Philadelphia.

Mr. Stalker claimed his seat in Synod. The Moderator having decided that Mr. Stalker is not entitled to a seat, being reported by the Cambridge Presbytery as deposed. An appeal was taken by Mr. Stalker from the Moderator's decision, but not sustained. Mr. Stalker then protested against the exclusion.

On motion resolved, that Synod will, instead of receiving papers, proceed with the business left unfinished last evening. Against this decision Mr. H. H. Blair protested; in this he was joined by Dr. P. Bullions, Messrs. Stark and Edwards. The members of the Presbytery of Albany were then heard in continuation, and removed. The following preamble and resolutions were offered for consideration, viz :

Whereas, it appears that Mr. Stark had been justly excluded from a seat in the Associate Presbytery of Albany, on the ground of his having declined their authority, which declinature he had also refused to withdraw; whereas the protestors against his exclusion, by withdrawing their protest, left his exclusion confirmed; and they had no right to review or reverse the deed of Presbytery; and whereas, Mr. Stark's illegal admission to a seat, vitiated all their proceedings.—Therefore

*Resolved*, That the party of which he was a member is not the Associate Presbytery of Albany, but was irregular in their constitution and all their acts null and void.

And whereas Dr. P. Bullions was under process for scandal, he had no right to accuse; and therefore the decision excluding from seats in the Associate Presbytery of Albany, Messrs. Martin and Campbell is null and void. Therefore

*Resolved*, That the body of which Messrs. Martin and Campbell are members, is truly the Associate Presbytery of Albany.

While these resolutions were under consideration, the Synod adjourned till the usual hour; Dr. P. Bullions and others having first requested extracts from the minutes of Synod in the cases in which they had protested, which request was granted. Closed with prayer.

3 o'clock P. M.

The Synod met, and was opened with prayer. Members present as above. The minutes of the forenoon sitting were read and approved.

Proceeded with the consideration of the resolutions under discussion in the forenoon. In the progress of the discussion Mr. D. Blair was understood as saying that "Mr. Stark's great error, (if he were the author of these pamphlets) was, that he told the truth in too plain and sharp a manner." Mr. Anderson called for the recording of the word, and the Synod sustained the call. After considerable discussion, but before going through the roll, the Synod adjourned till 8 o'clock this evening. Closed with prayer.

8 o'clock, P. M.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer. Members present as above, together with Mr. Thos. C. Collins, ruling elder from the Presbytery of Philadelphia. The minutes of last sitting were read and approved.

Resumed the consideration of the resolutions left under discussion at the close of last sitting. Before going through the roll the Synod adjourned till the usual hour to-morrow morning. Closed with prayer.

*Saturday, May 26th.*

The Synod met and was opened with prayer. Members present as above. The minutes of last sitting were read and approved.

Resumed the consideration of the subject left under consideration last evening. After a free discussion the previous question was moved and carried; and the question being put "adopt the resolutions under consideration or not?" it was carried "adopt," by the following vote:

*Ayes*—Dr. Ramsay, Messrs. A. Gordon, Anderson, Miller, Scroggs, Beveridge, Smart, McNaughtan, W. Easton, Hanna, Templeton, Wilson, Wallace, Kendall, Jas. Adams, D. Gordon, McGill, McElwee, Webster, McKee, Patterson, *ministers*; G. Robertson, McClelland, Darling, Martin, Wilson, Young, McCall, Taggart, Arthurs, Reid, A. Collins, Johnston, Bullock, McNary, Morris, *ruling elders*—36.

*Noes*—Mr. D. McLane, sen., Dr. Bruce, Messrs. Heron, D. Blair, France, Ferrier, Whyte, Thompson, T. Goodwillie, Pringle, Galbraith, D. Goodwillie, Rodgers, *ministers*; Gilkerson, Smith, Scott, Livingston, Mason, Bell, Gilliland, Bruce—*ruling elders*—21.

The Moderator craved to have it recorded that he voted in the affirmative.

Against the above decision, Messrs. Whyte, Heron, Ferrier, Thompson, France, Scott, Gilkerson, D. Goodwillie, Rodgers, McLane, Smith, T. Goodwillie, Mason, Pringle, Gilliland, Galbraith, D. Blair and Livingston, entered their protest.

Dr. Bruce gave notice that he craved the privilege of protesting, if he shall see cause.

Notice was then given by Mr. Martin, as Clerk of the Presbytery of Albany, that said Presbytery had suspended Dr. P. Bullions from the office of the ministry, and Mr. Stark from a seat in Presbytery.

The following standing committees were appointed, viz:

*Committee of Supplies*—Messrs. S. Wilson, McElwee, Hanna, Martin, Scroggs, D. Goodwillie, D. McLane, sen., D. Gordon, W. Easton and Thompson.

*Of Bills and Overtures*—Messrs. A. Gordon, Hanna and Kendall.

*On the Funds*—Messrs. Miller and Morris.

*On the Theological Seminary*—Dr. Ramsay and Messrs. Beveridge and Rodgers.

*On Appeals*—Messrs. Beveridge, McNaughton and Smart.

*On Missions*—Dr. Bruce, and Messrs. A. T. McGill and W. Easton.

*To transcribe the Minutes*—Messrs. D. Gordon and Smart.

Certain brethren of the Presbytery of Albany gave in a written protestation against the Synod's decision adopting the resolutions in reference to said Presbytery. This protestation was, on motion, laid on the table for the present.

Papers being called for, the following were given in and read, viz:

No. 1. The Report of the Presbytery of Stamford, which was, on motion, referred to the committee of Supplies.

*Report of the Presbytery of Stamford.*

Our settled congregations appear to continue in their usual state. We were filled with joy by the appointment of Synod in making a liberal supply for our vacancies. It is with regret that we have to say, that, as on many former occasions, it was not realized to the extent intended or hoped. Mr. Banks failed to appear within our bounds. If the reasons which he has to assign may satisfy Synod, we cannot object; but we trust that in making any further appointment, such a selection will be made as to secure us as much as possible from a similar misfortune. Synod must be aware of the injury inflicted on our cause by such disappointments.

We did not receive the copies of the Testimony which Synod granted, and which were to be brought by Mr. Banks. This was an additional injury. The demand for them increases, and they are greatly needed among us.

We are happy to report that Mr. McGill came into our bounds in proper time, and that his services were highly acceptable, and we trust were likewise profitable. He preached four Sabbaths in Chingacousey and Caledon, and six in London, and the Fastday appointed by Synod.

In Chingacousey where Mr. Coutts also has preached occasionally for a year past, a congregation has been organized. A petition has been presented from Caledon to be organized, and to receive supply. Our congregation in London still desires supply, and is willing to make every exertion to defray the expense. We are sorry to have to add, that from the want of adequate supply, some other places from which we have applications, and where good hope of success might be entertained, still remain unvisited by your missionaries. We therefore hope that Synod will consider our wants, and will be pleased to send on the supply that may be granted, as early in the season as possible. Indeed, it were desirable in our urgent necessity, if Synod could spare the supply, and if the expense were not too great, while there are other calls upon the bounty of our people, to have a permanent missionary among us throughout the year, or as much supply at certain seasons as might be equivalent to this.

We hope allowance will be made to Mr. McGill for the Fast day besides the rest of the balance, considering the expense to which he was subjected from his extensive travels. He received eight dollars in Chingacousey and Caledon, thirty-six in London, and twelve from the Treasurer of our Presbytery.

JAMES STRANG, *Moderator.*

No. 2. The Report of the Presbytery of Muskingum, which was, on motion, referred to the committee of Bills and Overtures.

*Report of the Presbytery of Muskingum.*

In presenting to Synod our annual report, we have to record the loving kindness of the Lord, and his great goodness to this portion of our Israel. Peace, and a high degree of harmony in the maintenance of our witnessing profession, continues to prevail. Our congregations, generally, are increasing in numbers, and ordinances dispensed by us are not without some tokens of the blessing of the Holy Spirit.

Our expectations of additional ministerial aid in the settlement of Mr. Samuel Douthett among us, have been disappointed by his early removal from the church below. He died soon after the last meeting of Synod, without being permitted to visit the congregations whose call he had accepted. Mr. Joseph McKee was ordained and installed Pastor of the congregations of Wooster and Dover, in September last. The supply allotted us by Synod has been generally received, and seems to have been greatly blessed for encouraging our numerous vacancies. Several calls are now in readiness, which we wish disposed of as early as practicable, viz: One from the congregations of McMahan's Creek and Belmont, for Mr. Samuel McArthur, one from Truro, (formerly a part of Mr. Lindsey's charge,) for Mr. Robert Forrester, one from Clear Creek, Mohican and Killbuck for the same candidate, and one from Cambridge, Claysville and Clear Fork, for Mr. James McGill. These calls we submit to Synod with the request that they be presented to the candidates respectively, for acceptance.

Presbytery have had under consideration the overture of a book of discipline, and agreed to submit to Synod the following resolution respecting it:

*Resolved,* That said book of discipline be recommitted to the committee originally reporting it for further amendment.

As there is no definite geographical line between us and the Presbytery of Ohio, in consequence of which difficulties may arise between us, we respectfully ask the Synod to grant such a line as may appear to be just and equitable.

As our numbers have increased and the greater part of our vacancies are remote from the usual places of meeting, Presbytery agreed to ask the Synod for a division, and the erection of a new Presbytery, making the Tuscarawas and Muskingum rivers the line; and that all that part of this Presbytery lying west and north of these rivers, be organized into a new Presbytery to be called the Presbytery of Richland.

By order,

THOMAS HANNA, *Presbytery Clerk.*

No. 3. The Report of the Presbytery of Miami, which was, on motion, referred to the committee of Bills and Overtures.

*Report of the Presbytery of Miami.*

In presenting our report we have doubtless something to record of the loving kindness of the Lord to this portion of our church, but mingled with much that calls for lamentation. Ordinances are generally, throughout our bounds, attended with an encouraging degree of punctuality, and we trust those committed to our care, are, under these means, advancing in holiness. But we have to lament that want of unanimity and harmony among both ministers and people, of which others of our brethren have so long complained. We would gratefully record our increase in ministerial aid since our last report. Mr. William Bruce, who accepted from Synod at its last meeting, a call from the Associate congregation of Bethel, was, after the usual trials being heard and sustained, solemnly ordained to the holy office of the gospel ministry on the 20th of July last, and installed pastor of said congregation on the 25d of October.

Two calls, one from the United Associate congregations of Poplar Ridge, Plainfield, Kenton and Roundhead, for Mr. James Dickson, and the other from the congregation of Raccoon for the same candidate, having been received and sustained, were presented to Mr. Dickson, and that from Raccoon accepted. After the usual trials being heard and sustained, Mr. Dickson was, the 9th of November last, solemnly ordained and installed Pastor of said congregation.

Notice has been duly given Presbytery by two of its members, the Messrs. Bruce, that they intend petitioning Synod to be erected into a distinct Presbytery. To the object of these brethren we do not object, but would represent that we believe the interests of our church in their bounds, require that their prayer be granted.

At a late meeting it was resolved also that Presbytery will, and they hereby accordingly do petition Synod for the erection of another distinct Presbytery, to be called the Presbytery of Indiana, and bounded by the boundary lines of the State of Indiana.

The subject of slavery still continues with us a subject of contention. Two appeals have been taken against decisions of Presbytery on this subject, since your last meeting. These appeals, together with the necessary accompanying documents, will be handed in in due time. The report of a committee of Massies Creek Session, to converse with the Fergusons, slaveholders, in whose case an appeal has been lying on your table since last meeting, was presented to Presbytery during the past season for the purpose of transmission to Synod, to appear with the other papers in the case of the above appeal. It is herewith forwarded accordingly.

The subject of *occasional hearing* was some time since brought up before Presbytery by three several memorials. These memorials, together with certain resolutions on the subject adopted by Presbytery, are herewith referred to Synod, with the urgent request that Synod will speedily take such measures as will be promotive of greater uniformity in practice throughout our church on this subject.

It having been ascertained that reports charging our brother, Rev. J. Adams, with the sin of intoxication, were in extensive circulation, Presbytery did, at its last meeting, resolve to investigate these charges, and that Mr. Adams be suspended from the exercise of the ministry and the communion of the church, until this investigation takes place. Against this decision, suspending him, Mr. Adams protested, and appealed to Synod. The papers in this case will in due time be laid on your table.

Appeals have been taken from a decision of Presbytery in the case of a complaint preferred against one of our number for marrying persons in our communion in the way of violating the Synod's rule respecting the publication of banns; also from a decision of Presbytery sustaining an appeal by Thomas White from a decision of the Session of Sugar Creek, adjudging him to censure for being married in the way of disregarding the above rule. An appeal has also been taken by Messrs. David Jackson and Archibald Collins, from a decision of Presbytery in a case of the former of these appellants, (D. Jackson.) These appeals with the accompanying papers, will in due time be presented.

The subject of foreign missions continues to engage the attention of Presbytery. A memorial on this subject to Synod from Presbytery, will be presented, to which the speedy attention of Synod is requested.

We have made some progress in examining the overture on the book of discipline, but still we are not prepared to report any definite amendments, owing to the small number of copies of the draft in our bounds. The report of a select committee of Presbytery on this subject, is herewith laid before you.

At a late meeting, the charge of Rev. T. S. Kendall was divided into two separate charges. Fork Creek comprising one, and Pistol Creek and Big Spring the other pastoral charge. Mr. Kendall has been located in Fork Creek, and the other congregations are thrown on our hands as a vacancy.

Much of the supply allotted us at the last meeting of the Synod has not been received, in consequence of which our vacancies have suffered much. This is especially true in regard to the southern part of our Presbytery. The most of our congregations there have had no supply for a year past, and some have had none for eighteen months. Owing to a variety of causes, it is with the utmost difficulty we can prevail on probationers to visit that portion of our Presbytery. To prevent the sustaining of such loss in future, on the part of this portion of our Presbytery, it was resolved at a late meeting that we petition Synod, which we hereby accordingly do, in making out the scale of appointments, to make separate appointments on behalf of Tennessee, south-eastern Virginia and Alabama.

Presbytery having been informed by Mr. James A. Brown, student of theology during the course of the past season, that he could not attend the Hall the then coming session, and having asked him for reasons of non-attendance, and considered them as satisfactory, one of our number was appointed a committee to superintend his studies. The report of this committee, and the exercises delivered by him before Presbytery, afford gratifying evidence of commendable diligence and improvement. A liberal portion of supply is earnestly requested.

Respectfully submitted, SAMUEL WILSON, *Presbytery Clerk.*

No. 4. The Report of the Presbytery of the Carolinas, which was, on motion, referred to a select committee, consisting of Messrs. A. Gordon and Wallace.

*Report of the Presbytery of the Carolinas.*

Since we last reported to you our situation, no changes worthy of mention have taken place. Our congregations, settled and vacant, amidst all their discouragements, still maintain their adherence to Presbytery, and if the same fostering care was extended which they once enjoyed, would doubtless flourish. The appointments made by last Synod, filled the hearts of our people with joy, but as on former occasions, we were doomed to disappointment. Mr. Smart, who was expected to commence his labors in August, did not reach the bounds till September, having been detained a month by the Presbytery of Philadelphia. Shortly after entering upon his duties, he was seized with sickness which disabled him from ministerial exercise for a considerable time. Before he recovered sufficiently to travel, the time had gone by to keep up with his appointments to the west, and the inclement season having set in, he was compelled to relinquish all hopes of overtaking them. He accordingly remained in our bounds, and as his health permitted, labored in the vacancies with great fidelity and great acceptance. Several calls would have been offered, but as his probationary year had not expired, we did not encourage them. We have, however, before us several petitions requesting our influence with Synod to have him appointed for the ensuing year in our bounds. We hope there will be a general disposition in your body to grant our request.

Neither Mr. Scroggs nor Mr. Thompson who were each appointed seven months, made their appearance. The former, very seasonably and in a christian manner, apprized us of the disappointment we would meet with occasioned by the loss of his health. We sincerely sympathize with him in his affliction, and would commend his example to others who may be under appointments which they cannot fulfil. The latter did not deign to inform us that he had no intentions of fulfilling his appointments, till he should have been in the field, and then ascribed his failure to fear for his personal safety and the counsel of some brethren, not to risk his life in the slaveholding States.

We have had frequent occasion to report delinquents to Synod, without the satisfaction of knowing that our complaints have excited the proper attention. It is not our design therefore to pursue the subject farther than simply to report the fact, and to remark that if the Synod can pass by without rebuke, such gross dereliction from duty on the part of Mr. Thompson of last year, and James McGill of the former, we wish not by our silence, to be considered as approving such lenity.

At your last meeting you altered the act on slavery, by pruning it of all appendages. You had before proffered assistance to slaveholders who might be inclined to the laudable work of emancipation, but who found it impracticable, without this assistance. You have now, of your own accord, revoked the promised help, and yet it would seem like the Egyptians, you require the full tale of bricks while you withhold the materials. It becomes necessary, now, to give us the true interpretation of the act, that our relation to Synod may be determined. We wish to be distinctly informed "whether this act, in its present shape, absolutely prohibits us from administering sealing ordinances to those who hold negroes in servitude, or whether some

discretionary power is given us to administer ordinances to such as may have slaves, but are not in principle and from choice, slaveholders." The Synod will understand that emancipation, without removal, is physically impossible, and that those who are in servitude by the laws of the land, must remain so until removed, the prating of many ignorant persons to the contrary notwithstanding.

All which is respectfully submitted.

A. WHYTE, *Moderator*.

Done at Rockbridge, Va., May 8, 1838.

No. 5. The Report of the Presbytery of Cambridge, which was, on motion, laid on the table.

*Report of the Presbytery of Cambridge.*

The Associate Presbytery of Cambridge report:—That though they have many evidences of the Lord's controversy with them, they have also encouragement to hope that his chastenings will ultimately prove to be for their benefit, and that of his cause among them, and that "at evening time it shall be light." Christ has assured us that "offences" and "divisions must come;" it is the part of christians and courts to consider well "by whom they come;" and not to be deterred from duty by the random charge of a persecuting spirit, too often made against all, without discrimination, who are involved in controversy. Presbytery still see evidences of God's gracious presence with them, in blessing divine ordinances, both in their settled and vacant congregations. One congregation called Hinchbrook, in Lower Canada, has been organized since the last meeting of Synod. This, with the other organized vacancies, and several preaching stations, is needing and asking supply. These places are weak and unable to furnish the means, as yet, of supporting such supply as ought to be given them. So far, a great part of the burden, both of supply of ordinances and of funds, has been borne by Presbytery. This has been no light burden, owing to the neglect of some of our congregations to give pecuniary assistance. Although Presbytery has been involved in debt since the Commission which was appointed in 1832, yet Cambridge and Ryegate have furnished no funds, and Barnet but once, notwithstanding all the pressing calls and demands made by Presbytery on them. Presbytery therefore request of Synod, that some annual allowance be made from their funds, for the assistance of our vacancies and preaching stations, in money as well as ordinances, for some time; and also that Synod will give special direction what to do in the case of those congregations that neglect all the requests and demands of Presbytery for pecuniary aid for these and other Presbyterial uses. The supply allotted to us by Synod have acceptably fulfilled their appointments as far as Presbytery required.

Presbytery are under the necessity of reporting much that is painful and humiliating among them, since the last meeting in Synod; and much, that, if we may judge by the past, will arouse the tongue of slander; yet we trust it will, as on a former occasion, meet with the solemn consideration of Synod as a court of Christ.

Dr. A. Bullions and Mr. Stalker have both been deposed by Presbytery from the office of the holy ministry. And though they entered some protests which might have brought up their cases before Synod, they have fallen from these, either by directly withdrawing them, or by neglecting the steps necessary in order to bring them regularly up for trial. Whether they expect their cases to be before Synod in any form we are not informed, and therefore Presbytery judge it necessary to give a brief view of them in this report.

Mr. Stalker, last September, charged two members of Presbytery with false-swearing, in a case before the Associate Presbytery of Albany, in reference to his conduct in some former difficulties between Presbytery and Dr. Bullions. This he did without using private means of obtaining satisfaction. The charge was put on trial in Presbytery. Mr. Stalker offered four witnesses, all of whom, except one, confirmed the testimony of the defendants, which was now in question. The defendants offered fourteen witnesses, of whom, only five were called in Presbytery, their testimony being judged sufficient. Presbytery unanimously decided that Mr. Stalker had not supported his charge, and that the defendants were acquitted. Afterwards, Mr. Stalker, by a written communication to Presbytery, acknowledged that what the brethren had sworn was correct. Nevertheless, he offered his protest against the decision of Presbytery, but withdrew it, confessed his sin, and submitted to a rebuke, and to suspension for one Sabbath. But, while these things were in progress, Mr. Stalker, in a trial of Dr. Bullions, read a paper, in which Presbytery found four articles of charge against him, viz:—Denying the right constitution and authority of this Presbytery—Positively charging Presbytery with unhallowed and malicious motives in their prosecutions—Adopting and threatening to pursue a divisive course in Presbytery—and, Disagreeing with Presbytery and Synod in their testimony against the U. Seces-

sion, blessing God that he had been a minister in that church. On trial, he refused to retract a word of what he had written, or to acknowledge his offence, or submit to a question on the Synod's testimony against the United Secession—gave in his declination of the Presbytery's authority—contemptuously withdrew, declaring that it was probably the last time that he and the Presbytery would meet in a judicial capacity. He was then, by a unanimous vote, deposed from the office of the holy ministry.

Dr. A. Bullions, on the trial of the charge, by Mr. Stalker, of false-swearing, objected to the Presbytery's proceeding with the case, because, as he he said, there were some members present, who, if reports were true, were unfit to sit in any court. On this grave charge, Presbytery, according to acknowledged order, required Dr. Bullions to furnish the names of those charged, and the reports and evidences referred to. He refused both, and yet wished Presbytery so far to act on the charge as to suspend their proceedings on a most important case on account of it. Dr. Bullions, after some time, denied that he had expressed himself as the minute stated it, and appealed from the minute. His protest was not admitted; and afterwards, for other purposes, testimony was taken in court, which abundantly maintained the correctness of the minute. After some dealing with Dr. Bullions, to induce him to give the names of the members charged, on account of whose character he wished Presbytery to suspend their proceedings, and the evidence on which the charge was based, but all in vain, he was judged censurable for slander and contumacy, and a rebuke voted as the censure. The execution of this sentence was postponed some hours; when it was proposed to be executed, Dr. Bullions protested against the execution. This protest was not admitted. Suspension was then proposed. Dr. Bullions then indicated four members as the persons charged, and said that the reports charged them with error in doctrine and immorality in practice, but still did not furnish, nor agree to furnish to Presbytery, the reports, their specifications nor evidence;—and then added, that what he had said in the morning, on which Presbytery had made their minute, was, that if those reports were true, those members were not fit to sit in *this court*; thus confirming the minute himself, in all that was culpable in his expression. Presbytery proceeded to suspend him from the exercise of his ministry and the communion of the church. Against this sentence he protested, but his protest was not admitted. The next day, Dr. Bullions gave in a paper, declaring, by solemn oath, that the minute did not convey his meaning, but yet it did not declare his meaning, retract his charge, nor furnish the evidence for investigation. Presbytery judged it unsatisfactory and profane, and consequently censurable. At two pro-re-nata meetings, originating in a request by the Associate congregation of Cambridge, Dr. Bullions refused to give such evidence of repentance as Presbytery could accept. He acknowledged that his expression, charging the four brethren indicated by him, was an *unfounded slander!* and that "he thought he was really sorry for it, and had made confession of it to God;" but he expressly refused the words *unfeigned sorrow*. He also refused to submit to the rebuke from consciousness of sin, but only in deference to Presbytery, or to withdraw his protests unconditionally, although he had confessed that the substance of his expression for which he was censured was an unfounded slander—he was therefore left under suspension. He then exercised his ministry in disobedience to Presbytery, and published a letter addressed to his congregation, but distributed to the public, containing many misrepresentations of Presbytery's procedure.

In the above censurable expressions, Dr. Bullions had referred to certain documents, as the reports on which he had based his charge. It was afterwards found, and proved by abundant testimony, that he himself had been the author or publisher of them, as his own hand-writing was proved on one of them, and it was given in testimony that he had read a copy of these documents to two of his brethren in the ministry before they had been circulated, and that though they had remonstrated against his circulating it, yet it was done. These documents contained slanders against the four brethren mentioned by him as chargeable, the substance of which was, the misrepresentation of things formerly settled by Presbytery and Synod, and also charges on members of error, lying and beastly intoxication, &c.

But before the trial of his authorship of these documents, and during the trial of it, he sent into Presbytery once and again a declination of the authority of Presbytery, and of their authority, not only in what had lately passed, but also in what they might do in future, and refused to attend the trial. Presbytery, after waiting from October 5, 1837, till April 12, 1838, dealing with him and citing him to appear, at length accumulating his offences, deposed him from the office of the holy ministry, &c.

## Minutes of Synod.

Since Mr. Stalker and Dr. Bullions have been deposed, they have continued to exercise the functions of the ministry, and the majority of the congregations of N. Argyle and Cambridge adhere to them respectively, and support them in their disobedience; for which reason these congregations have been refused a representation in Presbytery. Mr. Stalker has also published to the world his view of Presbytery's procedure in his case. They do not, however, complain of exhibitions of this procedure, but they require them to be true, and made in proper time and manner.

These things have not only been the source of much trouble to Presbytery, but of distraction and dissensions in this section of the church: and we may well take up the complaint of the Psalmist, 'O God, thou hast cast us off, thou hast scattered us, thou hast been displeased.' It is not improper to anticipate, from past experience, that some will reproach this Presbytery for want of love as the cause of these disturbances, and charge them with a spirit of persecution and contention. Even of such persons, we would simply and meekly ask where the fault lies? Mr. Stalker and the Presbytery were at peace till he produced his heavy charge. Dr. Bullions and the Presbytery were at peace, at least, on the part of Presbytery, till he produced his weighty charge. Was it the duty of Presbytery to allow any of their members to lie under these charges without a trial? or, a member to slander his brethren and obstinately refuse to follow necessary church order, without censure? We only desire that these positions be attended to, and questions be answered with a good conscience.

A. ANDERSON, *Presbytery Clerk.*

Hebron, May 9, 1838.

P. S. It should not pass unnoticed that Mr. Stalker has made a tavern advertisement of an injurious charge against a member of Presbytery, which, if it has any foundation in fact, he knew it more than five years ago.

No. 6. The Report of the Presbytery of Shenango, which was, on motion, laid on the table.

### *Report of the Presbytery of Shenango.*

The Associate Presbytery of Shenango report:—That few changes have occurred in our congregations, either settled or vacant, during the past year; we enjoy the blessing of peace and harmony, with a considerable increase of numbers. At a meeting of Presbytery in January last, Mr. Snodgrass was loosed from his pastoral relation with Oil Creek, hence, more supply of preaching by the appointment of Synod than formerly will be necessary during the present year. The case of Mr. Beggs is not yet issued, only one member of your commission attended with us, yet, from the importance of the case both to Mr. Baggs and the church, Presbytery agreed to enter upon the consideration thereof, and after hearing Mr. Beggs in his defence, and considering all the testimony taken in his case for some length of time, it appeared very difficult to give judgment, and therefore agreed to refer the case of M. Beggs *simpliciter* to Synod for final adjudication. A call from the congregations of Mercer, Springfield and Rocky-Spring, for Samuel McArthur, has been sustained by Presbytery, and is herewith transmitted to Synod, to have it presented as soon as practicable to Mr. McArthur for acceptance. The supply allotted for us by Synod, during the last year, has been received, with the exception of James Dixon, E. Small and James P. Smart; of these, Mr. J. P. Smart only forwarded reasons why he could not fulfil his appointment of Synod in our bounds, which reasons we could not fully sustain. We hope the Synod will grant us, during the present year, as much supply of preaching as may consist in doing justice to all.

Is respectfully submitted,

By order of Presbytery,

A. BOYD, *Clerk pro tem.*

No. 7. The Report of the Presbytery of Chartiers, which was, on motion, laid on the table.

### *Report of Presbytery of Chartiers.*

Since the last meeting of Synod, the Presbytery have licensed Messrs. Robert Forrester, Samuel McArthur and Edward Small. A call for the Rev. James McCarrel, to Tumlinson's Run, was presented to him last November, and accepted. At the same meeting the Rev. Mr. Allison, in consequence of age and infirmity, was, at his request, released from the charge of the Associate congregation of Mount Hope, and subsequently of Cross Creek; which congregations have since united in a call for Mr. David Thompson, which has been sustained, and the Presbytery request that he may be continued in their bounds, in order that the above call may be presented. Mr. Thompson having declined going to the South in consequence of

his apprehension that a faithful discharge of ministerial duty might not be consistent with his personal safety, has employed his time in our bounds for some months past. This supply, owing to the destitute condition of our vacancies, has been very seasonable and acceptable.

A call from the Associate congregation of Allegheny, for Rev. James Rodgers, one of our members, was presented to him at our meeting in March, agreeably to a request of the Presbytery of Allegheny. As Mr. Rodgers declined making a decision between said congregation and his present charge, the Presbytery agreed to refer said call for decision to the Synod.

Messrs. James W. Logue, of Guinston, York Co. Pennsylvania, James R. Doig, of Washington Co., New-York, together with Messrs. John Todd and John Patrick, graduates of Jefferson College, Pa., were examined and admitted to the study of theology, and have attended at the Hall during the winter.

T. BEVERIDGE, *Moderator.*

JAMES RAMSAY, *Clerk.*

No. 8. The Report of the Presbytery of Albany, which was, on motion, laid on the table.

*Report of the Presbytery of Albany.*

Since our last annual communication to the Synod, the cause for which we appear as witnesses seems to have declined within our Presbyterial jurisdiction. This we attribute chiefly to the nature and character of certain decisions, to which the Synod came at its last meeting, in the case of Mr. Stark. Erroneous decisions on the part of the supreme court of any church, cannot fail to prove disastrous in their consequences to the interests of the profession made in that church. Impartiality, integrity and firmness ought to characterize all judicial deeds, and especially those which emanate from the highest judicatory in the church. But it is with the deepest regret that we feel bound to say, that these qualities seem to have been lost sight of at the last meeting of the Synod; and to this cause we attribute the unhappy state of things presently existing among us. And we would earnestly but submissively entreat the Synod, in some way consistent with its dignity and honor, its love of truth and good order, and its high regard for the interests of religion, to counteract the injurious tendency of the decisions of which we complain, and whose pestilential effects we have so sadly experienced.

At a meeting of Presbytery in June last, Mr. Stark appeared and claimed the privilege of resuming his seat in Presbytery. This, however, was denied him, because 1st.—The Synod had just left him under *conviction* for the sin of insubordination, which scandal was not purged: because, 2d.—The Synod, after removing his suspension, had again laid him under process for scandal: and because, 3d.—He refused to withdraw his former declination, in which he had not only declined to be tried by the Presbytery, but in which, also, he had lampooned and slandered the members composing it.—But against this decision certain brethren protested and appealed to Synod. Their Reasons, together with the Presbytery's Answers, are herewith transmitted to Synod, in case they should be called for; although Presbytery has received an informal notice that the protesters have concluded not to prosecute the case any further.

In the month of July, Mr. James Williamson, a preacher from the Associate Synod of Original Seceders in Scotland, was, upon application, admitted by this Presbytery in the same capacity; and has since been employed, the greater part of the time, in supplying the vacancies under the care of Presbytery.

A congregation has been organized, by order of Presbytery, at Fall River, Mass., but owing to the pressure of the times, the prospect there is not so flattering as formerly.

At a meeting of Presbytery in September, the Rev. D. R. Defreest was restored to the exercise of the ministry; but owing to his peculiar circumstances, he has not been employed in supplying any of our vacancies.

At the same meeting Rev. J. G. Smart demitted his charge of the congregation of Johnstown, which demission, much to the regret of the Presbytery, was accepted. That congregation has since made out a call for Mr. Williamson.

Against a decision of Presbytery, ordering Mr. Stark to be supplied with a copy of all the testimony taken on the trial of Mr. Webster, a member protested and appealed to Synod; but the committee into whose hands the Reasons of Protest were placed for Answers, not having reported, the Presbytery is under the necessity of letting the matter lie over for the present.

The Synodical Fast was observed in the Congregations of Florida, Albany and Bovina.

At a meeting of Presbytery, held on the 21st inst., the Rev. P. Bullions was suspended from the exercise of the ministry and from the fellowship of the church, on the grounds exhibited in the accompanying papers.

P. CAMPBELL, Moderator.

JAMES MARTIN, Presbytery Clerk.

No. 9. The Report of the Board of Managers of the Theological Seminary, which was, on motion; laid on the table.

*Report of Board of Managers of the Theological Seminary.*

The annual meeting of the Board took place on the 29th of March last, at the Theological Seminary. The number of students in attendance during the last session was 24. Their names and grades respectively are as follows, viz. :—Joseph T. Cooper, J. W. Harsha, James Law, Isaac N. Lawhead, John L. McLane, and Wm. H. Walker, of the 4th year. Messrs. Thomas Gilkerson, James Hawthorn, Wm. Smith, and David R. Imbrie, of the 3d year. Messrs. John Bryan, John M. French, Isaac Law, Daniel H. A. McLean, Archibald Reid and George C. Vincent, of the 2d year. Messrs. David Bullions, Wm. J. Cleland, James R. Doig, James W. Logue, John Patrick, John Todd, and Thomas B. Walker, of the 1st year. Mr. Ambrose Bancroft also attended during the latter part of the session.

Discourses were delivered by all the students, excepting two, of the 2d, 3d, and 4th years, which were generally highly approved as specimens of Theological attainments. All the classes were examined on the system of Theology, Hebrew Bible, Church History, and the evidences of the Christian Religion, in which they acquitted themselves to the satisfaction of the Board. Those of the 4th year were also examined on the distinguishing principles of the Secession Church, and are hereby recommended to Synod to be taken on trials for license.

The Board would take the liberty of stating to Synod, that contributions have been made for several years past, particularly by one very liberal member of our communion, and also by the Female Benevolent Society of the Congregation of Philadelphia, for the aid of several students of Theology. These contributions, amounting to several hundred dollars, have been received by the Professors, and appropriated as directed. As there are usually a number of students who stand in need of pecuniary aid, and as the Board confidently believe there are many members of our communion who only need to be made acquainted with the fact to induce similar contributions, they have appointed the Rev. Professor Beveridge their Treasurer to receive any donations of this kind. Although the Synod has a fund for the aid of students, yet it has been the practice to loan out of that fund, on which account but few have availed themselves of it, by which they would subject themselves to a burden of debt. It is not thought necessary to dwell on the circumstances of most young men who are pursuing their studies with a view to the ministry. Nearly one half are obliged chiefly, on entering, to depend on their own resources; several of them enter the study of theology deeply in debt for their collegiate education; nor will the Board enlarge on the reasons why liberality should be manifested in aiding such, until they find this call disregarded.

In conclusion, the Board express their high gratification at the prosperous condition of this Seminary, and trust, that, through the blessing of the Church's Head, many will here be qualified to enter as faithful laborers the Lord's vineyard.

All which is respectfully submitted.

By order of the Board,

THOMAS HANNA, Secretary.

P. S. According to the late organization of the Board by Synod, the term of service of Messrs. French and Murray will expire at this meeting.

T. H.

No. 10. The Report of Dr. Houston, Treasurer, which was, on motion, referred to the committee on the Funds.

*Report of Daniel Houston, Treasurer.*

<i>Daniel Houston in account with Associate Synod.</i>		<i>Dr.</i>		April 1, Cash, interest from D. Houston, on Erie land,.....	124 00
1837.				12, Rent of Seminary and lots,.....	100 00
May 31, To balance in treasury,.....	\$404 00	May 3, Cash from ——— interest,.....		3, Cash from ——— interest,.....	30 00
June 12, Cash from South Buffalo Cong. contribution,.....	8 00	12, Cash from Chartier's Cong. contr.,.....		18, Cash from Segar Creek Cong. contr.,.....	10 00
Oct. 8, Cash received, interest,.....	120 00				
31, Cash from interest,.....	33 00				
Nov. 3, Cash from interest,.....	24 00				
1838.					
Mar. 20, Cash from interest,.....	20 00				
					\$978 00

<i>Contra.</i>		15, Cash paid John L. Gaw, for writing deed, . . . . .	3 00
<i>Treasurer claims credit for the following payments:</i>		30, Cash paid William Anderson, for coal, . . . . .	3 65
1837.	June 6, By cash paid T. T. McKennan, attorney's fees, . . . . .	\$10 00	
	13, Cash paid William Anderson, planting locust trees, . . . . .	10 00	
1838.	Sept. 11, Cash paid D. Gutvy, for locust trees, . . . . .	3 25	
	16, Cash paid Small & Giffin, repairs on Seminary, . . . . .	6 00	
	Oct. 10, Cash paid Rev. T. Beveridge, Semi-ann. salary, . . . . .	250 00	
	Nov. 10, Cash paid Hugh Sloan, for door handles, . . . . .	3 38½	
	Dec. 8, Cash paid John Watson, for fenders, &c., . . . . .	9 36½	
	1838. Cash paid postage, . . . . .	62½	
	Mar. 12, Cash paid John Enos, painting seminary, . . . . .	5 00	
	April 12, Cash paid William Anderson, room rent for students, . . . . .	34 37½	
	Cash paid J. Cochran, for brick, . . . . .	1 00	
	May 4, Cash paid Rev. T. Beveridge, books for library, . . . . .	26 50	
	7, Cash paid Rev. T. Beveridge, salary, . . . . .	250 00	
	8, Cash paid repairs on plaster of seminary, . . . . .	8 76	
	15, Cash paid James Ramsay, D. D. salary, . . . . .	300 00	
	Balance in treasury May 15th, 1838, the greater part of which is now at interest,	8,053 15½	
		<u>\$8,973 00</u>	

**DANIEL HOUSTON, Treasurer.**

The undersigned, committee of the Board of Trustees of the Theological Seminary, have examined the above account of the treasurer, with the accompanying vouchers, up to this date, and find it correct. *May 15, 1838.*

JAMES RAMSAY,  
D. S. STEVENSON.

No. 11. A memorial and complaint from the Rev. D. Stalker, which was, on motion, laid on the table.

Adjourned till the usual hour. Closed with prayer.

*8 o'clock, P. M.*

The Synod met and was opened with prayer. Members present as above. The minutes of the forenoon sitting were read and approved.

The following papers were given in and read, viz :

No. 12. A memorial from the congregation of N. Argyle, remonstrating against the proceedings of the Presbytery of Cambridge, in the case of their Pastor the Rev. Duncan Stalker.

No. 13. Complaint and memorial from the congregation of Cambridge, in relation to the proceedings of the Presbytery of Cambridge, in the case of their Pastor Dr. A. Bullions.

No. 14. A memorial from a minority of said congregation of Cambridge in relation to the same subject.

No. 15. A complaint and petition from the congregation of Ryegate, in relation to the proceedings of the Presbytery of Cambridge, in the above mentioned cases.

All these papers were, on motion, laid on the table.

No. 16. The Report of the Presbytery of Ohio, which was, on motion, laid on the table.

*Report of the Presbytery of Ohio.*

At our meeting in July last, a call from the congregation of Cross-roads, for a part of the time, of the Rev. William Douthett, which had been transferred to us from the Presbytery of Shemango, was presented and accepted, by which his charge has been greatly enlarged.

At our meeting in September last, Mr. James Patterson was ordained to the office of the holy ministry, and installed in the united congregations of Yellow-creek, Scroggsfield and Glade-Run. By this means, three of our principal vacancies have been settled. Last fall, Mr. William Cleland was examined and admitted to the study of Theology, and has attended the last session at the Seminary. We would take this opportunity of respectfully suggesting to Synod the necessity of taking some means to encourage young men of piety and talents to devote themselves to the ministry of the gospel. It must be evident to all, that the present number of candidates for the ministry is insufficient to supply the increasing wants of our church. Ever since our existence in this country as a church, the demands for faithful men to labor in the vineyard of Christ, have been numerous and urgent, and which we have never been able adequately to supply. Of late years, these calls

have greatly increased, and have come from every section of our church, especially from the missionary field. The few, who are licensed every year, are soon settled in the larger vacancies, the smaller are left to languish; and many petitions for supply from remote parts are entirely neglected. Does not this subject demand our most serious attention? Our Zion is greatly increased and extended, but there are few comparatively to guide her among all the sons, whom she hath brought forth. The harvest truly is plenteous, but the laborers are few, and while we pray the Lord of the harvest that he would send forth laborers into his vineyard, should we not use the means which he will bless? We also request as liberal a distribution of the public funds as may be consistent with other important objects, to the students of divinity under the care of Synod, that all may be able to attend the seminary regularly and without embarrassment.

The Book of Church Government and Discipline, submitted to the several Presbyteries at your last meeting, has been under our consideration: and while we regard it as preferable in many respects to the one now in use, we could not acquiesce in its adoption as a substitute without some amendments. On those subjects upon which it treats, it is full and explicit, and affords a much clearer light to church courts in the disposal of business, which may come before them, than they have hitherto enjoyed. Yet in the omission of the offences mentioned in our Book of Discipline, as grounds of church censure, we regard it as defective. There is in our view no impropriety in having such offences particularly specified as grounds of censure in the discipline, though this be virtually done in our Confession and Testimony, and at present to strike out some of these offences would materially weaken the hands of church courts in maintaining our witnessing profession. We refer particularly to the practice of occasional hearing mentioned in our present Book of Discipline as ground of censure. This we admit is virtually condemned in the Testimony, but deprive your courts of the authority which the present Book of Discipline affords them, and their future efforts in restraining this practice, will doubtless be weak and ineffectual. We would deprecate the idea of diminishing in any degree the authority under which your office bearers act in endeavoring to restrain this practice; a practice entirely at variance with our witnessing profession, and if any change be made, let such authority be increased. We would also suggest the propriety of retaining the forms appended to our present Book of Discipline and would desire to have them enlarged by adding to them forms in administering censure.

At our meeting in April last, Mr. Scroggs resigned the pastoral charge of West-Beaver, and the whole of his labors are now confined to West-Union and Four-mile, we therefore request as liberal a portion of supply as may in some measure meet our present and rising vacancies.

As to the observance of Synod's fast, Presbytery report, that so far as ascertained, it was observed by our members.

DAVID GOODWILLIE, *Presbytery Clerk.*

No. 17. A complaint and petition from the congregation of Barnet, in reference to the proceedings of the Presbytery of Cambridge, in the above mentioned cases. This paper was, on motion, laid on the table.

No. 18. The Report of the Presbytery of Alleghany, which was, on motion, laid on the table.

*Report of the Presbytery of Alleghany.*

The Presbytery of Alleghany reports that Mr. McCarrel has been released from his charge, an event which the Synod will be prepared to expect from our report of last year. A call has since been presented by those congregations to Mr. McAuley, which we have reason to hope will be accepted. The demand for supplies continues unabated, and we are the more anxious to obtain our full share, this year, as the supply of last year almost entirely failed, owing to various providential circumstances. A call was some time since sustained by our Presbytery for the Rev. J. Rodgers, which has been transmitted to the Presbytery of Chartiers, to whose report the Synod are respectfully referred. On the overture of a Book of Discipline received, we have only to state that we have made some progress in examining it, but are prepared to report nothing decisive or particular.

J. SCROGGS, *Clerk pro tem.*

No. 19. A paper by the Rev. James Adams, relative to his case as presented in the report of the Presbytery of Miami. This paper was,

on motion, referred to a select committee, consisting of Messrs. Anderson, W. Easton and D. Blair.

No. 20. A petition from the united congregation of Scroggsfield, Yellow Creek and Glade Run, to be disconnected from the Presbytery of Ohio, and connected with that of Muskingum. This petition was, on motion, referred to the committee of Bills and Overtures.

The following resolution was offered, viz :

*Resolved*, That in view of the difficulties in which the Synod is involved, and the alarming evidences of the Lord's displeasure with us, — next be set apart for the exercises of fasting and prayer ; and that our congregations in this city be invited to unite with us in those exercises.

To this resolution a substitute was offered and adopted, as follows :

*Resolved*, That next Monday evening be set apart for prayer and religious conversation.

From the adoption of the substitute in lieu of the original motion, Mr. Heron craved his dissent to be marked.

Dr. Bruce gave notice that he joined in the protest taken by certain brethren in the forenoon sitting.

The term of service of Messrs. French and Murray, as members of the Board of Managers of the Theological Seminary, being expired, it was, on motion,

*Resolved*, That according to a decision made at last meeting, a nomination be now made of members to fill the vacancy. Messrs. French and Patterson were nominated accordingly.

The following resolution was offered and adopted, viz :

*Resolved*, That no member of Synod vacate his seat until the Synod adjourn, without permission of the house ; and that Synod require of the different Presbyteries where any reside, who may violate this rule, to call such before them to answer for their conduct, and that Presbyteries report accordingly.

The protestation of the brethren of Albany Presbytery, mentioned in the minutes of the forenoon sitting, was called up, and, on motion, referred to a select committee, consisting of Dr. Ramsay and Mr. Beveridge.

Adjourned till the usual hour on Monday morning. Closed with prayer.

*Monday, May 28th.*

The Synod met and was opened with prayer. Members present as above. The minutes of last sitting were read and approved. Mr. H. Blair asked why his name was not called on the roll, and claimed his seat. The Moderator decided that he was not entitled to his seat. An appeal from this decision was taken by Mr. Blair, but not sustained. Against this decision, Mr. Blair protested, for reasons to be assigned.

Papers being called for, the following were given in, viz :

No. 21. Papers transmitted by the Presbytery of Miami on the subject of occasional hearing. These papers were, on motion, referred to the committee on Bills and Overtures.

No. 22. Papers transmitted by the aforesaid Presbytery, relative to an appeal by Messrs. D. Jackson and Archibald Collins, from a decision of said Presbytery in the case of the former of these appellants. These papers were, on motion, referred to the committee of Appeals.

No. 23. Papers transmitted by the aforesaid Presbytery in reference to appeals by Messrs. Templeton, Wallace and others, from a decision of said Presbytery, in the case of Mr. Heron, charged with violation of the Synod's rule, respecting the publication of the bans of marriage.

These papers also were, on motion, referred to the committee of Appeals.

No. 24. A petition by Messrs. James C. Bruce and Wm. Bruce, of the Presbytery of Miami, to be erected into a separate Presbytery. The petition was, on motion, referred to the committee of Bills and Overtures.

No. 25 The Report of a committee of the session of Massies Creek congregation, transmitted by the Presbytery of Miami, in the case of the Messrs. Fergusons, brought before Synod last year. This report was, on motion, laid on the table.

No. 25. The Report of a committee of the Presbytery of Miami, on the Draught of a Book of Discipline, transmitted by said Presbytery. This report was, on motion, laid on the table.

Reasons of protest against the Synod's decision of Saturday, signed Hugh H. Blair, Moderator, and Andrew Stark, Presbytery Clerk, were read; and it was, on motion,

*Resolved*, That said paper, though not admissible in its present form, yet be laid on the table for the use of Synod.

The committee on the paper given in by the Rev. James Adams on Saturday, presented a report which was, on motion, accepted and adopted, as follows, viz:

*Report on Mr. James Adams' Question.*

Your Committee to whom was referred a paper given in by the Rev. James Adams, report: That the question proposed by Mr. Adams should be answered in the negative for the following reasons. It is lawful for an Ecclesiastical Court to suspend for trial when the circumstances of the case require it, and they are the competent and proper judges of the necessity of the measure. The decision of the inferior court ought to be held as valid, till tried and reversed, and their official report, in whatever lawful form given, to be held as sufficient data for the action of the superior court till the case is brought up for trial. An edification requires that a sentence of suspension should remain in force notwithstanding an appeal, till that appeal be issued, and as the standing of ministers is legally known to Synod only through their respective Presbyteries, so they must act on that information till the trial takes place.

The request appended to the question is reasonable, and ought to be granted.

A. ANDERSON,  
W. EASTON.

The committee appointed on Saturday on the protest of the brethren of the Presbytery of Albany, presented their report, which was read, and, on motion, adopted as follows, viz:

The following is a copy of the paper submitted to your Committee:

PHILADELPHIA, May 26th, 1833.

We, the moderator and members of the Associate Presbytery of Albany, in our own name and in the name of the congregations adhering to us, solemnly protest against the decision of Synod made this day, declaring their constitution "irregular and all their acts null and void, and the body of which the Rev. Messrs. Martin and Campbell are members, to be truly the Associate Presbytery of Albany," and hold this decision null and void, and of no force or effect whatever, just as if it had not been made, and that all the acts and proceedings of said Presbytery are still good and valid. And we appeal to the next meeting of the Associate Synod for reasons to be assigned, and crave extracts. (Signed,) Hugh H. Blair, Moderator, P. Bullions, Andrew Stark, Robert Crookshank, John A. Gilmour, John Edwards.

On the above paper your Committee report as follows:

That the brethren who have subscribed the above paper have a right to enter a protest against the deed of Synod with which they are dissatisfied, for their own exoneration, if they choose to do so, is not denied. But as the above paper is expressed in such terms as imply a determination on their part to act in as direct opposition to that deed as if it had never been passed, we judge that it is both in the spirit and letter of it, a declinature, and that the subscribers of it should be dealt with accordingly.

JAMES RAMSAY,  
THOMAS BEVERIDGE.

From the decision adopting the report, Mr. Heron craved his dissent to be marked. In this he was joined by Mr. France.  
Adjourned till the usual hour. Closed with prayer.

3 o'clock, P. M.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer. Members present as above. The minutes of the forenoon sitting were read and approved. Mr. D. Blair gave notice that he joined in the dissent entered by Messrs. Heron and France at the close of the forenoon sitting.

Papers being called for, the following were given in and read, viz :

No. 27. The Report of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, which was, on motion, referred to the committee of Supplies.

*Report of the Presbytery of Philadelphia.*

Several important changes have taken place in our bounds, since the last meeting of Synod. Mr. C. Webster having accepted the call from the 1st Congregation of Philadelphia, mentioned in our last report, and his trials for ordination having been sustained, he was, on the 2d of November last, by the imposition of hands, ordained to the sacred office of the ministry, and installed Pastor of said congregation. The Rev. A. T. McGill having tendered his resignation of the united congregations of Carlisle, Dickenson, and Wheatfield, from want of health, for the discharge of the duties of that location: Presbytery found it necessary to accept the resignation, and dissolve the connection. A second congregation was organized in the northern part of the City of Philadelphia, on the 19th of July last, and they have since given a unanimous call to the Rev. A. T. McGill, which has been sustained. A call from the Associate congregation of Baltimore has been made out for Rev. John G. Smart, (late of Albany Presbytery,) presented and accepted; and on the 2d inst. he was installed as Pastor of said congregation. A call has also again been given to Rev. A. T. McGill, from Carlisle and branches, and sustained, and in connection with the call from Philadelphia, was presented, and the call from Carlisle accepted. A call for Mr. David Thompson, from the united congregations of Hantingdon, Boalsburg, and Newton Hamilton, has been made out and sustained, and is herewith transmitted to Synod for presentation. Messrs. James P. Smart and Wm. Y. Hamilton having been appointed in our bounds to be taken on trials for license, were, after delivering the exercises assigned them, and undergoing the customary examinations, licensed to preach the everlasting gospel; the former on the 19th of July, and the latter on the 14th of September last. On the overture for a book of discipline, Presbytery report:—that, inasmuch as there are in that overture some expressions ambiguous, some subjects deficient, and some things entirely wanting, it be recommended to Synod to recommit it. Though Baltimore and Philadelphia are thus, in the good providence of God provided for, we have yet several important vacancies on our list, and a due proportion of supply is solicited. Presbytery would beg leave to suggest the propriety of urging upon all the ministers in our communion, the duty of frequently calling the attention of our congregations to the evils of popery, and the danger, to both our civil and religious liberties from the rapid increase of this "mystery of iniquity."

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM EASTON, *Presbytery Clerk.*

No. 28. A memorial from a portion of the congregation of Massies Creek, declaring their adherence to the protest of their pastor, the Rev. James Adams, and requesting the appointment of a commission of Synod for the trial of Mr. Adams' case.

This memorial was referred to the committee on Bills and Overtures.

No. 29. A representation from Mr. A. Anderson and others, complaining of certain alleged inaccuracies in the printed minutes of last year. This paper was referred to a select committee, consisting of Messrs. Heron and Martin.

No. 30. A protest against the Synod's decisions of Saturday and this day, signed H. H. Blair, Moderator, and Andrew Stark, Presbytery Clerk, and declining the authority of the Associate Synod as now constituted, and appealing to the first free and faithful meeting of the Associate Synod.

Whereupon, certain resolutions were offered to **issue the case** respecting the protesting brethren; and after considerable discussion, said resolutions were referred to a select committee, consisting of Dr. Bruce and Mr. Miller. Said committee were instructed forthwith to retire, and to bring in a resolution issuing the matter.

While the committee were withdrawn, the following resolution was offered and adopted, viz:

*Resolved*, That the calls reported by the several Presbyteries be presented to such candidates as are present in Synod for acceptance.

Calls being reported for, Mr. S. McArthur, from the congregations of McMahan's Creek and Belmont, in the Presbytery of Muskingum, and of Mercer, Springfield, and Rocky Spring, in the Presbytery of Shenango; it was, on motion,

*Resolved*, That Mr. McArthur have his choice of Presbyteries. Mr. McArthur made choice of the Presbytery of Muskingum. Consequently, the call from McMahan's Creek and Belmont was presented and accepted.

The call from the congregations of Huntingdon, Boalsburgh, and Newtown, Hamilton, reported by the Presbytery of Philadelphia, for Mr. D. Thompson, was, on motion, referred to the Presbytery of Chartiers, for presentation.

Paper No. 31 was read, viz: The Report of Mr. Wm. Y. Hamilton, on the Western mission. This report was, on motion, referred to the committee on the Funds, and is as follows, viz:

*Report of Western Mission.*

**BATHEN**—Your missionary arrived at Unity, Randolph County, Illinois, the first sabbath of December. The Synod's Fast was observed on the third Thursday of this month, the time appointed having past. Having remained in Unity and its vicinity six sabbaths, he proceeded from thence to Mr. John Walker's, Elkhorn, from thence to John Gracey's, Sugar Creek, Madison Co., and from thence to Clark and Mackay's, Shoal Creek, Bond Co., remaining in the two former one sabbath each, and in the latter vacancy two sabbaths. He then proceeded to Apple Creek, Green Co., where he remained during the remainder of February and through the month of March. Travelling becoming difficult, he concluded to spend the remaining month of April again at Unity.

Little can be said in addition to what has frequently been laid before Synod, respecting the necessity of Preaching in the Far West, that necessity still continues, particularly in some places, the labors of an ordained minister are much needed. Emigration is rapidly directing its thousands to the West. The growing facilities of this country, and the embarrassments of the East, contribute to render it the spot towards which many are directing their steps. But there is a lack of the word of truth. Every species of delusion, from the subtle heresies of Arminianism to the wild extravagance of Mormonism, seems to have sprung up in the Far West as a fruitful soil. Here increasing Infidelity and Romish abomination are exerting their influence to deceive, if it were possible, even the elect.

With respect to the prospects of the Secession Church in these parts:—Unity, in Randolph Co., will probably soon sustain a settled ministry, and there are numbers elsewhere, for whose sake, doubtless, it is the duty of the church to obey the injunction, "preach the gospel to every creature."

To accomplish the ends for which our church has in God's great name displayed her banner, may the King and Head of the church pour upon us the spirit of power, of love, and of a sound mind, that, under its reviving influence, the wilderness and solitary place may be glad, and the desert rejoice and blossom as the rose.

Respectfully submitted to the Associate Synod in session, by

WM. Y. HAMILTON.

<i>The Associate Synod, to</i> WM. Y. HAMILTON,		
For Missionary labor, from 1st Dec. to 1st May—23 Sabbaths, . . . . .		\$132 00
Received from the Unity Congregation, Flat Prairie, . . . . .		636 00
"    "    Mr. John Walker, Elkhorn, . . . . .		5 00
"    "    Mr. John Gracey, Sugar Creek, . . . . .		1 00
"    "    Messrs. Clark & Mackay, . . . . .		6 00
"    "    Apple Creek Congregation, . . . . .		23 00
		73 00

The committee to whom the resolutions lately under consideration had been referred, now returned, and Mr. Miller, from said committee, offered the following preamble and resolution, in the latter part of which, but not in the former part, Dr. Bruce concurred.

Whereas, the conduct of Messrs. H. H. Blair, P. Bullions, D. D., and A. Stark, ministers, condemned in the resolution passed by Synod on Saturday, is not only irregular, but sinful and distracting to the church—And whereas, the paper of the said ministers, together with Messrs. John Edwards, Robert Crookshanks, and John A. Gilmour, which purports to be some of their reasons of protest, and also their declination given this afternoon, offer a contemptuous opposition to the authority of this Synod:—And whereas, they still continue to claim to be the Presbytery of Albany, thereby contemptuously refusing submission to Synod:—Therefore, Resolved, that said ministers and elders be suspended from the exercise of their offices and the communion of the church—and that they be referred to the Presbytery of Albany for the ultimate issuing of their case, either by their returning to submission to the authority of the church, or by the infliction of her higher censures.

This report, after having been the subject of some discussion, and a brother having been employed in prayer, was adopted by the following vote:

*Ayes*—Dr. Ramsay, Messrs. Anderson, Miller, Scroggs, Beveridge, Smart, McNaughtan, Hanna, Templeton, Wilson, Wallace, Kendall, Jno. Adams, A. Gordon, D. Gordon, McElwee, Webster, McKee, Patterson, Campbell, Martin—*ministers*. G. Robertson, McCelland, Darling, Martin, Maxwell, Smeallie, Wilson, Dickson, Young, McCall, Arthurs, Reid, A. Collins, Johnston, Bullock, McNary, Morris, T. C. Collins—*elders*—39.

*Noes*—Mr. McLane, Dr. Bruce, Messrs. Heron, D. Blair, France, Ferrier, Whyte, Thompson, T. Goodwillie, Pringle, Galbraith, D. Goodwillie, Rodgers—*ministers*. Gilkerson, Smith, Scott, Mason, Bell, W. Bruce, Gilleland—*elders*—20.

The Moderator craved to be marked as voting in the affirmative. Against this decision, Mr. Heron protested, for reasons to be assigned. In this he was joined by Dr. Bruce and Messrs. France, Thompson, Ferrier, McLane, Gilkerson, Smith, D. Blair, Whyte, W. Bruce, Bell, Galbraith, Scott, Gilleland, T. Goodwillie, D. Goodwillie, Rodgers, Mason and Pringle.

On motion, it was

*Resolved*, That Dr. Ramsay and Mr. Beveridge be appointed a committee to purchase books for the Theological Seminary.

Messrs. Kendall and A. Gordon were appointed to lead in the exercises of this evening.

Adjourned till the usual hour to-morrow morning. Closed with prayer.

*Tuesday, May 29th.*

The Synod met and was opened with prayer. Members present as above. The minutes of last sitting were read and corrected.

Papers being called for, the following were given in and read, viz:

No. 32. A complaint of Messrs. D. Stalker and others, against the Presbytery of Cambridge, for excluding them from their seats in said Presbytery on the trial of a charge against Dr. A. Bullions. This complaint was, on motion, laid on the table.

No. 33. Memorial and Complaint by Dr. A. Bullions, against the Presbytery of Cambridge, for certain of their proceedings in his case.

This paper was, on motion, laid on the table.

The committee on Bills and Overtures presented a report on the sub-

ject of division of Presbyteries contemplated in the reports of the Presbyteries of Muskingum and Miami. After some conversation, the said report was, on motion, recommitted. The same committee presented a report on the memorial on occasional hearing, transmitted by the Presbytery of Miami. This report was, on motion, laid on the table.

The call for Mr. Rodgers from the congregation of Alleghany, reported by the Presbytery of Alleghany, was called up, and after hearing the commissioner from Alleghany, and reading a representation from the congregation of Noblestown in opposition to the removal of Mr. Rodgers, the question was taken, "Transfer or not," and carried, "Not transfer," by a vote of 20 to 19. The vote being so near a tie, and so many of the members not being prepared to vote, it was, on motion,

*Resolved*, That the call be presented to Mr. Rodgers for his own decision. The call was accordingly presented, but Mr. Rodgers craved permission to defer his answer till the afternoon. The request was granted.

The protest of the Rev. James Adams against a decision of the Presbytery of Miami, suspending him from the exercise of his ministerial office till a charge now pending against him be tried, was, on motion, taken up; all the documents connected with the case were read, and some explanation in reference to the facts of the case given, and the Synod adjourned till the usual hour. Closed with prayer.

3 o'clock, P. M.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer. Members present as above. The minutes of the forenoon sitting were read and approved. Dr. Bruce craved extracts from the minutes, in reference to the resolution protested against by himself and others in the forenoon. The request was granted.

Papers being called for, the following were given in and read, viz:

No. 34. A call from Tuscaloosa for the Rev. Thos. S. Kendall. This paper was, on motion, referred to a special committee, consisting of Messrs. Miller and Anderson.

No. 35. A communication from Mr. D. Thompson, containing his excuse for the non-fulfillment of his appointment to the Presbytery of the Carolinas. The excuse was sustained.

From this decision Mr. Heron craved his dissent to be marked.

The call from Cambridge, Clear Fork, and Claysville, for Mr. James McGill, reported by the Presbytery of Muskingum, was on motion, presented and accepted.

Resumed the consideration of the business left unfinished at the close of the forenoon sitting, viz: the protest of Mr. Adams. Mr. Adams and the members of the Presbytery of Miami were heard, and parties removed, and after a brief discussion the question was put "sustain the appeal or not," and carried "not sustain."

Mr. Adams requested to have his papers returned to him. The request was granted.

The call for Mr. Rodgers from the congregation of Alleghany, was called up, and the decision of the forenoon sitting, on motion, reconsidered. And the question being again put, "Transfer or not," it carried "Transfer."

Reasons of protest by Mr. Anderson and others, against the decision of Synod last year, sustaining the appeal from the Moderator's decision in the case of Mr. Stark, were given in. Dr. Bruce and Mr. Rodgers were

appointed a committee to answer said reasons of protest, with instructions to report before Synod rise.

Reasons of protest by Mr. Heron against the deed of Synod last year, in the case of the Rev. James Lyle were read, and Messrs. Miller and D. Gordon were appointed a committee to prepare answers.

On motion, it was *Resolved*, That the case of Dr. Bullions and the Presbytery of Cambridge, be made the order of the day for to-morrow morning.

Adjourned till the usual hour to-morrow morning. Closed with prayer.  
*Wednesday, May 30th.*

The Synod met and was opened with prayer. Members present as above. The minutes of last sitting were read and approved.

Mr. D. Gordon gave notice that he joined in the dissent from the decision of last evening, sustaining the excuse of Mr. D. Thompson for the non-fulfillment of his appointment.

Papers being called for, the following were given in and read, viz:

No. 36. Reasons of protest by Mr. D. Gordon against the decision of Synod last year, deferring further proceedings in the case of Mr. Stark till the present meeting. Messrs. D. Blair and McLane were appointed a committee to answer said reasons.

No. 37. A memorial from a minority of the Presbytery of Miami, complaining of a decision of said Presbytery, in the case of Mr. James A. Brown, student of theology, refusing to apply to Synod for his licensure, on the ground of his having some doubts on the subject of occasional hearing. This memorial was, on motion, referred to a select committee, consisting of Messrs. Hanna and A. Gordon.

A Report by the Committee on Missions was given in and read, and, on motion, laid on the table.

The Committee on Bills and Overtures presented a report on the memorial from certain members of the congregation of Massies Creek, in the case of Mr. Adams. After a brief discussion, the report being amended, was adopted as follows, viz;

“The Committee on Bills and Overtures, report on the memorial of some people in Massies Creek congregation that that part of their request which invites a Commission to be sent by Synod to try the libel against the Rev. James Adams ought to be granted, for this reason, that while it affords the means of a fair trial it may be more satisfactory to all the parties concerned.

*Resolved*, also, That said Commission be authorised to try and settle all other matters which may involve the standing of Mr. Adams.

ALEX'R GORDON,  
THO'S HANNA.

From the decision adopting the above report, Mr. Webster craved his dissent to be marked.

Messrs. Hanna, S. Hindman and McElwee were appointed said Commission.

On motion, it was agreed to defer the appointment of the time of the meeting of the Commission till the afternoon.

Answers to Dr. Bruce's reasons of protest against Synod's decision of last year, deferring the consideration of Mr. Stark's case till the present meeting, were read and adopted as follows, viz.:

*Protest of Dr. Bruce—1837.*

The subscriber begs leave to Protest against the decision of Synod last evening, deferring the trial of Mr. Stark till next year, because that decision proceeds on a deceitful ground, is cruel and unjust.

The ground is deceitful—because it was our own decision we were to review ; and as prosecutors, we cannot alter our libel, nor, in reviewing, consider any evidence but that on which the decision was founded. This could have been done in a few minutes.

It is cruel—because it keeps a whole congregation in suspense for twelve months, without any necessity.

It is unjust—because part of the reasons assigned for the delay was to take additional testimony on the part of the prosecution. The defendant has the right, if permitted by court, to give any new testimony he possesses, but the prosecutors, in reviewing their own deed, can consider the grounds only of their own decision. It would not be a review otherwise, but a new trial, which should commence in Presbytery.

Signed,

ROBERT BRUCE.

Pittsburgh, June 2d, 1857.

*Answers to Dr. Bruce's Reasons of Protest—1838.*

The committee to which were referred the reasons of Protest by Dr. Bruce, against the vote of Synod last year, deferring the "Review" of Mr. Stark's case, offer the following report :—

The correctness of the general doctrines laid down in the Protest, your committee are ready to admit ; and if the term *deceptive* had been used instead of "deceitful," they would also admit the soundness of the particular principle of order, by which the first reason is illustrated. The distinction between a review and a new trial, noticed both in this and the third reason, we admit to be technically correct and worthy the notice of Synod in the issuing of the case. And it may be, some who voted for the review were deceived, by not understanding or attending to this distinction.

While your committee agree with the protester that a review is not a new trial, much less can it be a *reversal* of the deed to be reviewed, they are compelled to admit, as a necessary consequence, that the deed of Synod is in force until it is not only reviewed, but until it is reversed.

On the second reason in the protest, viz : "That the decision was *cruel*," your committee would only remark, that although the proper operation of the decision of granting a review of Mr. Stark's case did leave his congregation under suspense, so long as they adhered to Mr. Stark, while under sentence of suspension ; yet they do not appear to have felt its cruelty, as they appear wholly to have disregarded and disobeyed it.

On the third reason offered by the protester, your committee would only remark, while the soundness of the general principle is admitted, being not materially different from the first, it is still to be kept in remembrance, that the plea chiefly urged, both in the memorials and speeches, in favor of Mr. Stark, was based on the ground that new testimony was offered.

All which is respectfully submitted,

JAS. P. MILLER,

F. W. McNAUGHTON.

The Committee of Appeals reported on the appeals of Messrs. Templeton, Wallace and others, from the decisions of the Presbytery of Miami, on the subject of marrying without publication. The report was read, and on motion, laid on the table.

The same committee reported on the appeal of Messrs. Jackson and Collins, transmitted by the Presbytery of Miami. This report was likewise laid on the table.

The committee on Bills and Overtures reported on the subject of a division of Presbyteries, contemplated in the reports of the Presbyteries of Muskingum and Miami. The report was adopted.

*Report of the Committee of Bills and Overtures on division of Presbyteries, &c.*

The Committee of Bills and Overtures, to whom was referred the reports of the Presbyteries of Muskingum and Miami, requesting among other things, a division of said Presbyteries, beg leave to report the following resolutions for adoption, viz :

1. *Resolved*, That all that part of the Presbytery of Muskingum lying west and north of the Tuscarawas and Muskingum rivers be erected into a new Presbytery, to be called the Presbytery of Richland.

2. *Resolved*, That the ministers with their elders respectively included in said bounds, shall meet in Presbytery at Wooster, on the first Wednesday of August next, and that the Rev. Samuel Irvine shall preach and constitute said Presbytery ; and

further that all papers or documents in the hands of the Presbytery of Muskingum, affecting said Presbytery, or any of its members, be forthwith transmitted to them.

On the report of the Presbytery of Miami your committee report the following resolutions.

1. *Resolved*, That all that part of the Presbytery of Miami within the bounds of the state of Indiana, be erected into a new Presbytery, to be called the Presbytery of Indiana; and further that the ministers and their elders respectively included in said bounds, shall meet in Presbytery on the second Wednesday of August next, at Bloomington, and that the Rev. Nathaniel Ingles shall preach and constitute said Presbytery.

2. *Resolved*, That all that part of the Presbytery of Miami within the bounds of the state of Illinois, and such congregations as lie west and north of said state, be erected into a new Presbytery to be called the Presbytery of Illinois; and further that the ministers and their elders, respectively, in said bounds, shall meet in Presbytery on the second Wednesday in August next, at Henderson, and that the Rev. James C. Bruce shall preach and constitute said Presbytery.

3. *Resolved*, That all documents in the hands of the Presbytery of Miami, affecting the above named Presbyteries, or any of their members, be forthwith transmitted to said Presbyteries respectively.

4. Agreeably to the request of the Presbytery of Miami, *Resolved*, That hereafter in making out the Scale of Appointments, special appointments be made in behalf of Tennessee, Southwestern Virginia, and Alabama.

With respect to the petition from the congregations of Scroggsfield, Yellow Creek and Glade Run, and the request from the Presbytery of Muskingum, for a definite line between them and the Presbytery of Ohio—your committee recommend the adoption of the following resolution, viz:

*Resolved*, That the aforesaid congregations, with their pastor Mr. Patterson, be annexed to the Presbytery of Muskingum, and that the following line be established between the aforesaid Presbyteries, viz: Beginning at Wellsville on the Ohio river, and running due west to Massillon, on the Tuscarawas river.

ALEX'R GORDON,  
THOMAS HANNA,  
THOMAS S. KENDALL.

On motion, Messrs. McKee and Kendall were added to the Committee of Supplies.

Proceeded to the order of the day, viz: the case of Dr. Bullions and the Presbytery of Cambridge. At this stage Mr. James Lowrie from the session of Cambridge congregation appeared, claiming his seat in Synod. Mr. Lowrie was asked whether he considered himself as representing a session now in subordination to the Presbytery of Cambridge and to the Synod. Mr. Lowrie answered in the affirmative. After some further discussion, Mr. Lowrie declared that he waived his right for the present.

The following resolution was then offered, and after some discussion agreed to, viz:

“Whereas it appears that Dr. Bullions' case does not come before Synod in any regular form, there having been no legal notice given to Presbytery—Therefore,

*Resolved*, That Synod cannot according to order, but with consent of Presbytery, now proceed to the investigation.”

From this decision Mr. Heron craved his dissent to be marked.

Dr. Bullions protested against the decision.

The members of the Presbytery of Cambridge having declared their willingness to proceed with the investigation—the memorial of Dr. Bullions was read. The memorial of the congregation of Cambridge relative to this matter, was also read in part, but before going through with it, the Synod adjourned till the usual hour. Closed with prayer.

3 o'clock P. M.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer. Members present as above. The minutes of the forenoon sitting were read and approved.

Papers being called for, the following were given in, viz :

No. 38. A petition and representation from Samuel Creswell, in reference to his case as before the Session of West Union.

No. 39. Reasons of Protest by the same individual, against a decision of the Session of West Union in his case.

These papers were, on motion, referred to the Presbytery of Ohio.

No. 40. A communication from Mr. Beggs, in relation to his case as in the hands of the Presbytery of Shenango. This paper was, on motion, referred, together with all the other documents in the case of Mr. Beggs, to a select committee, consisting of Messrs. Kendall and S. Wilson.

No. 41. An additional report of the Presbytery of Albany, which was, on motion, referred to a select committee, consisting of Dr. Ramsay and Mr. Beveridge.

*Additional Report of the Presbytery of Albany.*

The Presbytery of Albany hereby give notice to the Synod that, at a meeting of Presbytery this morning, on the question of presenting the call from the Associate congregation of Johnstown, to Mr. Williamson, the Presbytery agreed that he be first required to signify his acknowledgment of the validity of the Synod's decision respecting the Presbytery of Albany, and that he submit to said Presbytery as recognised by that decision; but Mr. W. wishing to consider the matter, the Presbytery allowed him further time; at the expiration of the time allowed the Presbytery again met; Mr. W., however, did not appear, but communicated, in writing, an answer to the Presbytery's request, which was voted not satisfactory. The Presbytery, therefore, in view of these facts, ask the Synod to direct them, as to what further steps they should take, if any, in this matter.

P. CAMPBELL, *Moderator.*

J. MARTIN, *Presbytery Clerk.*

At the request of Mr. Miller, he was released from the committee appointed to answer Mr. Heron's reasons of protest against the decision in the case of the Rev. Jas. Lyle, and Mr. Scroggs substituted in his room.

Resumed the consideration of the business left unfinished at the close of the forenoon sitting. All the remaining documents in the case of Dr. Bullions and the Presbytery of Cambridge, were read. During the reading of these documents, Mr. John Graham, minister, and Mr. John Elliott, ruling elder, of the Presbytery of Albany, appeared and took their seats.

After the papers were read, Dr. Bullions was heard in his defence, and the Synod adjourned till 8 o'clock this evening. Closed with prayer

8 o'clock P. M.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer. Members present as above. The minutes of last sitting were read and approved.

Resumed the consideration of the business left under discussion at the close of last sitting. Commissioners were heard on behalf of the memorials from the congregation of Cambridge, respecting the case of Dr. Bullions; and the Synod adjourned till the usual hour to-morrow morning. Closed with prayer.

*Thursday, May 31.*

The Synod met and was opened with prayer. Members present as above. The minutes of last meeting were read and approved.

Papers being called for, the following were given in, viz. :

No. 42. The Report of Mr. D. Murphy, Assistant Treasurer, which was, on motion, referred to the Committee on the Funds.

Associate Synod of North America, in account with Daniel Murphy in Synod's Fund.

1838. DR.	
May 25, To cash paid the Rev. A. Heron, for services as stated clerk, . . . .	\$100 00
Balance remaining in treasury, . . . . .	663 99½
	<hr/> \$763 99½ <hr/>
1838. CR.	
May 25, By cash from Fairfield cong. per Rev. J. Scroggs, . . . .	\$26 57
25, By cash from 2 years interest on Mrs. Whiteside's legacy, per Rev. Jas. P. Smart, . . . .	18 00
By cash from Pittsburgh cong. per Mr. Wm. Bell, . . . . .	20 00
By cash from Xenia Cong. per Rev. S. Wilson, . . . . .	20 00
By cash from Margaret McClellan, donation, . . . . .	5 00
By cash from Censar's Creek cong., per Rev. A. Heron, . . . .	10 00
By cash from Massies Creek cong., per Geo. Galloway, Esq., . . . . .	20 00
By cash from Stone Valley cong., per Rev. Wm. Easton, . . . . .	11 00
By cash from East Nottingham cong., per Rev. Wm. Easton, . . . . .	6 10
By cash from Octorara, per Rev. Wm. Easton, . . . . .	5 25
By cash from Gunston and Lower Chanceford cong., per Rev. John Adams, . . . . .	22 00
By cash from Noblestown cong., per Rev. J. Rodgers, . . . .	8 00

1838. CR.	
May 25, By cash from Baltimore cong., per Rev. J. G. Smart, . . . . .	70 63
By cash from Wooster cong., per Rev. Jos. McKee, . . . . .	5 52
By cash from Hebron cong., per Rev. A. Anderson, . . . . .	13 17
26, To cash from Unity cong., Harrison co., Ohio, per Rev. J. Walker, . . . . .	7 15
To cash from quarterly collections 1st cong. Phila. . . . .	28 35
To cash from Testimonies sold, received from Rev. T. Beveridge, per Mr. Wm. S. Young, . . . . .	48 12½
30, To cash from Cambridge cong. per Mr. James Lourie, . . . . .	11 25
To cash from Florida cong., per Rev. P. Campbell, . . . . .	4 60
To cash from Albany cong., per Rev. Jas. Martin, . . . . .	45 31½
	<hr/> 405 42½ <hr/>
1838. IN MISSIONARY FUND.	
May 26, By cash from Barret cong., Vermont, per Rev. T. Goodwillie, . . . . .	18 42
IN STUDENT'S FUND.	
May 12, By cash from Commercial Bank stock, 1 year's dividend, . . . . .	99 00
By cash remaining in treasury as per report of May the 17th, 1837, . . . . .	241 15
	<hr/> \$763 99½ <hr/>

The above is a correct report of the state of the different funds in my hands belonging to Synod, up to the present date.  
Philadelphia, May 30th, 1838.

DANIEL MURPHY, Assistant Treasurer.

To the Associate Synod of North America, the Assistant Treasurer begs leave to report the following in addition to the report already given in.

Associate Synod of N. A. in account with D. Murphy, in Synod's fund.

1838. DR.	
June 2, To cash paid James Galbraith, as per order of Synod, dated June 3d, 1837, . . . . .	\$15 00
To cash paid for 600 extra Nos. of Religious Monitor, . . . . .	40 00
To cash paid the Rev. T. Beveridge, for the purchase of books for Theological Hall, . . . . .	100 00
	<hr/> \$155 00 <hr/>

1838. CR.	
June 2, By cash from Bovina cong., per Rev. J. Graham, . . . . .	\$7 50
By cash from Argyle cong., per Rev. J. F. Miller, . . . . .	24 00
By cash from Mr. Wm. Stevenson and wife, Cambridge, N. Y., per Rev. J. G. Smart, . . . . .	25 00
Balance, . . . . .	97 00
	<hr/> \$153 50 <hr/>

1838. IN MISSIONARY FUND.	
June 1, By cash from Mr. Daniel Williamson, Putnam, Washington co., N. Y. . . . .	\$5 00
	<hr/> \$5 00 <hr/>

By the above statement it will be seen that the amount in the treasury will be \$92. 90 less than formerly reported.  
Philadelphia, June 2d, 1838.

DANIEL MURPHY, Assistant Treasurer.

No. 43. Papers transmitted by the Presbytery of Shenango, in reference to the case of Mr. Beggs. These papers were, on motion, referred to the select committee, to whom the communication of Mr. Beggs was yesterday referred, and Mr. D. Goodwillie was, on motion, added to said Committee.

The Select Committee, on the additional report of the Presbytery of Albany, reported, and the report was, on motion, re-committed.

The Presbytery of Miami requested to have their report returned to them for amendment. The request was granted.

Resumed the consideration of the subject left under discussion last evening, viz: the case of Dr. Bullions and the Presbytery of Cambridge.

The Presbytery were heard in defence of their decisions in the case of Dr. Bullions. In the course of the discussion, the Moderator having decided that Messrs. T. Goodwillie and Pringle could not be heard, as they were not with the Presbytery in their views, nor protesters in the case; an appeal was taken but not sustained. Against this decision Mr. Goodwillie entered his protest. In this protest he was joined by Messrs. Pringle and Gilkerson. Before the parties were fully heard, the Synod adjourned till the usual hour. Closed with prayer.

3 o'clock P. M.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer. Members present as above. The minutes of the forenoon sitting were read and corrected.

On motion, it was resolved that Mr. D. Blair be added to the committee appointed to answer reasons of protest against the Synod's decision of last year, reversing the Moderator's decision in the case of Mr. Stark.

Papers being called for, there was given in and read:

No. 44. A letter from the Rev. Jos. Banks, containing his excuse for the non-fulfillment of the appointment given him by Synod last year. This letter was, on motion, laid on the table.

An addition to the report of the Presbytery of Miami was read, in relation to Mr. James A. Brown, student of theology, and, on motion, referred to the select committee to which the memorial respecting Mr. Brown had been referred.

The report of the select committee on the additional report of the Presbytery of Albany was read, and, on motion, adopted as follows, viz:

*Report of the Committee on the Additional Report of the Presbytery of Albany.*

The committee to whom was referred the additional report of the Presbytery of Albany, would recommend to Synod that their conduct be approved, in refusing to present a call to Mr. Williamson, while he refuses to recognize them as the Presbytery, agreeably to the decision of Synod; and that Mr. Williamson be appointed to the Presbytery of Albany during the year, and his case referred to them for farther dealing.

JAMES RAMSAY,  
T. BEVERIDGE.

On motion, Resolved, that the Commission yesterday appointed, meet at Massies Creek on the first Thursday of July, at 11 o'clock A. M.

Resumed the consideration of the business left under discussion at the close of the forenoon sitting. The parties were further heard and removed, and the members of Synod proceeded to express their views. Before going through the roll, the Synod adjourned till 8 o'clock this evening. Closed with prayer.

8 o'clock P. M.

The Synod met and opened with prayer. Members present as above, with the exception of Messrs. McKee, Dickson, Taggart, Reid and Mason, absent without leave.

The minutes of last meeting were read and approved.

Proceeded with the business left under discussion at the close of the last sitting. Before getting through the roll, the Synod adjourned till the usual hour to-morrow morning. Closed with prayer.

Friday, June 1st.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer. Members present as above, with the exception of Messrs. McLane, France, D. Blair, Douthett, Rodgers and W. Bruce, absent without leave.

Resumed the consideration of the business left unfinished last evening. The members of Synod were heard in the expression of their views.

After a free discussion, a motion was made and seconded, that the question be put, "Affirm or reverse the decision of the Presbytery of Cambridge?" An amendment was proposed to this effect, "that a select committee be appointed to prepare a minute issuing the whole case." This amendment being put to the vote, was negatived. From this decision, Mr. Heron craved his dissent to be marked. In this he was joined by Mr. Ferrier.

The original motion was then put and carried, and a brother having been employed in prayer for divine direction, the question was put, "Affirm the decision of the Presbytery of Cambridge or not?" and carried "affirm," by the following vote, viz:

*Ayes*—Dr. Ramsay, Messrs. Campbell, Martin, Scroggs, Beveridge, Smart, McNaughton, W. Easton, Hanna, Templeton, S. Wilson, Wallace, Kendall, Jno. Adams, McGill, Graham, McElwee, Webster, McKee, Patterson—*ministers*. Maxwell, Smaellie, Wilson, Dickson, Young, Galloway, McCall, Taggart, Arthurs, Reid, A. Collins, Johnston, Bullock, McNary, Morris, F. C. Collins, Elliot—*elders*—37.

*Noes*—Dr. Bruce, Messrs. Heron, Ferrier, Whyte, Thompson, Galbraith, D. Goodwillie—*ministers*. Scott, Bell—*elders*—9.

The Moderator craved to have it marked that he voted in the affirmative.

Against the above decision, Dr. Bruce protested, for reasons to be assigned. In this protest he was joined by Messrs. Ferrier, T. Goodwillie, Pringle, D. Goodwillie, Galbraith, Gilkerson and Smith. Mr. Heron craved to have it marked, that, in voting in the negative, he is not to be understood as approving the conduct of Dr. Bullions, but as expressing his belief that the sentence is too severe, and his disapprobation of some steps of the Presbytery's procedure. Mr. Scott craved to have the same explanation of his vote marked.

Messrs. Whyte and Thompson craved to have it marked in explanation of their vote, that according to their views the Synod should not have been called to vote upon the whole case in *cumulo*.

Dr. Bullions protested against the decision, and craved extracts, with time to prepare his protest in form, and follow it with reasons. The protest was admitted, and the request granted; but it was, on motion,

*Resolved*, That Synod declare that Dr. Bullions has no right to exercise his ministry under his protest.

The Synod proceeded to the consideration of the memorial and complaint of Mr. Stalker, against the Presbytery of Cambridge. Documents connected with the case were read, and the Synod adjourned till the usual hour. Closed with prayer.

3 o'clock, P. M.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer. Members present as above. The minutes of the forenoon sitting were read and approved. The Presbytery of Cambridge requested permission to retire for a short time. This request was granted.

Reasons of protest by Dr. Bruce against the decision of Synod in the case of the Presbytery of Albany were read, and Messrs. Miller and A. Gordon were appointed a committee to answer said reasons. The Presbytery of Cambridge having returned, presented a petition praying for a division of said Presbytery. This petition was, on motion, referred to a select committee, consisting of Messrs. Hanna and S. Wilson.

Mr. S. Wilson asked and obtained leave of absence for the remainder of the present sitting.

Resumed the consideration of the business left under discussion at the close of the forenoon sitting. Reasons of protest by Mr. Stalker against a decision of the Presbytery of Cambridge, excluding him from a vote on the ground of his having prejudged the cause, were read, together with the Presbytery's answers. After a brief discussion, the question was put, "Sustain the appeal or not?" and carried, "not sustain."

The charges of the Presbytery against Mr. Stalker, which finally led to his deposition, with Mr. Stalker's answers to said charges, and other documents connected with the case were then read. The commissioner from the congregation of N. Argyle was heard, and the parties being heard, and removed, the members of Synod proceeded to give their views. Before coming to a decision, the Synod adjourned till half past 8 o'clock this evening. Closed with prayer.

8 o'clock, P. M.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer. Members present as above, with the exception of Dr. Bruce and Messrs. Galbraith, Smith, Dickson, Taggart, Mason and Gilleland, absent without leave.

The minutes of last sitting were read and corrected.

On motion, the reading of papers were dispensed with, in order to proceed with the business left under discussion at the close of last sitting. After a brief discussion, the question was put, "Affirm the decision of the Presbytery of Cambridge in the case of Mr. Stalker or not?" and carried, "affirm."

Against this decision, Messrs. Ferrier, Heron, Gilkerson, T. Goodwillie, Pringle and D. Goodwillie, entered their protest for reasons to be assigned. Mr. Nicholas Robertson, ruling elder from the congregation of North Argyle, also protested against the decision.

Mr. Stalker protested against the decision for reasons to be given in, and craved extracts from the minutes in his case. This protest was admitted, and his request granted; but it was, on motion,

*Resolved*, That Synod declare that Mr. Stalker has no right to exercise his ministerial office under his protest.

The following resolutions were then offered and adopted, viz:

*Resolved*, That Mr. Stalker be required to acknowledge the Presbytery of Cambridge as a lawful court of Jesus Christ, to which he owes subjection in the Lord.

*Resolved*, That he satisfy the Synod that he approves of our professed principles, particularly in those points where we have testified against the defections of the United Seceders.

*Resolved*, That he express his sorrow for those expressions used by him injurious to his co-presbyters.

*Resolved*, That upon his acquiescence in these requirements, a rebuke be administered, and that he be restored to the communion of the church, and to the office of the ministry."

To the requirement in the 1st resolution Mr. Stalker acceded. In answer to the 2d he declared in substance, that he never could agree to testify against the United Secession Church,—in answer to the 3d, he declared that he was not conscious of having given his brethren any just cause of offence.—Whereupon it was voted that Mr. Stalker's answer is not satisfactory;—and, on motion, *Resolved*, That both Mr. Stalker and Dr. Bullions be remitted to the Presbytery of Cambridge for further dealing with them.

*Resolved*, That two ministers be sent forthwith, by this Synod, to the congregations of the deposed and suspended ministers, to labor among them, and as far as possible heal their divisions, to remain three or four

weeks, and that their expenses be defrayed from the Synod's fund. Messrs. A. T. McGill and McKee were appointed accordingly.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the following students, having completed their full term of study, be taken on trial for license, viz :

Mr. Joseph T. Cooper, by the Presbytery of Philadelphia.

Mr. James Law, by the Presbytery of Cambridge.

Mr. J. N. Laughead, by the Presbytery of Miami.

Mr. J. W. Harsha, John L. McLean, and Wm. H. Walker, by the Presbytery of Muskingum.

On motion, *Resolved*, That Messrs. Robert McClelland and William McNary be, and they hereby are, appointed Trustees of the Theological Seminary, in the room of Rev. Alexander Donnan and Mr. William Bell.

Messrs. French and Patterson were, on motion, elected members of the Board of Managers of the Theological Seminary.

The Committee of Bills and Overtures reported respecting the memorial from a minority of the Presbytery of Miami, in the case of James A. Brown, student of Theology. The report being amended was, on motion, adopted as follows, viz :

"Your Committee of Bills and Overtures report on the memorial of certain brethren of Miami Presbytery, in the case of Mr. Brown,—That the request be not granted, and for these reasons:

1. Because it is understood that he has not fulfilled the prescribed number of years at the Hall.

2. Because the point of which Mr. Brown is in doubt essentially considered is, whether we have sufficient reason for continuing a distinct body or not.

3. That however it may be sometimes expedient to bear with the doubts of honest private individuals, the case of a candidate for license is different, because he ought to be able to teach others this very doctrine.

4. That while it is "*manifestly consistent*" to hold Mr. Brown back from preaching until his doubts are removed, as to what he should preach, yet no censure is inflicted on him or intended thereby, and the phrase "*indefinite suspension*," as used in the memorial is wholly inapplicable.

5. *Resolved*, That it be recommended to Mr. Brown to attend the Seminary during the next session, and in the mean time, that he take the subject of Occasional Hearing more fully under his serious consideration.

ALEX'R GORDON,  
THOMAS HANNA.

Mr. John Adams asked, and obtained leave of absence, for to-morrow.

Messrs. McCall, Scott, Easton, A. Collins, T. C. Collins, W. Bruce, and James Wilson, asked and obtained leave of absence for the remaining sittings of Synod.

Adjourned till the usual hour to-morrow morning. Closed with prayer.  
*Saturday, June 2d.*

Synod met and was opened with prayer. Members present as above. The minutes of last sitting were read and approved.

A committee was appointed to bring in a minute to express the Synod's mind about protests from decisions of a superior court.

Mr. Beveridge was appointed said committee.

A request was made on behalf of the Presbytery of Cambridge, that said Presbytery be furnished with copies of the papers in the case of Mr. Stalker. The request was granted.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the professors be appointed a committee to prepare a formula of the obligations to be used in dispensing the ordinance of baptism.

*Resolved*, further, That said formula be printed along with the Testimony.

These resolutions were adopted.

The Draught of an Act for a Fast was read and on motion recommended.

Answers to reasons of protest by Messrs. Anderson and others, against the decision of Synod last year, refusing to sustain the decision of the Chair, in the case of Mr. Stark, were read, and, on motion, it was *Resolved*, That Synod do not adopt these answers as their own, but that they be printed with the reasons of protest, as the answers of the committee. The Moderator desired his dissent to be marked from the decision to print.

*Reasons of Protest against a deed of the Associate Synod of 1837.*

The undersigned having protested against a decision of Synod not sustaining a decision of the Moderator in the case of Mr. A. Stark, now present their reasons of protest.

The decision of the Moderator was, that the vote of Synod to review their deed of the preceding year in the case of Mr. Stark, left "the sentence of suspension unreversed." This decision, on an appeal from the chair, was sustained, but was afterwards reconsidered and voted "not sustain." Against the final decision of Synod not sustaining it, the undersigned protest for the following reasons:

1. They consider the decision protested against as asserting an *untruth*, either the vote to review reversed the sentence of suspension, or it did not. There is no medium between these positions. The Moderator decided that it did not; the Synod, that it did. The answer to the question at issue must be drawn from the vote to review, as that is the only thing supposed to affect the standing of Mr. Stark in the case. Now that was a vote to *review*, and not a vote to *reverse*; and of course necessarily implied and promised that a trial was to be made whether to *confirm* or to *reverse*. The vote to review was not the trial itself, and still less was it the ultimate decision without a trial. Therefore, it is not true that the vote to review reversed the decision, as the deed protested against necessarily says, and it therefore is and ought to be null.

2. The decision protested against misrepresents the vote to *review*, if it imply, as some plead that it does, that the vote to review placed Mr. Stark in the attitude of a defendant to be put on trial, and that therefore the sentence should be taken off till the trial took place.

The result of reversal does not necessarily follow even from these premises, because in matters of scandal of weighty import as this of Mr. Stark's was, church courts usually suspend for trial. But even the premises, that the vote to review placed Mr. Stark in the attitude of defendant for trial, are false, because it was not a vote to try Mr. Stark, but to *review the deed* of Synod. Books of Discipline and the regular practice of church courts, make a distinction between the trial of a *cause*, and of a *deed* of court. The trial of the deed is first; the trial of the cause follows, if it take place at all. As then the vote was to review the *deed* of Synod and not the *cause*, the decision protested against misrepresents that vote, and is therefore null.

3. The decision protested against was an unlawful assumption: it assumed a decision without a trial, and is therefore illegal. It assumed, without trial, what may be condemned on the trial which is promised. It assumed to condemn without trial a decision which it had just been determined to try. It assumed to reverse, without trial, what had been decided with trial; thus it illegally and in a disorderly manner reversed what had been legally and orderly done, and treated with contempt Synod's deed of the preceding year, because it condemned it without examination.

4. The decision protested against ought to be null, because it is in violation of acknowledged rules of discipline. The sentence of suspension laid on Mr. Stark by the decision of Synod, is surely as valid and to be as much respected as the sentence of an inferior court which may be brought up by appeal. Now, according to Books of discipline, the sentence of *suspension*, as well as of deposition and excommunication, must be considered as in force till the appeal be issued. This is recognized in our Overture, which, though not adopted, yet the rule is not objected to, and carries evidence with it of its correctness, viz: "The effect of an appeal is to suspend all further procedure in the case till the appeal be issued by a final decision. From this general rule, however, edification requires that one exception should be made, viz:

when the appeal is taken from a sentence of suspension, deposition, or excommunication, which sentence shall be considered as in force till the appeal be issued." Book 2, chap. 9, §9. The Book of Discipline of the General Assembly Presbyterian church in N. America, of acknowledged value, has substantially the same rule. Book 2, chap. 7, sec. 3, item 15. Our own Book of Discipline virtually maintains the same rule, part 3, art. 12, by allowing the court to proceed with the trial when they reject the protest. Now the vote to review the deed of Synod in Mr. Stark's case, found him under suspension, and by these authorities should have left him there till Synod would do what by that vote they promised to do, viz: review the deed of Synod. If edification requires this course in reviewing an appeal from an inferior court, surely it requires it in agreeing to review Synod's own deed. It is said, however, that the sentence of suspension may be considered as the execution of the deed of Synod. It is not strictly so, for we have this rule in our own Book of Discipline, part 3, art. 3, sec. 3. "A temporary suspension may become necessary without censure, when a prosecution for scandal appears to be unavoidable, and impossible to be overtaken before the administration of sealing ordinances." Both these circumstances existed in Mr. Stark's case. And if such a suspension be necessary in the case of a private church member, surely it is at least as necessary in the case of a church officer. But whether this suspension be considered a censure or not, it appears that edification requires it to remain in force till issued.

5. This decision was also made by a breach of public faith, and ought to be held null and void. The established rules of discipline are not only the deliberate judgment of the church respecting what is morally right and agreeable to the word of God, but the mutual pledge of the church to one another of the rules by which they will be governed in their measures. It is contrary to all precedent to reconsider a vote sustaining the chair on a point of order. About one half of the majority on this question went home. In their absence, the case was called up for consideration violating this pledge, on which they had just reason to depend, viz: that no decision shall be reconsidered at the same meeting, without the consent of two-thirds of the members.

6. This decision protested against was also most injurious as well as unlawful. It was given on a reconsideration of a former vote, and by Synod when mutilated by the absence of about one half of the members. It cast contempt on a regular decision of the preceding year, reversing it without examination or trial, and encouraging by example a prevailing spirit of contempt for divine ordinances, and particularly that of discipline. It set Mr. Stark at liberty to exercise all the ministerial functions, and enjoy all christian privileges, while an unreversed deed of Synod, a deed unexamined for reversal was lying against him, and while there was so much ground for believing the charge. It allowed him to be a member of Synod, whose authority he had contemned and disobeyed, and was still contemning and disobeying. It allowed him to enjoy church privileges and exercise all the ministerial functions, while there was palpable evidence of his contumacy, of which the same Synod shortly after did, by a judicial decision, convict him, though they strangely suffered the sin, which, by that sentence, they found him guilty of, to pass one year without rebuke. The decision, therefore, protested against, is not only illegal, but injurious, and ought to be condemned.

*May 29, 1838.*

A. ANDERSON,  
D. GORDON,  
JA. P. MILLER,  
JAMES RAMSAY,  
T. BEVERIDGE,  
ALEX. GORDON,  
JAMES MARTIN,  
JOHN G. SMART,  
PETER CAMPBELL.  
JOSEPH SCROGGS,

*Answers to reasons of Protest by Mr. Anderson and others, against a decision not sustaining the chair in 1837.*

**ANSWER TO FIRST REASON—**It is a truth that the previous vote of Synod was to review and not to reverse: But as Mr. Stark was not suspended when or before his trial commenced, (which in certain cases must be done) and when his trial was laid open as at its commencement, it would have been unjust to consider him suspended. He stood as at the commencement of his trial. Then, he was not suspended; nor till found guilty by Synod in 1836: and as his case was laid open again, the deci-

sion of Synod in 1836 lost its hold on him, and he occupied the same ground that he did during the first steps of procedure in his trial till it be issued. Had the decision of 1836 been reversed, Mr. Stark would have been cleared; whereas, the Synod is particular in stating that his trial is deferred in toto to this present meeting of Synod in 1838.

**ANSWER TO SECOND REASON**—The Synod did not proceed on the supposition alleged, “that Mr. Stark was to be put on trial;” but that he was on trial and not to be suspended till it is over. Should the Synod now confirm the decision of 1836, it may then suspend Mr. Stark as it did before; and if no review of his case is to take place, the suspension might not only be continued, but if Mr. Stark did not repent he might be deposed. But in the state in which Mr. Stark was at the meeting in 1837, could the Synod (suppose him obstinate) proceed to depose him by the rules of presbyterial order? No, he was on his trial and they could not do it. It would have been the mere authority of Synod that therefore could have continued the suspension: and there is no authority in a presbyterian court purely as lords; but their authority is delegated, and is in the nature of their cause.

**ANSWER TO THIRD REASON**—The vote of Synod did not assume that the decision of Synod of 1836 was reversed: it merely considered Mr. Stark's case as standing as it did, before he was found guilty in 1836: and as he was not then suspended, so when the trial was laid open for an entire review, he and his whole case, stood just as they stood before.

**ANSWER TO FOURTH REASON**—The sentence of suspension can not take place in an inferior court, where an appeal lies to a superior court; except in those instances where the crimes require suspension before entering on the trial. There can be no appeal but on the footing of a previous protest; and this, says our Books of Discipline, sists all further procedure till the case is decided by the superior court. In a similar way the decision to review did not reverse the decision of 1836, and acquit Mr. Stark of the charges; but put him where he would have been by a regular protest and appeal from a presbytery. On this supposition there was no suspension on Mr. Stark; and in fact when his case was referred to Synod, he was not suspended, and the relevancy of his libel even was not entered upon. Nor was there any protest or appeal taken before Synod's decision against the view of the chair, till, after that decision, Mr. Anderson and others protested.

**ANSWER TO FIFTH REASON**—The Synod did not violate public faith to the church by departing from the rules agreed upon for our discipline, but Synod supports in simplicity the very spirit and letter of our church discipline. We believe it not a fact, that many of the *majority* went home; but at any rate the Synod did not send any of them away—to home or elsewhere.

**ANSWER TO REASON SIXTH**—The Synod in not sustaining the chair did not intend any contempt for divine ordinances. Individuals may be contemptuous; but a whole body of men cannot enter into contempt in an instant of time against God and his ordinances. The Synod, as she was right according to her judgment, (she claims no infallibility) so she was sincere in that decision. The Pope might say to the people who proclaim him the head of the church, that in a measure which displeases him, they are treating with contempt the ordinances of the church; but in protestant courts men are supposed sincere though they may differ from others, and they may all err too in their decisions. Mr. Stark was not in this case contemning the authority of Synod, any more than the Synod was contemning God's ordinances:—he took his seat with the approbation of Synod.

R. BRUCE.

Reasons of protest by Dr. Bruce, and others, against the Synod's decision in the case of Dr. Bullions were read. Messrs. Anderson and Martin were appointed a committee to answer said reasons.

Reasons of protest by Dr. Bullions against the Synod's late decision in his case, were given in and read, and, on motion, referred to Messrs. Anderson and Martin, as a committee to prepare answers.

The select committee on the request of the Presbytery of Cambridge, for a division of said Presbytery, presented the following report, which was on motion, adopted as follows, viz:

The committee to which was referred the additional report of the Presbytery of Cambridge, requesting a division of said Presbytery, beg leave to report the following resolutions for adoption, viz:

*Resolved*, That a new Presbytery be erected as requested, to be called the Pres-

bytery of Vermont, including all that part of the Presbytery of Cambridge lying north-east of the line between New-York and Vermont, extended due north, and the south line of Vermont extended due east.

*Resolved*, That the ministers, with their elders included in said bounds, shall meet in Presbytery on the first Monday of July next, at Barnet; that the Rev. Thomas Goodwillie shall preach and constitute said Presbytery; and further, that all documents in the hands of the Presbytery of Cambridge, affecting the Presbytery of Vermont, or any of its members, shall be forthwith transmitted to them.

THOMAS HANNA,  
SAMUEL WILSON.

The select committee on the case of Mr. Beggs, presented a report, which was, on motion, adopted as follows, viz:

*Report of committee in the case of Isaac Beggs.*

Your committee having examined the papers referred to us in the case of Isaac Beggs, respectfully report as follows:

That inasmuch as the accused has long been kept in a state of suspense, the Synod should immediately take measures by which his case may speedily be issued; that since the accused has requested a reference of his case to the Presbytery of Miami, without being aware of the late division of that Presbytery; and that as he is situated as nearly to the place of meeting of the Indiana Presbytery as any other, that the whole case be referred to that Presbytery with instructions to them that it be issued as soon as possible; and that the Presbytery of Shenango be required to transmit all the papers in the case of Mr. Beggs, to the Presbytery of Indiana.

THOMAS S. KENDALL,  
DAVID GOODWILLIE,  
SAMUEL WILSON.

Reasons of protest by Messrs. Hall and others against a decision of the Presbytery of Miami in the case of Mr. James Todd, with answers to said reasons, transmitted by said Presbytery, were read and, on motion, laid on the table till next meeting of Synod.

The Moderator craved his dissent from this decision to be marked.

The committee appointed to answer Mr. Heron's reasons of protest against the Synod's decision of last year, in the case of Rev. Jas. Lyle, reported answers, which were read, and, on motion, it was agreed that neither reasons nor answers be published.

After hearing the reasons and their answers the Synod agreed that Mr. Lyle be considered as under suspension—only, until his cause can be formally tried by the Presbytery of Miami.

"The committee appointed to bring in a report respecting the effect of a protest against the decisions of Synod beg leave to state that such protests cannot be regarded as staying process or authorising disobedience to the acts complained of."

T. BEVERIDGE.

The report was, on motion, adopted.

The committee of supplies reported a scale, which being amended was adopted as follows, viz:

*Scale of Appointments.*

- Rev. Robert Laing, in the Presbytery of Albany, till next meeting of Synod.
- Rev. A. White, Sen., in the Presbytery of Cambridge, till next meeting of Synod.
- Rev. T. Ferrier, Shenango, June, July, August, September, October; Ohio, November; Allegheny, December, January; Chartiers, February; Albany, March; Vermont, April, May.
- Rev. S. McLean, Muskingum, June; Richland, July; Miami, August; Indiana, September, October; Illinois, November, December, January; Chartiers, February; Allegheny, March; Philadelphia, April, and May.
- David Thompson, in the Presbytery of Chartiers, till next meeting of Synod.
- J. M. Scroggs, in the Presbytery of Muskingum, till next meeting of Synod.
- R. Forrester, in the Presbytery of Richland, till next meeting of Synod.
- J. P. Smart, Philadelphia, June, July; Albany, August; Philadelphia, Septem-

ber; Shenango, October; Chartiers, November; Richland, December; Miami, January; Indiana, February, March, April, May.

W. Y. Hamilton, Philadelphia, June; Illinois, July, August; Indiana, September; Tennessee, October, November, December; Carolinas, January, February, March, April, May.

E. Small, Cambridge, June; Stamford, July, August, September; Shenango, October, November; Ohio, December, January; Richland, February; Chartiers, March; Philadelphia, April, May.

J. T. Cooper, Philadelphia, June; Albany, July; Philadelphia, August; Carolinas, September, October, November, December; Tennessee, January, February, March, April, May.

J. W. Harska, Chartiers, June, July; Richland, August; Cambridge, September, October; Albany, November; Cambridge, December, January, February; Albany, March, April; Ohio, May.

James Law, Cambridge, June, July, August; Albany, September, October, November; Philadelphia, December, January; Carolinas, February, March, April, May.

J. L. McLane, Chartiers, June; Muskingum, July; Miami, August; Indiana, September, October; Illinois, November, December, January, February; Tennessee, March, April, May.

J. N. Laughhead, Miami, June, July; Tennessee, August, September; Indiana, October, November; Richland, December, January; Alleghany, February; Philadelphia, March; Albany, April, May.

W. H. Walker, Muskingum, June; Ohio, July; Miami, August; Stamford, September, October; Cambridge, November; Albany, December, January, February, March, April, May.

D. R. De Freest, Albany, June, July, August; Philadelphia, September, October, November; Carolinas, December, January, February; Tennessee, March, April, May.

J. McAuley, Alleghany, June, July, August, September; Chartiers, October, November, December, January; Ohio, February; Philadelphia, March, April, May.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the minutes be published in the Religious Monitor. Seven hundred extra copies were ordered to be published. The expenses to be defrayed from the Synod's fund.

Adjourned till the usual hour. Closed with prayer.

3 o'clock P. M.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer. Members present as above. Read the minutes of the last sitting.

The committee to whom was referred the call from Tuscaloosa, for Rev. Thomas S. Kendall, reported as follows, viz:

"The committee to whom was referred the call and petitions from Tuscaloosa offer the following report: That the paper and provision of supply for the congregation of Tuscaloosa be referred to the Presbytery of Miami."

An additional report of the assistant treasurer was given in and read. This report was, on motion, referred to the committee on the funds.

On motion, *Resolved*, That as much of the Province of Lower Canada as we can occupy, be considered missionary ground.

Next meeting of Synod was appointed to be held at Pittsburg, on the 4th Wednesday of May next, at 4 o'clock P. M.; Sermon at half past seven. Mr. Kendall was appointed the Moderator's alternate to preach the Synodical Sermon.

On motion proceeded to the unfinished business of last year. Agreed to take up the case of Mr. Stark. Mr. Stark was called, but not appearing, the following preamble and resolution were adopted, viz:

Whereas, at the meeting of the Synod at Pittsburgh, in 1837, the Synod, according to the request of Mr. Stark and others, agreed to review the deed of the preceding Synod convicting Mr. Stark of various offences; and whereas Mr. Stark has withdrawn from the present meeting, therefore

*Resolved*, That the former deed of Synod in his case be affirmed.

From this decision Mr. Heron craved his dissent to be marked.

Dr. Ramsay joined in this dissent.

The Presbytery of Miami asked and obtained leave to withdraw for a few minutes.

The consideration of the proposed change in the time and duration of the sessions of the Hall, was, on motion, postponed till next meeting.

Mr. Martin requested, on behalf of the Presbytery of Albany, a copy of the paper in which Dr. P. Bullions offers new light or additional testimony on Mr. Stark's case; and a copy of the paper marked No. 24, in the printed minutes of last year.

This request was granted.

*Resolved*, That the Treasurer be ordered to pay Mr. Graham, sexton, \$20.00 for his services in attending on Synod.

The committee on the publication of the Confession of Faith, reported as follows, viz :

The committee respecting the publication of the Confession of Faith, report, that they have made such inquiry on the subject as seemed necessary, having ascertained that Mr. Wm. S. Young, of Philadelphia, is willing to undertake the publication at his own risk, and furnish copies to the members of Synod on as favorable terms as he can afford, and that he will as soon as practicable emit an edition.

*Resolved*, That the Synod recommend to Mr. Young to undertake the aforesaid publication.

JAMES RAMSAY,  
T. BEVERIDGE,  
J. P. MILLER.

The draught of an act for a fast was read as amended, and, on motion, adopted as follows, viz :

*Act for a Fast.*

The Associate Synod again call the people under their inspection, to solemn fasting, humiliation and prayer.

While the aspect of threatening Providence may be changed, and less apprehension felt that sentence against our evil works will be executed speedily, there is yet melancholy evidence, that the sins and enormities for which the Lord is angry, and his soul will be avenged on such a nation as this, are black and manifold as ever. Both as a church and as a nation, we are a people laden with iniquities.

Amidst all our precious and eminent privileges, ignorance, the grossest ignorance of God, and his truth prevails. Not only does the natural enmity of the heart oppose the light, and the pride of human reason obscure it, but the eager and absorbing pursuit of the world supplants it, and secures the reign of darkness over the soul. Men seem at this day so goaded and hurried in the service of Mammon, that they have no time to read, and meditate, and pray. If there is one sin, which more than another, characterizes this sinful age, it is "covetousness which is idolatry." No sin is more subtle and disguised, and covered over with specious pretences. It escapes the rebuke of the church, and the condemnation of the world. Nay, it secures the indulgence of the one, and the applause of the other, so that it seems to have overspread, and to have deadened, like a blighting pestilence, the graces of the christian character. Divine Providence has visited this iniquity with frowns and confusion. And while men of carnal wisdom contend in tracing the causes and the cure of calamity in the country, let us see the Lord's hand lifted up, and know that for the iniquity of our covetousness, he was wroth and smote us.

When we compare the abundance and even affluence of individuals and families, in our own communion with what we have done in the cause of Christ by supporting the gospel where it is, and sending it where it is not, we must own before God that we have withheld more than is meet—that we have been greedy and unfaithful stewards. We have thrown disparagement on our own witnessing profession, by extreme parsimony in the cause of God. We profess that there is no salvation without the light of the gospel, and yet make little exertion to save benighted heathen from inevitable woe—while others who corruptly allow the possibility of salvation without the gospel, labor to disseminate the light of revelation to the ends of the earth.

Our land and liberties are still endangered by the progress of Popery. The man of sin is not only increasing in the number of avowed adherents; but the poison of his principles is spreading widely and deeply in the bosom of Protestant churches. "No matter what we believe, if we are only sincere." "Let us do good, whether the means are warranted by the word of God or not." These are only another version of the Jesuitical maxims—"Ignorance is the mother of devotion"—"the end justifies the means." Yet these pervade the churches at the present day.

Error and delusion prevail, in every variety, from cold atheism itself, to the wildest fanaticism.

Gross immoralities abound. The name of God is dishonored with daring profaneness; and the tender concern of christians to hallow it, and to discountenance every custom and every institution that profanes it, is greatly abated.

The holy Sabbath is still profaned with open contempt; and because the desecration is legalized, even the followers of Christ seem often to acquiesce, as if the arm of unrighteous law could exonerate the conscience, and suppress the opposition of those who profess to obey God rather than men. And little can we hope for reformation from this grievous sin, when even such as sigh and cry for its public prevalence, profane it "in finding their own pleasure, and speaking their own words." And still less can we hope for such reformation, while our rulers are so little remembered in our prayers. We complain of their dereliction of duty to God and his church, ordaining laws in violation of laws that are divine; and yet how guilty are we, in neglecting to pray without ceasing, that the Supreme Ruler of nations would lead them to advance in their decisions the glory of God and the best interests of man. We deplore the horrid scenes of impiety and blood, which pollute the high places of honor in this land; and we must equally deplore the neglect of God's people to plead with him, that men of power and responsibility might be turned to "the wisdom of the just," and made to fear Him who can destroy both soul and body in hell.

The sin of slavery blots our country with still deeper and darker guilt. Efforts to wipe it away seem only to increase its atrocity. They are met with turbulent and lawless outrage. Liberty of speech is stifled—presses are destroyed—houses demolished—blood is spilled in its desperate struggle to escape the light.

Insubordination to the constituted authorities of the church, is a sin of fearful and increasing magnitude. Instead of meek submission to the order and discipline of Zion, the censured proudly spurn every yoke, and strive with reckless ambition to bring contempt on the courts of Christ. So prevalent is the spirit of rebellion against the thrones of judgment in the house of David, that ecclesiastical censures have become passports to fame and favor with the world. A perverse sympathy is ready to sustain every offender, and the most wholesome acts of discipline incur an opposition, which threatens the overthrow of all order and government in Zion.

We mourn the divisions and bitter strife, which now convulse the visible church. Grateful to God for reviving a little the love of truth and courage in defending it—we lament the schism and acrimonious conflict which it costs, to sustain the order of his house and the purity of his truth.

When we look at the state of family and personal religion among us, we have the saddest evidence of declension. Families neglect the worship of God, or observe it with cold and heartless formality. Parents neglect to instruct their children, or delegate the sacred trust to others who are neither qualified nor responsible.

Secret prayer, secret reading of the scriptures, self-examination and self-denial, all so essential to the growth of grace, are lamentably omitted. Ordinances are barren for want of devout preparation with ministers and people, by mutual and unceasing prayers for each other. Vice and iniquity are not reprov'd with just abhorrence. Lying, and slander, and fraud, and intemperance, and other sins equally heinous, are encouraged by the sinful indifference, and even participation of many, who profess to follow after that holiness without which no man shall see the Lord.

For these sins and others past reckoning, we ought to lie down in our shame, and confusion ought to cover us, for we have sinned "against the Lord our God, we and our fathers, from our youth even to this day, and have not obeyed the voice of the Lord our God." Let us look to Jesus the propitiation for our sins, and plead, that for his sake God would pardon all our sins, according to the greatness of his mercy, and send his Holy Spirit to renew and sanctify, and refresh us—that he would arrest the progress of infidelity, delusion and licentiousness—that he would sustain the discipline of his house, and bless it for reclaiming and restoring the offenders—that he would bless his ordinances for the conversion of sinners, and edification of his people—that he would extend the knowledge of Christ, and cause the light of the

glorious gospel to arise upon those who are sitting in heathen darkness, and in the shadow of death—that he would destroy Popish idolatry, and especially save our own land from its guileful and withering influence—that he would send into his vineyard faithful and laborious servants of Christ; and bless the seminaries, where youth are trained for the ministry of reconciliation; and bless the ministers appointed by the Synod to teach them—that he would bless all his ministers and people engaged in sustaining the covenanted reformation of our Fathers—that he would bless our nation, our rulers, and save us from the sins that reproach a people—that he would hasten the glorious fulfilment of prophecy, and usher in the day “when the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be sevenfold, as the light of seven days: when the Lord shall bind up the breach of his people, and heal the stroke of their wound.”

The second Thursday of November next was appointed to be observed as the day of fasting.

The report of the committee of appeals, on the complaint of Mr. John Dobbin, laid on the Synod's table last year, was called up. Mr. Robertson the original protester in the case being present, withdrew the protest, and the case was dismissed.

The report of the committee on the appeals of Messrs. Templeton and others from the decisions of the Presbytery of Miami in the case of the publication of the purpose of marriage, was called up, and on motion, *Resolved*, That Synod's rules on the publication of banns be strictly adhered to.

The committee on the funds reported, and the report was adopted as follows, viz:

The committee on the funds offer the following report: They have examined the reports of the several treasurers, submitted to them, and find them all correct. From which it appears, that on the 15th of May there was in the treasury at Cannersburgh, the sum of \$8053.15 3-4. In the treasury in Philadelphia at this date, the sum of \$761.89 1-4.

In the Bible fund the sum of \$425.84. Respectfully submitted,

J. A. P. MILLER,  
WM. MORRIS.

June 2, 1838.

The report of Mr. Wm. S. Young, Treasurer of the Bible Society, was read, as follows, and on motion, referred to the committee on the funds.

*Report of the Treasurer of the Bible Fund for the year ending June 3, 1838.*

May 24, 1838.—Received from Dr. Jas. H. Gillespie, by Rev. Mr. Kendall,	\$4 00
26, 1838.—Received from Baltimore congregation, per Rev. J. G. Smart,.....	69 00
June 3, 1838.—Received from Albany congregation, per Rev. Mr. Martin,	15 00
Received from S. Argyle congregation, by Rev. Jas. P. Miller,.....	15 00
Received from Rev. Jas. P. Miller, as treasurer pro tem. for preceding year,.....	105 80
Received from do. as interest on the above,.....	8 00
Balance by last report,.....	189 04
Interest on the above balance,.....	12 00
	<hr/>
	\$425 84
	<hr/>

WM. S. YOUNG.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the sum of \$59.00 be ordered to be paid by the Treasurer to Mr. Wm. Y. Hamilton, due to him on account of his Western Mission.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the Board of Managers be authorized to donate to students of Theology, who may stand in need of aid, such sums from the Student's Fund as their exigencies may require.

On motion, the Synod *Resolved* itself into a Committee of the Whole on the subject of the Bible Society.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the Executive Committee of last year, and the same Treasurer be continued.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the Executive Committee be authorised to publish a correct edition of the metrical version of the Psalms, and that the Treasurer be authorised to attend to this business.

When the Committee rose, the Minutes of the present sitting were read and approved, and the Synod adjourned, after prayer and singing the 121st Psalm, and the apostolical benediction pronounced by the Moderator.  
**ANDREW HERON, Synod's Clerk.**

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF ALBANY.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States	Fam.	Com.
Peter Campbell	Florida	Schenectady	Schenectady	N. Y.	42	140
James Martin	Albany	Albany	Albany	do	70	158
John Graham	Bovina	Bovina Centre	Delaware	do	82	158
Vacancies	New-York 1st	New-York	New York	do		
	New York 2d	do	do	do		
	Troy	Troy	Rensselaer	do		
	Johnstown	Johnstown	Montgomery	do		
	Newark	Newark		N. J.		
Without charge.	Fall River	Fall River		Mass.		
Robert Laing						
David R. DeForest						

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF ALLEGHANY.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.
Robert Bruce, D. D.	Pittsburgh	Pittsburgh	Alleghany	Penn.
John Dickie	Rich-Hill		Armstrong	do
	Kittanning	Kittanning	do	do
Joseph Scroggs	Buffalo		do	do
	Fairfield	Ligonier	Westmoreland	do
David Blair	Donagal		do	do
	Indiana	Indiana	Indiana	do
	Conemaugh		do	do
John Hindman	Union		do	do
	Concord		Armstrong	do
	Glade Run	Glade Run	do	do
James Rodgers	Mahoning		Indiana	do
	Berachah		do	do
Wm. Galbraith	Allegheny	Allegheny	Allegheny	do
	Bethel	Murrysville	Alleghany	do
Vacancies	Turtle Creek	Westmoreland	Westmoreland	do
	Freeport	Freeport	Armstrong	do
	Jefferson		Jefferson	do
Vacancies	Upper Piney	Strattonville	Armstrong	do
	Cherry-Run		do	do
	Warren	Apollo	do	do
	Lower Piney	Kittanning	do	do
	Gibson's	Punxutaway	Jefferson	do
	Clearfield	Curwinville	Clearfield	do

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF SHENANGO.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
Daniel McLane	Venango	Hart's x roads	Crawford	Penn.	200	500
John France	Salem		do	do		
	Glade-Run	Bakerstown	Butler	do	60	200
Matthew Snodgrass	Coneaut	Meadville	Crawford	do	25	50
	French Creek		do	do	32	30
	Cherry Run		Venango	do	20	80
Alex. Boyd	New Castle	New Castle	Mercer	do	32	70
	Neshannock		do	do	20	43
	Mount Prospect		do	do	25	45
William C. Pollock	Harmony	Harrisville	Butler	do	80	120
	Unity		do	do	55	100
Vacancy	Mercer	Mercer	Mercer	do	26	83
	Springfield		do	do	48	110
	Rocky Spring		do	do	56	126

## STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF PHILADELPHIA.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
F. W. McNaughton.	Mercersburgh, . . . . .	Mercersburgh, . . . . .	Franklin, . . . . .	Penn.		102
	McConnellsburgh, . . . . .	do	do	do		
W. Easton, . . . . .	Octorara, . . . . .	Sunflower . . . . .	Lancaster, . . . . .	do	65	
	E. Nottingham, . . . . .	do	do	do	57	
	Muddy Run, . . . . .	do	do	do	20	
John Adams, . . . . .	Guinston, . . . . .	L. Chanceford . . . . .	York, . . . . .	do	100	
	Lower Chanceford, . . . . .	do	do	do	50	
John S. Easton, . . . . .	Stone Valley, . . . . .	Brown's Mills . . . . .	Mifflin, . . . . .	do		
	Kishacoquillas, . . . . .	do	do	do		
	Lewistown, . . . . .	do	do	do		
C. Webster . . . . .	1 Cong. Philadelphia . . . . .	Philadelphia, . . . . .	Philadelphia, . . . . .	do	80	176
John G. Smart . . . . .	Baltimore . . . . .	Baltimore, . . . . .	Baltimore, . . . . .	Md.	68	
	Carlisle, . . . . .	Carlisle, . . . . .	Cumberland, . . . . .	Penn.		
A. T. McGill, . . . . .	Dickinson, . . . . .	do	do	do		
	Wheatfield, . . . . .	do	do	do		
	2d Cong. Philadelphia . . . . .	Philadelphia, . . . . .	Philadelphia . . . . .	do		
Vacancies, . . . . .	Huntingdon, . . . . .	Huntingdon, . . . . .	Huntingdon, . . . . .	do		80
	Belfonte . . . . .	Belfonte, . . . . .	Centre, . . . . .	do		
	Sinking Creek, . . . . .	Potter's Mills, . . . . .	do	do		

## STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF OHIO.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
David Imbrie . . . . .	Darlington . . . . .	Darlington, . . . . .	Beaver . . . . .	Penn.	60	140
	Bethel . . . . .	do	do	do	70	150
Alex. Murray . . . . .	Mountville . . . . .	Portersville . . . . .	Batler, . . . . .	do	70	140
	Slippery Rock . . . . .	do	do	do	80	150
Elijah N. Scroggs . . . . .	West Union . . . . .	New Lisbon . . . . .	Columbiana, . . . . .	Ohio.	75	150
	4 Mile Square . . . . .	do	do	do		
Dav. Goodwillie . . . . .	Poland . . . . .	Poland . . . . .	Trumbull . . . . .	do	67	189
	Liberty . . . . .	do	do	do	79	115
Wm. Douthet . . . . .	Milton, . . . . .	Warren, . . . . .	Trumbull, . . . . .	do	8	87
	Palmyra, . . . . .	do	Carrol, . . . . .	do		
	Newton, . . . . .	do	do	do		
Joseph Banks, . . . . .	Northfield, . . . . .	do	do	do		
	Stow, . . . . .	do	do	do		
James P. Ramsay, . . . . .	Springfield . . . . .	do	do	do		
	Deer Creek, . . . . .	New Bedford, . . . . .	Mercer . . . . .	Penn.		
Vacancy . . . . .	West Beaver . . . . .	do	do	Ohio.	103	210

## STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF CHARTIERS.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
Wm. Wilson . . . . .	Monteur's Run . . . . .	Clinton . . . . .	Alleghany . . . . .	Penn.	40	140
	Robison, . . . . .	do	Washington . . . . .	do	42	150
	Mt. Hope . . . . .	W. Middletown . . . . .	do	do	46	114
Thomas Allison . . . . .	Cross Creek . . . . .	do	Brooke . . . . .	Va.	26	61
James Ramsay, D.D. . . . .	Chartiers . . . . .	Cannonsburgh . . . . .	Washington . . . . .	Penn.	122	330
David French . . . . .	N. & S. Buffalo . . . . .	Washington . . . . .	do	do	110	240
Alex. Donnan . . . . .	Mt. Pleasant . . . . .	Hickory . . . . .	Washington . . . . .	do	105	220
	Burgetstown . . . . .	do	do	do	85	180
Alex. Wilson . . . . .	Peter's Creek . . . . .	do	do	do		
Wm. M. McElwee, . . . . .	Service & King's Creek . . . . .	Frankfort, . . . . .	Beaver . . . . .	do	116	264
Bankhead Boyd, . . . . .	Pigeon Creek . . . . .	McCullough's . . . . .	Washington . . . . .	do		
T. Beveridge, . . . . .	Washington . . . . .	Washington, . . . . .	do	do		
James M'Carrell . . . . .	Tumbleson's Run . . . . .	do	do	do	31	58
Vacancies . . . . .	Nobletstown, . . . . .	do	Alleghany, . . . . .	do	50	
	Ohio, . . . . .	Economy, . . . . .	do	do	70	

## STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF CAMBRIDGE.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
James P. Miller . . . . .	Argyle . . . . .	Lake P.O. N. Y. . . . .	Washington . . . . .	N. Y.	120	300
A. Gordon . . . . .	Putnam . . . . .	Putnam . . . . .	do	do	48	105
D. Gordon . . . . .	Salem . . . . .	Anaquasscook . . . . .	do	do	50	80
A. Anderson . . . . .	Hebron . . . . .	Salem . . . . .	Washington . . . . .	do	72	157
	Cambridge . . . . .	Cambridge . . . . .	do	do	131	366
	North Argyle . . . . .	North Argyle . . . . .	do	do		110
Vacancies . . . . .	Hemmingsford . . . . .	do	do	L. C.		
	Beech Ridge . . . . .	do	do	do		
	Hinchbrook . . . . .	do	do	do		
Without charge.						
A. White, sen.						

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF THE CAROLINAS.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
A. White, jr.....	Steel Creek.....	Charlotte.....	Mecklenburg..	N. C.	27	60
	Bethany.....	Lexington.....	Rockbridge...	Va.	36	98
Horatio Thompson,	Ebenezer.....	Timber Ridge..	do	do		
	Timber Ridge..	Steel's Mill.....	do	do		
	Old Providence	Natural Bridge..	do	do		
	Broad Creek.....	Union.....	do	do		
	New Lebanon...	Statesville.....	Iredel Co. ....	N. C.	50	100
	Cambridge.....	do	do	do	20	48
	Virgin Spring ..	Bogles.....	do	do	12	22
	Nob Creek.....	Wilsonville.....	Lincoln.....	do	11	20
	McGalliard's...	Morgantown.....	Barke.....	do	7	12
	Cochran's Vale..	Old Fort.....	do	do	5	9
Vacancies.....	Piedmont.....	Franklin.....	Macon.....	do	7	15
	Sharon.....	Yorkville.....	York Dis.....	S. C.	16	40
	Neiley's Creek ..	Coate's Tav.....	York.....	do	28	66
	Smyrna.....	Chester.....	Chester.....	do	18	50
	Little River.....	Young's.....	Fairfield.....	do	8	16
	Sardis.....	Smithsford.....	Union.....	do	6	14

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF MUSKINGUM.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
John Walker.....	Unity.....	New Athens...	Harrison.....	Ohio	90	209
Thomas Hanan...	Cadiz.....	do	do	do	84	174
Daniel McLane...	Bloomfield.....	N. Concord.....	Muskingum...	do	103	221
	Northfield.....	do	do	do		
Joseph Clokey...	Mount Pleasant	Smithfield.....	Jefferson.....	do	33	60
	Piney Fork.....	do	do	do	45	100
Andrew Isaac.....	Londonderry...	Londonderry...	Guernsey,....	do	65	160
	Sharon.....	do	do	do	17	33
Thomas Wilson...	Carroll.....	Carrollton,...	Carroll,.....	do		
	Sandy.....	do	do	do		
	North Union,...	do	do	do		
James Patterson..	Scroggsfield...	Scroggsfield...	Carroll.....	do	70	150
	Yellow Creek ..	do	do	do		
Samuel McArthur.	Glade Run.....	do	do	do		
	McMahon's Creek	St. Clairsville,	Belmont.....	do		
James McGill....	Belmont.....	do	do	do		
	Cambridge.....	Cambridge.....	Guernsey.....	do		
Vacancies.....	Claysville,...	do	do	do		
	Clear Fork.....	do	do	do		
	Jefferson.....	Harrison.....	Harrison.....	do		
	Salem.....	do	do	do		

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF MIAMI.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
A. Heron,.....	Caesar creek,...	Jamestown.....	Green.....	Ohio.	45	120
James Adams,...	Massias Creek,...	Xenia,.....	do	do	91	202
James Templeton,	Sugar Creek,...	Centreville....	Montgomery..	do	59	120
Samuel Wilson,...	Xenia,.....	Xenia.....	Green.....	do	75	186
James Wallace,...	Cherokee,.....	Cherokee.....	Logan.....	do	36	62
	Darby,.....	do	Union.....	do	31	64
Thos. S. Kendall..	Pistol Creek,...	Maryville.....	Blount.....	Tenn.		
	Big Spring,...	do	do	do	70	158
Vacancies,.....	Fork Creek,...	do	Monroe.....	do		
	Tuscaloosa,...	Tuscaloosa,...	do	Ala.		
	Rocky Spring,...	Abingdon.....	Washington..	Va.		
	Limestone,...	do	do	do		
	Salem,.....	do	do	Tenn.		
	Salt River,...	do	do	do		
	Poplar Ridge,...	Ottaway,.....	Putnam.....	Ohio.		
	Sugar Ridge,...	Finley,.....	Hancock,....	do		
	Plainsfield,...	do	do	do		
	Kenton,.....	Kenton,.....	Hardin,.....	do		
Round Head,...	Roundhead,...	do	do			

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF STAMFORD.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
John Russell,...	Stamford,...	Queenston,...	do	U. C.	35	80
James Strang,...	Dumfries,...	Galt,.....	do	do		230
D. Strang,.....	York.....	soria,.....	Genesee.....	N. Y.		63
D. Couatts,.....	Esquising,...	do	do	U. C.		60
Vacancies.....	London,.....	do	do	do		11
	Chingacousey ..	do	do	do		25

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF VERMONT.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Conuties.	States	Fam.	Com.
T. Goodwillie.....	Barnet.....	Barnet.....	Caledonia.....	Vt.	80	200
Wm. Pringle.....	Ryegate.....	Ryegate.....	do.....	do	65	143

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF INDIANA.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	State.	Fam.	Com.
Nath. Ingles.....	Barnett's Creek.....	Lockport.....	Carrol.....	Ind.	46	110
J. M. Henderson..	Pleasant Run.....	Smockville.....	Jefferson.....	do		
	Carmel.....		Clarke.....	do		
G. M. Hall.....	Madison.....	Bryantsburgh.....	Jefferson.....	do		
	Big Creek.....		do			
James Dickson...	Raccoon.....	Russelville.....	Parke.....	do		
Vacancies.....	Princeton.....		Gibson.....	do		
	Otter Creek.....		do			
	Bloomington.....		do			

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF ILLINOIS.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	County.	State.	Fam.	Com.
James C. Bruce...	Henderson.....	Monmouth.....	Warren.....	Ill.	58	160
William Bruce...	Bethel.....	Bethel.....	do.....	do		
Vacancies.....	Unity.....		do.....	do		
	Sugar Creek.....		do			
	Buffalo.....		do			
	Mount Prairie.....		do			
	Auxvasse.....		do			
	Sharon.....		do			
Hennepin.....				do		
				do		
Crooked Creek.....				Wis.		

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF RICHLAND.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	County.	State.	Fam.	Com.
Samuel Irvine.....	Salt Creek.....	Fredericksburgh.....	Wayne.....		75	120
Samuel Hindman..	Millersburgh.....	Mansfield.....	Richland.....		25	57
	Mansfield.....					
David Lindsay,...	Clear Creek.....	Wooster,.....	Franklin.....		17	27
	N. Washington.....					
	Jonathan's Creek.....					
Joseph McKee...	Goshen.....	Wooster.....	Wayne.....		26	50
	Licking.....					
	Dover.....					
	Killbuck.....					
	Mohican.....					
Vacancies.....	Clear Creek.....	Vermillion.....	Richland.....		18	41
	Truro.....	Reynoldsburgh.....	Franklin.....		23	60
	Delaware.....					
	Bucyrus.....	do.....	Crawford.....			

SUMMARY OF THE PRECEDING TABLES.

PRESBYTERIES.	Ministers.		Families.	Communicants.
	settled	and vacant.		
Cambridge.....	6	9	547	1481
Carolinas.....	2	19	198	436
Ohio.....	7	16	690	1431
Chartiers.....	10	16	843	1752
Miami.....	6	19	496	1182
Philadelphia.....	7	19	198	660
Alleghany.....	7	24		
Muskingum.....	9	31	665	1865
Albany.....	5	9	333	976
Shenango.....	5	14	679	1557
Stamford.....	4	6	35	236
Indians.....	4	10		
Illinois.....	2	10		
Richland.....	4	16		
Vermont.....	2	2		
Ministers Itinerating.....	15			
Total.....	94	209		

**ART. II. *The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church.***

This body at its late meeting in Philadelphia, became divided into two bodies, each claiming to be "The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States." The proceedings of both these bodies related principally to the division which had taken place and to subjects therewith connected. It would not be interesting to our readers to lay these proceedings before them. The following account of the origin of the "New School," or as some term it the "Constitutional Assembly," we extract from the minutes of the "Orthodox Assembly:"

"The committee appointed to prepare a minute respecting the disorder which occurred at the time of organizing the General Assembly, reported the following minute:—

"After the sermon, the Moderator gave notice that as soon as the benediction was pronounced, he would take the Chair, and proceed to the organization of the Assembly. The benediction being pronounced, the Moderator took the Chair, and having opened the meeting with prayer, called upon the permanent clerk to report the roll.

"The Rev. William Patton, a member of the Third Presbytery of New-York, rose and asked leave to offer certain resolutions which he held in his hand.

"The Moderator declared the request at that time to be out of order, as the first business was the report of the Clerks. (See form of Government, chap. xii. sec. 7.

"Dr. Patton appealed from the decision. The Moderator declared the appeal, for the reason already stated, to be at that time out of order. Dr. Patton stated that the resolutions related to the formation of the roll, and began to read the same, but being called to order, took his seat.

"The Permanent Clerk from the standing committee of commissions, reported that the following persons present have been duly appointed commissioners to this General Assembly, and laid their commissions on the table, viz. [Here follows the roll, which has already been published.]

"After the report of the committee of commissions had been read, the Moderator stated that the commissioners whose commissions had been examined and whose names had been enrolled, were to be considered as members of this Assembly; and added, that if there were any commissioners present from Presbyteries belonging to the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, whose names had not been enrolled, then was the time for presenting their commissions.

"Mr. Mason rose, as he said, to offer a resolution to "complete the roll," by adding the names of certain commissioners, who, he said, had offered their commissions to the clerks and had been by them refused. The Moderator inquired if they were from Presbyteries belonging to the Assembly at the close of the sessions last year? Mr. Mason replied that they were from Presbyteries belonging to the Synods of Utica, Geneva, Genesee, and the Western Reserve. The Moderator then stated that the motion was out of order at this time. Mr. Mason appealed from the decision of the Moderator, which appeal also the Moderator declared to be out of order, and repeated the call for commissions from Presbyteries in connection with the Assembly.

"The Rev. Miles P. Squier, a member of the Presbytery of Geneva, then rose, and stated that he had a commission from the Presbytery of Geneva, which he had presented to the clerks, who refused to receive it, and that he now offered it to the Assembly and claimed his right to his

seat. The Moderator inquired if the Presbytery of Geneva was within the bounds of the Synod of Geneva. Mr. Squier replied that it was. The Moderator said, "then we do not know you, sir," and declared the application out of order.

"Mr. Cleveland then rose and began to read a paper, the purport of which was not heard, when the Moderator called him to order. Mr. Cleveland, however, notwithstanding the call to order was repeated by the Moderator, persisted in the reading. During which the Rev. Joshua Moore, from the Presbytery of Huntington, presented a commission, which, being examined by the committee of commissions, Mr. Moore was enrolled and took his seat.

"It was then moved to appoint a committee of Elections, to which the informal commissions might be referred. But the reading of Mr. Cleveland still continuing, and the Moderator having in vain again called to order, took his seat, and the residue of the Assembly remaining silent, the business was suspended during the short but painful scene of confusion and disorder which ensued. After which, and the actors therein having left the house, the Assembly resumed its business."

During the confusion above referred to, the new Assembly was organized by the appointment of a Moderator and Clerks, after which organization they immediately adjourned to meet in another place. The following debate, as published in the N. Y. Observer, will give our readers some further light on the subject of this division.

Mr. Maxwell then moved the following resolutions in relation to the members concerned in the disorders which attended the opening of the Assembly:

1. *Resolved*, That those commissioners to the General Assembly, viz: Wm. Patton, D. D., Erskine Mason, D. D., John P. Cleveland, Nathan S. S. Beman, D. D. and others, who, according to law and usage, had presented their commissions to the Permanent and Stated Clerks, prior to the meeting of the body on Thursday last, the 17th instant, and afterwards on that day, while the house was organizing, and the clerks, under the direction of the Moderator, were actually engaged in completing the roll, interrupted the progress of the regular proceedings, by combining with certain other persons present unknown to the General Assembly, in openly forming another body, which they called the General Assembly; and subsequently, voluntarily, and without leave asked or obtained, left the house to convene in the First Presbyterian church in this city—in so doing committed an act which, however intended, can only be considered as a plain and palpable violation of order and decorum, and in derogation of the duty which they owed to the house, and to the church and cause of Christ.

2. *Resolved*, That by their said conduct and by their subsequently neglecting to attend the sessions of the General Assembly since that day, and at the same time notoriously attending the sessions of another body convening from day to day in the First Presbyterian, calling itself the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States of America, the said commissioners appear to have wilfully and deliberately vacated their seats in this house, the only true and proper General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States of America; and to have originated and organized a schismatical secession from the body to which they belonged.

3. *Resolved*, That the names of said commissioners be now called and recorded, in order that they may be reported to the Presbyteries of which they are members respectively.

A motion for the adoption of these resolutions elicited considerable diversity of opinion.

*Thursday morning, May 24.*

After the reading of the minutes, the resolutions under discussion yesterday afternoon were again brought before the house. On being read separately for adoption, exceptions were taken to phraseology, viz:—“Combining with others,” etc. that it was technical, and expressed too much.

Mr. Harding thought the objection to the resolution was, that it was not strong enough to express all they did. They did “combine.” It was *treason* to the church and to God. It was *moral perjury*. He was opposed to their return to this house, until they should improve both their morals and manners.

Mr. Denny said, he supposed the brother who had just taken his seat, had expressed his own feelings by the language he had used, and he did not wonder that he wished strong language, when he used such himself. He exceedingly regretted that such language should be used. It was the violent and improper language and temper of some of the members of this body, which was doing more to injure us, more to injure Presbyterianism, than any thing else. He thought a different course should be pursued. We should not denounce them, though we were satisfied they had erred. Better that we employ the language of kindness, that we may bring them back from their wanderings, and not erect a wall of separation so as forever to place them beyond the reach of our influence.

Mr. Williamson said, he had not intended to speak at all. He regretted that any difference of opinion should arise on such a question as this. He thought the resolutions were suitable, and the best that could be adopted. Shall we not express what we know is the truth? Are we to bow to them as suppliants, and seek at their hands what we are in duty bound to assert and claim as our own?

Mr. Maxwell said, he perfectly agreed with his worthy brother, Denny, and in a double sense—except in the application in the present case. He thought the language expressed nothing but the simple facts in the case. It was a fact in the recollection of all, that there was a combination; the commissioners of this Assembly had joined with others; that was the object of Mr. Mason’s remarks. The language of the resolutions express the thing we wish to express, precisely. He was surprised that the objection should come from Mr. Denny. He had exhorted us to keep cool, and said that he dared not trust his own feelings! Mr. M. said he was surprised that he had not yet got cool. It was now a *whole week* since the occurrence, and he must have been very much heated indeed. As for himself, he was as cool as winter, and he had been from the commencement.

On motion, the first resolution was finally adopted almost unanimously—one only dissenting.

On motion for the adoption of the second resolution,

Dr. Hodge suggested an amendment in the use of some of the terms employed. He thought it most wise to avoid epithetical language. Nothing could be gained by it. He was satisfied that it lessened rather than increased the force or influence of the resolution.

Mr. Breckinridge said, he was very sorry that the assembly should consume so much of its time about what he considered of little importance, and he thought the house had sufficiently expressed the same opi-

nion. The General Assembly is not a school of rhetoric or of grammar, but constituted for a far higher purpose. It was a fact, that every man who had knowledge enough would have a style of his own. He was not prepared to adopt the words or the style of every body, but he thought the resolution was well enough drawn. Certainly, the large committee who had prepared it, ought to be competent. It embraced several D. D.'s, Presidents and Professors of Colleges, lawyers, and *one* who was often charged with having been a *lawyer*, but who was now a very indifferent minister; and he hoped the house would not consume so much time about the choice of words meaning the same thing.

Prof. McLean said, he had signified his assent to the resolutions, and he had no particular objection to their adoption; yet he thought the Assembly ought to regard the feelings of those brethren who felt a difficulty concerning their adoption without amendment. He took the same view with Dr. Hodge.

Dr. Baxter moved the substitution of "*forfeiting* their seats" for "*vacating*" &c. He thought it important to determine who were members of this house. (The question here arose, whether it was to be considered as affecting the several Presbyteries to which members belonged, or only themselves.)

Mr. Breckenridge said, he was disposed to sustain the rights of every one. He would not say they were not members of this house. They came here with commissions, and they must answer to their respective Presbyteries for their conduct here. It was the business of this house to give due notice to those Presbyteries. He was credibly informed that the members of the General Assembly were daily called at the meetings of those members in another part of this city; and he was not sure (this he said playfully) but the Assembly had better adjourn and meet with them, and close their sessions at once! But to return to the subject. It was not for trifles that he wished to contend. He wished to take a more comprehensive view of the subject. It was the interests and safety of the Church, her purity, which he wished to guard. It was this for which he had been contending for years. Hicksism and Taylorism, and New-lightism, and all other *isms*, he regarded as essentially the same, as all were united in departing from the *vital, fundamental* principles of Christianity; and it was for the benefit, of not only the Presbyterian Church, but of all churches, and all posterity—for they would look with avidity upon these proceedings—that he had contended.

Judge Leavitt thought it important for the house to inquire in what capacity it was acting; whether *legislative* or *judicial*. To say that they had vacated their seats, was proper; but to go farther, and declare them *forfeited*, would be judicial; and if the Assembly now pass a decision judicially, it might disable it from action if the subject should hereafter come up from another source.

Dr. Green thought it not necessary to make the change. What they had done was personal, and not to affect their Presbyteries. We should allow other members from those Presbyteries, regularly sent up here, their, seats in this Assembly.

Mr. White, of S. C. said, this subject involved many important principles which will affect the judicatories below. This body had no authority to declare their places forfeited. That was a business which belonged to the Presbyteries.

This resolution, as also the whole when finally taken, was passed *unanimously*.

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,  
AND  
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

JULY, 1838.

---

ART. I. *Historical Sketch of the United Brethren or Moravians.*

(Continued from Vol. XIV, page 541.)

Soon after the accession of Maximilian II. to the imperial throne of Germany, the edicts against the Brethren, issued by his predecessor, were rescinded, and in 1564 their churches were restored to them, and re-opened for public worship, having been closed for nearly twenty years. Many members of their church, who, during the persecution had expatriated themselves, returned to their native country.

But they had scarcely begun to taste the sweets of religious liberty, when their enemies concerted fresh measures for depriving them of it. For this purpose, the imperial Chancellor of Bohemia, Joachim Von Neuhaus, went in 1565 to Vienna, and by his incessant importunity induced the Emperor to sign a new edict against the Brethren. Its execution was, however, providentially frustrated; for, as the chancellor was passing the bridge over the Danube, it broke under him, precipitating his carriage into the river, in which he, and most of his retinue, found a watery grave. A young nobleman, swimming across on horseback, on observing the chancellor rise, seized hold of his gold chain, and kept him above water, till some fishermen hastened to the spot, and took the lifeless body into their boat. But the box which contained the death-warrant of many thousand innocent persons, was carried away by the stream, and never found. The Emperor, who had issued the edict with great reluctance, was by no means disposed to renew it, but, on the contrary, formed a favorable opinion of the Brethren's church: and the impression made on the mind of the young nobleman was such, that he became a member of their community, and in far advanced age spoke of this occurrence with admiration and gratitude.

This season of repose was employed by the Brethren for the advancement of vital religion. In the first instance, the time and attention of the Synods which met, were occupied in reviewing their ecclesiastical constitution, and in making such regulations as appeared calculated to remove various irregularities which had crept into their church during

the late persecution. Another important subject of deliberation respected a new translation of the Bible into the Bohemian language, from the originals, the version hitherto in use having been made chiefly from the Latin Vulgate. To render this work as perfect as possible, they sent some of the students of divinity to the Universities of Wittemberg and Basle, to acquire a more extensive knowledge of Hebrew and Greek. They were accompanied by Lucas Helitz, a baptized Jew, from Posen, and minister of the gospel. Having completed their studies, they assembled at the castle of Kraliz, in Moravia, and commenced their labors, being joined by several of the Brethren's ministers; three bishops, Johannes Æneas, Johannes Epraim, and Paul Jensenius, superintended the work. In order to facilitate the business, Baron Scherotin established, at his own expense, a printing-office, at his castle of Kraliz. The translators spent fourteen years in completing their work. The high value of this translation is sufficiently evident from the many editions through which it has passed.

Till the death of Maximilian II. the brethren enjoyed rest and peace. His successor, Rudolph II., who ascended the imperial throne in 1576, was likewise well disposed towards them. Their adversaries, however, and especially the Jesuits, used every means to incense the Emperor against them; and at length, in 1602, they so far succeeded, that he consented to the revival of an old edict, by which their churches were shut up. It is related that the Emperor, on receiving immediately after the news that the town of Stuhlweissenberg had been taken by the Turks, made the following declaration:—"I have been expecting intelligence like this, because I have arrogated to myself power over the consciences of men, which is the sole prerogative of God." With this impression on his mind, he was easily persuaded by the representations of the friends of the brethren to annul the edict.

After the death of the Emperor Rudolph II., which happened in 1612, the Popish clergy adopted the most violent measures to enforce the resolutions of the council of Trent, for suppressing Protestantism; and it was determined to begin this work, *misnamed Reformation*, in Bohemia and Moravia. By repeated acts of oppression, the popish party tried to excite the Protestants to deeds of open violence. Having in vain appealed to the Imperial Letters Patent, they were at length driven to impatience, flew to arms, renounced allegiance to their new king, and chose Frederick, elector of the Palatinate, for their Sovereign. This was the very thing their enemies desired, as it furnished them with a pretext for declaring war against the Bohemians as rebels.

It is probable that the brethren had the least share in these acts of open violence; yet they were involved in all the distress which ensued, and which terminated in the almost total destruction of the Protestants, who had been defeated by the imperial troops, in a battle fought in 1620, on the Weissenberg, a hill near Prague. Great numbers were made prisoners, and many took refuge in the adjacent States. Some of the latter were induced by the promise of pardon and complete oblivion of all that passed to return; but were soon dreadfully undeceived. They were cast into prison, and not a few died by the hand of the executioner.

The persecution was first levelled against the Anabaptists, who had above forty congregations in Moravia, consisting of many thousand souls. They were either forcibly expelled the country, or obliged after the spoliation of their property, to emigrate. A similar fate afterwards

befel the brethren. Besides those who dwelt in other parts of the country, the Vice Margrave of Moravia, baron Charles Scherotin, had twenty-four of their ministers residing on his own estates. This nobleman, who was one of their principal patrons, submitted an humble but energetic remonstrance to the imperial court, representing the injustice of extending the edict of banishment to him and his tenantry; because they had taken no share in hostilities, nor broken their allegiance to the Emperor. But all his exertions were fruitless, and he was at length compelled to leave the country, together with those bishops and ministers of the Brethren's church, to whom he had afforded an asylum.

These atrocities the Popish party endeavored to palliate by representing them as the execution of the laws against persons accused of rebellion for having taken part in the war. It, however, soon became manifest, that this was a mere pretence, and that the real object was nothing less than the entire extirpation of all, who did not adhere to the church of Rome not only in Bohemia, but also in Moravia, though none of the Protestants in this country had joined in the war. To effect their purpose, they first vented their rage against the teachers of religion whom they imprisoned or expelled. Their next endeavor was to get rid of the noble patrons of the Protestants.

The first of these who were led to the scaffold, was count Schlick, who, during the reign of king Frederick, had been governor of Bohemia, and the principal patron of the Brethren's church, a man of superior talents and unquestioned piety. When his sentence had been read to him, intimating that his body, after decapitation, should be quartered, and impaled in a place where four roads met, he said in Latin:—"To remain unburied matters little." "I can boldly aver that, through the grace of God, that no fear of death disquiets me." The dignified cheerfulness, with which he once or twice walked a few paces on the scaffold, and then uttering a short prayer, kneeled down to receive the stroke of the executioner's sword, so affected the spectators, that they could not refrain from tears.

He was followed by Wencellas von Budowa, likewise a member of the Brethren's church; a man of considerable learning, whose writings had procured for him no small celebrity, and who, under the Emperor Rudolph, had held several high offices. He was seventy-four years of age. When informed of the danger which threatened the friends of evangelical religion, he conveyed his family to a place of personal security, but himself returned to his mansion, as he said his "conscience would not let him abandon the good cause." Hearing soon after that, it was reported he had died with grief, he said with a smile, "How? I die of grief? Never have I tasted greater joy than in my present situation." Putting his hand on the Bible, he added: "This paradise has never offered me sweeter fruits, than it does at this moment. I live, and shall live as long as God pleases; and the day shall never come, of which it shall be said, *Budowa died of grief.*"

While in confinement, he was visited by two Capuchin monks, who said they were come to do a work of mercy unto him in his present distress. He asked them what this work of mercy was? To which they replied, "to show your Lordship the way to heaven." "By the grace of God," rejoined he, "I have known it long ago." Not silenced by this reply, the monks intimated their fears, that he would find himself woefully deceived. "By no means," was his reply, "my hope is founded on the unerring word of God. I know no other way to heaven than

through Him, who hath said, "*I am the way, and the truth, and the life.*" The monks continuing on the authority of the Romish church, to adduce several objections, he forcibly confuted them, and offered his visitors, if they would stay a while longer with him, clearly to point out to them the way to heaven. But for this they had no leisure, and having crossed themselves, withdrew.

On the day of execution, two Jesuits came and told him they were very desirous to save his soul, he answered, "I only wish *you* were as certain of salvation as I am. Praise and thanks be to God, who by his Spirit hath assured me of salvation through the blood of the Lamb. I know in whom I have believed; I know there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness." At these words he was interrupted by the Jesuits, who remarked that he had no right to apply that text to himself, it being spoken by Paul solely in reference to his own person. "Nay," rejoined he, "in this you are grossly mistaken, for the Apostle adds, *which the Lord shall give not to me only, but unto ALL them also, that love his appearing.*"

By a reference to several other passages of Scripture, he so exposed their ignorance, that though inwardly ashamed, they left him in a rage, as an incorrigible heretic. Soon after, he mounted the scaffold, uncovered his head, and stroking down his silver locks, said, "Behold my grey hairs, what honor is conferred upon them to be encircled with the martyr's crown!" Placing himself in an attitude of prayer, he presented his hoary head to the sword of the executioner, who quickly severed it from the body. It was afterwards fixed on a tower as a public spectacle.

Were it not that these sketches have been already much farther extended than was originally intended, we might give an account of the death of several other noblemen which would be equally edifying with the preceding. We shall close this article with a sketch of the life and character of Amos Comenius, who was the last surviving bishop of the ancient Church of the Brethren. He was the connecting link between the ancient and the modern Church of the Brethren, and his writings were materially conducive in transfusing into the renewed Church of the Brethren no small portion of the spirit of its ancestors.

John Amos Comenius was born on the 28th of March, 1592, at Komna in Moravia. He early devoted himself to the ministry of the gospel in the Brethren's Church, and the better to qualify himself for this, after receiving the rudiments of education at home, he attended the Reformed (Calvinistic) Universities of Herborn and Heidelberg. Having completed his academical course, he was appointed principal of the grammar school at Prezerow in Moravia, and in 1618 was chosen minister of the congregation at Fulnek, the chief settlement of the Brethren in that country.

Six years after, when all Protestant ministers were banished, he retired for some time to the castle of a Bohemian baron, situated in the mountains, and paid occasional visits to his bereaved flock, but was obliged to quit his place of concealment in 1627, when all the Protestant nobility were banished. Thus forced from his retreat, he emigrated, with part of his congregation, through Silesia into Poland. Having reached the summit of the mountains which form the boundary, he cast one more sorrowful look on Bohemia and Moravia, and kneeling down with his fellow exiles, offered up a fervent prayer, imploring God not to suffer the light of his Holy Word to be totally and forever withdrawn

from these countries, but to preserve there a seed which should serve him. The sequel of the history, especially as it relates to our own times, shows that his prayer was graciously heard and answered.

He and his company having arrived in Poland, he chose Lissa for his place of residence; and at a Synod held in this town in 1632, was consecrated bishop of the Bohemian and Moravian branch of the Brethren's Church, many members of which were dispersed in different countries. Here he published his introduction to the Latin language, a classical work which was translated into twelve European and several Asiatic languages. The fame of his erudition and distinguished talents for the instruction of youth, was widely circulated. He received invitations to Sweden, Transylvania and England, where he labored with much success for the improvement of schools. In the interval of these journeys he resided mostly at Lissa, and was occupied with the compilation of an extensive work designed to be an epitome of all the sciences. But during a fire which destroyed part of Lissa in 1656, his manuscripts and most of his books were consumed. In consequence of this disaster, he went first to Frankfort, on the Oder, thence to Hamburg, and lastly to Amsterdam. Here he maintained himself by giving private tuition; and published his elementary works on education.

In his many journeys into foreign countries, he neglected no opportunity of soliciting the influence and patronage of persons in power for the oppressed Church of the Brethren. But it is to be regretted, that in his zeal to procure its liberty and promote its spiritual interests, he lent too ready an ear to the many pretended prophecies which were then afloat concerning the downfall of Popery, and the overthrow of the Austrian dominions. While noticing this weakness of judgment in a man otherwise so highly esteemed for his piety and learning, it is pleasing to reflect that he lived long enough to see and lament his error, and as far as lay in his power, to undo any mischief which might have arisen to religion, by giving the sanction of his name and authority to these pretended prophecies. In his last work, entitled, *THE ONE THING NEEDED*, published three years before his death, he acknowledges and deeply deplors this error.

These pretended revelations, to which certain events, during the thirty years' war in Germany, might have given a color of probability, confirmed his hopes of a speedy restoration of religious liberty. In the prospect of this, Comenius, during the continuance of the war, made repeated and earnest application to all the Protestant princes, and particularly to the British nation, to patronize the Brethren's church. But when no provision was made for it in the treaty of peace concluded in Westphalia, in 1648, he relinquished all hope of obtaining help from man.

How grievously this disappointment afflicted him is evident from the manner in which he speaks of it in a small treatise, containing an affecting description of the distress of his people; from which a few extracts are here inserted. "We ought, indeed," says he, "patiently to bear the wrath of the Almighty: but will those be able to justify their conduct before God, whose duty it was to make common cause with *all* Protestants, but who, unmindful of former solemn compacts, have not come to the help of those who suffer oppression while promoting the common cause? Having procured peace for themselves, they never gave it a thought, that the Bohemians and Moravians, who were the first opponents of popery, and maintained the contest for centuries de-

served to be made partners in the privileges obtained, at least in so far as to prevent the extinction of gospel light in Bohemia, which they were the first to kindle and set on a candlestick. Yet this extinction has now actually taken place. This distressed people, therefore, which on account of its faithful adherence to the apostolic doctrine and the practice of the primitive church, is now universally hated and persecuted, and even forsaken by its former associates, finding no mercy from man, has nothing left but to implore the aid of the eternally merciful Lord God, and to exclaim, with his oppressed people of old, 'For these things I weep; mine eye, mine eye runneth down with water, because the Comforter that should relieve my soul is far from me. But thou, O Lord, remainest for ever; thy throne is from generation to generation. Wherefore dost thou forget us for ever, and forsake us for so long a time? Bring us back unto thee, O Lord, that we may return to the land of our nativity; renew our days as of old.'"\*

The hope, that by the providence of God, the Brethren's Church would, in some way or other, experience a renewal, consoled Comenius for the grief he felt on account of its depression and declension in his day. Animated by this hope, he, in 1649, published a History of the Brethren's Church, with an appendix, stating his views respecting its reformation and the improvement of its discipline. This work he dedicated to the Church of England, as its last will and testament, that by her it might be preserved for the use of the successors of the Brethren, whenever that church should revive.

Though separated from the people of his former charge, he still endeavored to promote their spiritual edification. With this view he compiled a catechism, which was printed at Amsterdam in 1661, and dedicated to the scattered sheep of Christ, especially those in Fulnek and its vicinity. It is somewhat remarkable, that from all these towns and villages in Moravia, which are mentioned in this dedication, persons came to Hernhut in the next century, and assisted in the revival of the Brethren's Church.

Still intent on doing all in his power to preserve the Brethren's Church from utter ruin, Comenius resolved on the election and ordination of a bishop, to prevent the total extinction of this order, which had been preserved to the Brethren in regular succession for upwards of two hundred years. The election fell on Nicholas Gertichius and Paul Jablonsky. But Jablonsky dying before Comenius, whose daughter he had married, Daniel Ernestus Jablonsky, Chaplain in ordinary to the Court of Berlin, was appointed his successor in 1669. And, through him, episcopal ordination was afterwards transferred to the renewed church of the Brethren.

On the 15th of October, 1672, Amos Comenius closed his laborious and useful life, at the advanced age of eighty years, of which he had spent nearly forty in banishment.

In concluding our extracts from these historical sketches of the ancient Brethren's Church, we are deeply impressed with a sense of the truth and infallibility of God's promise, that *a seed shall serve him*. Neither tribulation nor distress, persecution or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword, nor the gates of hell, shall so prevail against the church as to destroy it: neither shall error and corruption, so far gain the ascendancy in the earth, as wholly to banish truth and godliness. When the first churches began to swerve from the form of sound words, and to corrupt the discipline of the house of God, we cease to trace the

\* Literal translation of Luther's Version.

kingdom of Christ among them, but we find it successively among the churches of the Novatians, the followers of Ærius, the Paulicians, the Cathari or Puritans of Germany, the Paterines, and the Waldenses and Bohemians, until the times of the Reformation.\*

God has had his churches and people in every age, since the decease of the apostles: but to attempt to trace a regular succession of ordained bishops as their successors in the valleys of Piedmont, Bohemia, or any where else—is laboring in the fire for very vanity, and seems to proceed upon mistaken views of the nature of the kingdom of Christ.

[To be continued ]

---

ART. II. *An Address to the Students of the Theological Seminary on the subject of Foreign Missions.*—BY ONE OF THE STUDENTS.

DEAR BRETHREN—I rise before you on this occasion, in obedience to the call of our constitution, requiring of me an address on the subject of Foreign Missions. This call, I cannot, from the conviction of duty, refuse to obey. I approach it with emotions of fear and hope—of fear, that your confidence has been misplaced—of hope, that my feeble efforts on this occasion may excite, on your part and mine, an increased attention to this interesting and momentous subject. What is the object for which we have this evening convened? Is it that we may, for the last time, plight our friendship and reciprocate expressions of affection—an affection which has linked our hearts by a tie which, we trust, absence cannot sever, but which years often remembered shall tend but to strengthen and confirm? No. My friends, we have a higher and nobler object in view. We have assembled here to reflect upon the awful condition of the heathen world—upon their claims on the christian—on *ourselves*. And although in witnessing the woes and wants of others, our hearts may be drawn more closely together, yet let us, for a few moments, turn away from *ourselves* and drop a tear of christian sympathy over the moral desolation *without*. And can such a tribute of compassion for those who are without God be unworthy of those who enjoy the light of the gospel? Could our blessed Saviour weep over the metropolis of Judea, at the thought of the desolation with which it should shortly be visited? and can we, his professed disciples, look unmoved upon the vast empire of heathenism, and behold, without a tear this wide-spread ruin of immortal souls? No. The scene demands our sympathy, and, with our sympathy, our prayers that God would repair this ruin and restore this waste. Nay, more, it demands our serious inquiry—what can we do as instruments in the hand of God for effecting this glorious change? For we must not forget that there is something more to be done by the christian than to offer up the petition “thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.”

There is a *work* to which he is called to perform. A work to which every one who has felt the power of this blessed gospel is bound by the most solemn obligations to contribute according to his ability—a work which you and I, dear brethren, as candidates for the gospel ministry, cannot, *dare* not, put away. Remember, that if we enter the gospel field, it must not be that we may stand idle all the day, but that we may act the part of diligent and faithful laborers, that when the

---

\* See Jones's Church History.

great husbandman enters his field, we may present him with a rich and glorious harvest—a harvest of immortal souls. In what part of this field, then, shall you and I direct our labors, should the great Husbandman honor us with a part in this work of love? Shall we be sent forth to water and nourish that part where the spiritual sower has scattered his seed, or shall we be directed to a distant corner in this wide field of labor, where the gospel seed has not been sown—where plants of the Lord's planting cannot be found, but all around noxious weeds of deadly growth?

This, dear Brethren, is a momentous, a solemn question—True, the decision of this question does not rest with us alone, but with that church to which we have subjected ourselves in the Lord. But how shall the church direct us to a particular part in this field, unless we are qualified to labor there? And how can we be qualified without an acquaintance with the nature and character of the work to be performed? And how can we obtain this acquaintance without previous study? It cannot be done. It becomes us then, before we enter this field, to take a comprehensive view of its *whole extent*; for we know not in what part Providence may cast our lot.

But there is another consideration which gives this subject an importance, as it respects *ourselves*; for not only shall we, according to the constitution of our church be called to *labor*, but also to *rule*, and therefore the question presses upon us with all its force. You will then readily admit that the subject before us merits our most serious inquiry, for it is one which embraces the duty which we owe to the Lord Jesus Christ, to the church of God, and to the perishing condition of millions of our fellow beings. I hope you will then bear with me, while I present to you a few thoughts which had been suggested to my own mind.—And here I am almost afraid to proceed, from a conviction of my little acquaintance with the subject, and its great importance—but, I trust, you and my elders present, will make every allowance.

The views which may be presented are intended for your consideration and their counsel; and should you find them to be that which you cannot receive, and they that which their judgment condemns, I trust that you and they will not ascribe it to a spirit of indifference or presumption, but rather the want of information or the inexperience of youth.

We would then observe, as a fundamental principle on this subject, that the church is the only authorised organ of Missionary operations. We had not intended to have adverted to this point, as your attention has been heretofore called to it by those who have preceded me, by whom the subject has been fully and ably discussed; but such is its increasing interest and importance, that its introduction on an occasion like the present cannot be altogether unseasonable. This remark is made in opposition to those voluntary and irresponsible societies, that exist in a capacity distinct from the church.

Our ground of objection is not that their members are not members of the church, but that, as a *society*, they do not constitute the church—they do not possess an ecclesiastical character. We do not oppose the principle of societyism, when the object to be obtained is not purely *religious*, as is the case with the Temperance Society, and many others of a similar nature. In a society of this description, men may, as members of civil society, unite in a civil capacity for the attainment of an object civil in its nature. True, the object to be obtained may

exert a *religious* influence, but the grand and prominent design of all societies is, to operate upon men as members of civil society, for they are not composed *exclusively* of the religious. Now it will be admitted that the act of sending the gospel to the heathen, by ambassadors chosen for this purpose, is an act purely religious. It may, and undoubtedly does exert a moral and civil influence, but this is not the *prominent* object of the act. Societies are formed for sending Missionaries, and Missionaries are sent, with the professed and avowed design of evangelizing the heathen, of christianizing sinners. And this, we consider, is the province of the church in her ecclesiastical capacity, and of the church in this capacity *alone*. Think not that we are disposed to detract from the motives which swayed the conduct of those by whom these societies were formed, or the zeal by which their work of labor and of love has been characterized. Many of them, we trust, have been ornaments to the christian name; but while we recur to it with pain, candor requires us to express our disapprobation of all irresponsible societies for the propagation of the gospel, however pure the motive—however laudable the zeal, and however great the results. Here, then, is a point at issue between ourselves and a great portion of the christian church. We believe that the only court which has, by the authority of Christ, the right of sending the gospel, is that court which has the right of deciding *judicially* upon the doctrines of this gospel, which court is the church of God, the pillar and ground of truth. This right the church cannot yield to any society, for it has been derived from the Head, and can be taken away but by the same power. She is vested by her King and Head with *full* power of commissioning gospel ministers, and to her alone are they responsible. This authority, we conceive, cannot be taken away, without infringing the divine right of the church, and violating the appointment of Jehovah. In proof of this, we might advance the spiritual nature of Christ's kingdom—the conduct of our Saviour and his apostles, together with many express scripture declarations, which represent the church as the grand and only instrument authorized by *Him* who is King in Zion, for proclaiming the glad tidings of life and salvation to a lost and ruined world. Out of *Zion*, it is said, shall go forth the law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. Here is a prediction which, from its connection with the other parts of the chapter, plainly relates to the general spread of the gospel under the New Testament dispensation; for you will observe, that is given as a reason why many people shall go and say—"Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord—to the house of the God of Jacob;" and as a consequence attending the going forth of the law out of *Zion*, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem, it is declared that the "Lord shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up their sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

Hence, then, this glorious event, so ardently desired by every christian, the Almighty will accomplish by his faithful heralds, who shall "go forth from *Zion*"—the church of God, where Christ clothes his ambassadors with full power and authority to proclaim his gospel, and assigns them their respective places in this benighted world.

We have thus stated to you our belief, that the church of Christ, in her *ecclesiastical* capacity, is the only lawful *operative* Missionary Society, because it is the only society which our Saviour has vested with

the power of sending forth missionaries, and appointing them their respective fields of labor, to which they are responsible for the faithful and proper discharge of their ministerial office.

We may state for your information, that according to the last Annual Report of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, that the number of missions under the auspices of this Board are thirty—its stations amount to seventy-nine—its ordained missionaries one hundred and twenty-two—its physicians, besides six who are ordained, eleven—its teachers, twenty-eight—its printers and book-binders, eight—its other lay assistants, thirteen—and the married and unmarried females connected with its missions, one hundred and seventy-nine—making in all, three hundred and sixty-one laborers sent from this country. If you add to these, five native preachers, and one hundred other native assistants, you will have at present four hundred and sixty-six laboring in its missions and supported by its funds. The number of mission churches formed and existing in the several missions is fifty-two. These contain two thousand one hundred and forty-seven native members in good standing. There are eight seminaries to educate native laborers, to labor in connection with the missions. These seminaries contain four hundred and eighteen scholars. In Ceylon, there is a seminary for females, containing seventy-five pupils. There are three hundred and fifty free schools, containing about thirteen thousand children. There are at present twenty-four presses in operation, three type founderies, and two stereotype founderies. The printing last year amounted to six hundred and forty-two thousand one hundred and eighty books and tracts, and from the beginning of the operations of the society there have been printed one million three hundred and thirty-nine thousand seven hundred and twenty books and tracts, in twenty different languages. Thus I have given you a concise summary of the present state of missionary operations, under the direction of the American Board. And in conclusion, I would say—that although we may not be able to approve of the means, yet we cannot but rejoice in the end that “*Christ is preached.*” I trust that, like the apostle, therein we *do* rejoice, yea, and *will* rejoice. Thus we have stated to you our belief that the church is the only scripturally authorised Missionary Society.

Our next observation is, that it is the duty of the church to extend her operation to heathen lands, even while there may be many destitute at home.

In advocating this principle, we may meet with opposition from a quarter less remote than in defending the missionary *right* of the church; but we shall present to your consideration, in a brief manner, the reasons which have led us to adopt this conclusion; and, in the first place, we would remark, that this view seems to be sanctioned by the nature and spirit of the New Testament dispensation. You know the laws by which the Old Testament dispensation were regulated, were *exclusive* in their nature. True, it is, that the stranger and sojourner were received among them with kindness and hospitality, and distinguished by favors, equal, in many respects, to one of Israel's sons. True, it is, that the blessings of their religion were secured to all of every nation, who were willing to come away then, and incorporate themselves with them in a *national* capacity. But messengers were not sent forth to distant lands, to call upon their inhabitants to copy their example and institute their laws. Heralds of salvation were

not commissioned to proclaim among the nations of the earth the glad tidings of love and mercy. The very nature of their institutions prevented this, and rendered the wide extension of their kingdom impracticable, for the place of their worship was *fixed*, and those that were permitted to officiate were confined to that tribe which was consecrated to this holy purpose. But when this dispensation was to cease, no longer should the testimony remain at Jerusalem—but the Lord should make bare his holy arm in the eyes of all nations, and all the ends of the earth should see the salvation of our God.

Here then is a feature which marks the old dispensation, and always presents it in striking contrast with the new. The one is national; the other knows no distinctions of nations; for this all the prophets represent as its glory, its praise. Here then we discard that language in the sense in which it is often used—that *Charity begins at home*. We discard it, because we do not find it recognised in Scripture. We discard it because it mars the glory of this dispensation. We discard it because it strips charity of her brightest ornament, and converts the gospel of universal love into a system of *religious monopoly*. No. True charity seeks to unfold, like the bright belt of Saturn, a world in her embrace, and spread through all its parts life and immortality. Should she begin to dispense those blessings at Jerusalem, it is not because of preference, but that she may *begin* in her work of love and mercy. And here she does not stop, but like the full orb'd moon travels around until all the ends of the earth have experienced her benign influence. This is that charity which seeketh not her own; and this we conceive to be the charity of the gospel.

Look then at the picture of the Old Testament church, as portrayed in her laws and history, and then look at the picture of the New Testament church as drawn by the pen of prophecy, and then taking a glance at the Secession church, ask yourselves if the principle on which she acts, in the dissemination of the gospel, does not resemble too much that of the former, and too little that of the latter. The question is an important one, and with you, dear brethren, I leave it.

I here form no comparison among the respective churches of Zion. Among them, I make no distinction, for as I said before, their circumstances are wholly different. It is with a higher and more perfect model with which I would suggest a comparison, than that which any church can afford. And I repeat it again; Have we, as a church, conformed to this model? Has the standard of the Lord been set up by us in the true sense of prophecy, among the Gentiles? Have the isles of the sea presented their offerings unto us? Has Ethiopia lifted up her hands unto God, and nations been born unto Zion through our instrumentality? Think you that we pretend to assert that this glorious work is to be accomplished *exclusively* by the Secession Church? No. It is to be the work of the New Testament Church. But have we as a part of this Church, engaged in it with that activity and zeal which the Lord requires?

But it may be that we have mistaken the true spirit of the New Testament Church. Perhaps those prophecies which represent the glory of this dispensation so transcendently great, are to be viewed in a restricted sense. Perhaps they merely convey the idea that national distinction should not be the test of admission into the church. If it be so, then should we find them who were appointed to usher in this dispensation, acting in conformity with this principle. But was such the case?

O no. Twelve apostles were chosen, qualified and commissioned by their divine Master to preach the gospel to every creature, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. These faithful ambassadors were, it is true, to *begin* at Jerusalem, but this was only the *starting place* of that race which they were to run with messages of love to sinful man. They took a comprehensive view of the work which they had to perform. A *world* was lying before them in wickedness; and although every individual in that world might not hear their voice, yet they posted themselves like Generals in an army, where it would be heard as far as possible, and from these situations the Apostle declares "their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world." What! Did these few heralds of the cross blow the trumpet of peace to the remotest ends of the then known world, and was this done by continuing in Jerusalem and Judea until all their inhabitants were enrolled under the standard of Jesus, and from this spot calling upon the nations of the earth to *come* and enlist themselves in the glorious cause? No. Dear brethren, their command was to *go and teach all nations*; and in obedience to this command they did go, and nations were taught. They flew with the torch of love flaming in their hands—that torch which their Saviour had enkindled at the cross.—You know how few the first apostles of our Lord were, but among those few, forget not there was *one* who was officially the apostle of the Gentiles. The testimony of Jesus concerning him, was, "that he is a *chosen* vessel unto me to bear my name before the Gentiles, and Kings, and the children of Israel."

The children of Israel, it is true, were benefitted by his ministry.—But mark it, the Gentiles are mentioned first, as constituting the *primary* object of his ministry. Does this comport with the sentiment as it is generally used, "that charity begins at home?" When Paul received his commission to "*go far hence among the Gentiles*," what was the state of the christian church at Jerusalem, the *home* of her birth!—Could she boast of her hundreds of ministers, and thousands of members? No. They were few—few indeed; but among those few be it known there was *one* who bore in his hand, even while Calvary was warm with the Saviour's blood, a commission to the "*isles of the sea, and the nations far hence*." And did this apostle of the Gentiles fulfil his commission? Let the history of his labors and travels answer the inquiry. He meets with his brethren in Jerusalem, to whom he communicates his remarkable conversion. But how short is his stay here. In a verse or two we are informed that he is sent to Tarsus, a distinguished city in the south western part of Asia Minor. Thence he is taken by Barnabas, in a few years, to Antioch, a city of Syria. Again he returns to Judea, to convey to the brethren there that relief which had been collected by the disciples at Antioch. In a short time they are separated by the Holy Ghost and sent to Selucia, a city near Antioch, in Asia, and thence to the isle of Cyprus, south of Asia. Here Paul and Barnabas remain for some time, preaching we doubt not, with success in the principal cities of this island. Pamphylia, a province of Asia, is visited by them, and here John, for reasons unknown to us, departs from them to Jerusalem. The apostle, with those who accompanied him, is not discouraged by the departure of John, but visits Antioch, a city of Pisidia, a province of Asia; and here he delivers to a congregation of Jews and proselyte Gentiles, that remarkable sermon that is recorded in the 13th chapter of the Acts. This brings conviction to the

hearts of many. And on the following Sabbath the whole city resorted to hear the apostle declare again those words of life and salvation. But the Jews, filled with envy and malice, take offence at seeing the Gentiles, whom they had been accustomed to despise, entering that kingdom of which they were unwilling to become subjects. Alas! What an awful time was this to their nation! Now the cup of their iniquity is full—now Paul and Barnabas summon up all the resolution with which the Spirit of God had endowed them, and pour forth upon their souls a curse which the impenitence of ages had accumulated—a curse more terrible in its effects than a thunderbolt from Heaven. “It was necessary that the word of God should have been first spoken unto you, but seeing ye put it far from you and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo! we turn to the Gentiles.”

Why was it necessary that the word of God should have first been spoken to the Jews? Why was it that the apostles were to *begin* at Jerusalem? Was it merely because of the *convenience*? because they were *at home*? We think not. It was necessary because the grace of God would thereby be more conspicuously manifested. What could exhibit divine grace in a more glorious light than to invite those who had smitten the rock, to drink of its cooling streams—those who had pierced the Saviour’s side, to wash in that blood which flowed from the wound their own hands had made? The word was first preached to these Jews. But this preaching was of short duration, for by thus putting it away at this time from them, the apostle declared that they judged themselves unworthy of it. And if such were the case with regard to them, how many are there in this gospel land, who have rendered themselves less worthy of the word by their *continued* opposition to it. Methinks I hear the poor heathen addressing gospel ministers in this land, in a voice of supplication. How long will ye continue to expostulate with those who by their opposition have judged themselves unworthy of that word which we have never heard?

Hitherto the apostle had preached to Jew and Gentile. But now by the impenitence and unbelief of Israel, they had forfeited all claims to the gospel, and henceforth the Gentiles should be the object of his labors and travels, though here and there he should gather into the fold of Christ a “lost sheep of the house of Israel.” And mark, dear brethren, the reason the apostle assigns. “So hath the Lord commanded us, saying, I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldst be for salvation to the ends of the earth.” He looks at this blessed promise, and knowing that it must receive its fulfilment by the instrumentality of God’s ministers, “without whom they could not hear,” his resolution is, “Lo we turn to the Gentiles;” and henceforth they are almost the exclusive objects of his ministry. He travels about with his faithful and tried companion, Barnabas, among the different cities of Asia, organizing new churches, and confirming those that had already been organized.

But while at Troas, one of these cities, the vision of a man of Macedonia appears in the darkness of the night, imploring help. Here is a moment in the history of this apostle’s travels, fraught with interest and instruction to us at this day. Is it to be supposed that in a country embracing the extent of territory, and crowded with a population like that of Asia Minor, there could not be thousands destitute of the stated ordinances—nay, thousands who had never heard of the joyful news which the apostle was commissioned to proclaim? What then shall he

do? The cry of help is heard from Macedonia—but this cry is echoed back by the groans of distress at home. He goes to Macedonia. True it is in obedience to a heavenly vision. But why was this vision sent, if the wants of those at home were not supplied? Is it not because they were “*far hence*,” and consequently less likely to hear the gospel than those at a distance less remote? Inscrutable are the ways of God to man, but in this we think we see a demonstration of his love, and in this demonstration the church of God may derive a lesson of instruction.—God will sometimes bring “his sons from far, and his daughters from the ends of the earth,” and when the cry of help is heard, he will have his ministers, like Paul, to run to their assistance that they may, according to the prophecy, “bring their sons in their arms, and carry their daughters upon their shoulders.”

The distance, so far from discouraging and retarding, should rather animate and accelerate us in our flight. The church is not now visited with visions, either from those around us, or in heathen lands. But does she not hear from far, that which gave *authority* to this vision—the *cry of help*? Have not the degraded Hindoo and superstitious Chinese stretched forth their hands to us, and in the language of the man of Macedonia, cried to us “to come over and help them?” Shall we disregard this call? Or shall we not rather like Paul, gird on our zeal afresh, and *immediately endeavor* to go, assuredly gathering that the Lord has called us to preach the gospel to the heathen?

Need we follow this prince of the apostles farther? Need we trace his travels through the principal cities of Macedonia, Greece and Asia Minor, planting churches and ordaining elders to watch over them, feed them and guard them. Be it known that he arrives at Rome, the metropolis of an extensive heathen empire. Here his historian leaves him, laboring in his old age as a faithful missionary in the cause of his Redeemer. We should not have protracted this particular part of our subject, but from an impression of its importance; for it is only by setting before our minds the labors and travels of these apostles, that we can ever arrive at a thorough and correct knowledge of the duty of the church.

And now, dear brethren, what do they teach us? Do they not teach us that a preference for any particular nation, which does not arise from a prospect of winning a greater number of souls to Christ, is not sanctioned by the authority of our Saviour and the conduct of his apostles? Do they not teach us that in order to propagate the gospel, distant parts should be occupied? That while we retain the citadel of Jerusalem, we should not forget the outskirts, and endeavor to assault the enemy even in his kingdom of darkness where he sits upon his dark throne of superstition and idolatry? Against these conclusions it may be urged, that as the apostles had the gifts of tongues, and consequently were not under the necessity of acquiring, at the expense of much time and labor, the languages of those nations whither they went, their conduct is not a model for the imitation of the church now, in whom this gift no longer exists.

In reply, we would remark, that so far from supposing the conclusion weakened by this objection, we consider it rather strengthened. For in giving the apostles this power, our Lord plainly told them the necessity of preaching the gospel among those nations when this power was exercised. For if it could have been equally as well propagated by confining it among those who spoke the same language, why is the Al-

mighty power of Jehovah exercised in bestowing this gift? But we know this power never will be exercised when necessity does not demand it. Here, then, one principle is admitted—that the preaching of the gospel among different and distant nations, more readily secures its rapid and extensive propagation, and in the admission of this principle, all that we claim is granted. But as this power was *supernaturally* bestowed upon the apostles, does it follow that ministers of the gospel should not, from their example, acquire it in a natural and ordinary way? By no means. As well might we object to the long and laborious study of Theology, for a knowledge of this the apostles received by the immediate inspiration of the Holy Spirit. The difficulty under which ministers of the gospel now labor in this respect, should only excite them to greater diligence and more laborious application. Why was it that the apostles were enabled to work miracles and address the inhabitants of distant and different nations in their own language? Was it that they might establish their claims as ambassadors of Heaven? But why does this power no longer exist in the church? Were the evidences which the apostles adduced, (even when derived from their miraculous power,) greater than those which the advocates of christianity can now adduce? We think not. For although they could call to their aid supernatural power to attest the divinity of their religion, yet the possession of this power was then necessary, from the *want* of that testimony which has since accumulated, and which we now enjoy. They established the religion of Jesus by miracles. These miracles we cannot now perform, but we have infallible testimony that they were performed; and in addition to this we have the results which attended the labors of these apostles and their successors; and above all, the continued fulfilment of prophecy; so that a gospel missionary *now* possesses evidences equal, if not superior, to those possessed by the apostles.

These observations are intended to obviate those objections which are sometimes urged against the argument by which the duty of the church is established, from the practice of the apostles by whom the christian church was organized.

With this argument we have done, and now humbly submit it for your consideration. How far we may have mistaken its true nature and application, is for you to judge. If by comparing the state of the church at present, with the picture which the evangelists have given us of her infancy, we find a prominent and striking resemblance, let us rejoice and give God the glory. But if a comparison of this kind presents the two in contrast, let us lament the sad apostacy, and implore her King and Head to pour out upon us and all the churches, that same spirit which actuated the apostles when they went forth at the command of their Master and devoted themselves and all their substance to the holy cause of winning souls to King Jesus.

(To be Continued.)

---

### ART. III. *Future Retribution.*

MR. EDITOR,—Believing as I do, in accordance with the general sentiment of mankind and the christian church since the earliest ages, that man is a responsible being, and that his responsibility extends to a fu-

ture state of existence, that the hour is coming in which all that are in their graves shall hear the voice of the Son of Man, and shall come forth, they that have done good to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation, according to the Scripture, and considering the violence and artful sophistry with which this sentiment has been opposed of late, the zeal with which the contrary principle is propagated, and the rapidity with which it is pervading this Commonwealth, I have been induced to think that some remarks upon the subject may not be unprofitable at the present juncture. I therefore offer the following for publication in the Monitor, should you deem it advisable. I do not lay claim to originality. Edification is my object, and if sentiments be correct and calculated to promote in some degree the cause of truth and righteousness, it matters little from what source they are obtained.

As all religions, Pagan, Mahomedan, Jewish, and Christian have supposed a future state of existence beyond the boundaries of temporal life, so all have believed in a future state of retribution, and consequently all have had their Hell, or place of torment, in which the wicked receive the punishment due to their crimes. This is not therefore a sentiment peculiar to christianity, being generally admitted throughout the world. That it is a sentiment inculcated in the Scriptures, must, we think, be admitted by every plain, unsophisticated and unprejudiced inquirer, who will give them a candid, serious and dispassionate examination. That it was the sentiment of the christian church during the first, second and third centuries, is unquestionably established by the writings of that period. It was also one of the distinguishing tenets of the Waldenses, those martyr-witnesses for truth and righteousness in the dark ages, when the "man of sin" held almost universal and undisputed empire, when Romish ignorance and superstition sat nodding upon the throne. Nor can it be denied that this doctrine has formed an important article in the faith of the great majority of christians since the first dawn of the Reformation.

With regard to the design and duration of punishment in a future state, there has indeed existed some diversity of sentiment in the christian world, ever since the days of Origen. But the denial of all future punishment after death, is the result of certain modern discoveries of very recent date, and limited range, and rests chiefly on two unscriptural and contradictory dogmas, the immaculate spirituality and mortal materialism of the human soul. These dogmas, (observes a late writer,) lie at the foundation of the respective systems of Messrs. Ballou and Balfour, the fathers of modern Universalism. The denomination of professed christians formerly distinguished by this appellation, whilst they denied the eternal duration of future punishment, also maintained, that the effects of sin and the means of grace both extended into a future life. In 1785, a convention was organized at Oxford Mass., under the auspices of Messrs Winchester and Murray, the members of which, during the first twenty-five years, were professedly believers in the doctrine of a future retribution of limited duration. But about the year 1818, H. Ballou advanced the doctrine that all punishment is confined to this life—that a full and perfect retribution takes place in time—that our conduct here cannot affect our future condition, and the moment a man exists after death, he will be as pure and happy as the angels, however flagrantly wicked his conduct in the present life may have been. A sentiment highly encouraging and consolatory to such as lay the reins

upon the neck of their lust, and abandon themselves to every species of vice and immorality, and which appears at first to have been founded upon the old gnostic notion, that all sin originates in the flesh, and, consequently, that death frees the soul from all impurity. The reader will doubtless feel anxious to hear the scriptural authority upon which a sentiment so novel and dangerous is founded; and I will endeavor as briefly and speedily as possible, to gratify his curiosity. In Gen. i, 27, it is written, "so God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him." This simple declaration, which the plain, unsophisticated reader finds no difficulty in understanding, Ballou compares with Col. i, 15, where Christ is emphatically styled "the image of the invisible God." According to this passage he interprets the former. Christ is the image of the invisible God, and Adam was created in the image of God. Therefore, Adam was created in Christ, and hence he triumphantly derives the conclusion that all men are created in Christ, because Adam was created in Christ, and this he makes the foundation stone in his mighty edifice of universal salvation. For if it be true that all men are created in Christ, all men shall unquestionably be saved, not only from eternal condemnation, but from all future punishment. It requires but little sagacity to discover the absurdity of such an interpretation. A little research and reflection will teach any one that this novel theory is founded upon a gross misconception or wilful perversion, of the language of Moses, and is at irreconcilable hostility with numerous passages of the book of God. How can this sentiment be reconciled with those texts in which the unconverted are declared to be without Christ? Eph. ii, 12. "That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world. But now, in Christ Jesus, ye who some times were far off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ." In Rom. xvi, 7, the Apostle speaks of certain persons, "who (says he) also were in Christ before me," evidently implying, if there be any meaning in language, that there was a time when both he and they were out of Christ. Again, in Rom. viii, 9, he says, "if any man have not the spirit of Christ he is none of his." Moreover, how is this novel sentiment to be reconciled with those passages which make being in Christ the distinguishing characteristic of real christians, such as Rom. viii, 1. There is, therefore, now no consideration to them that are in Christ Jesus. Also, xii, 5. So we being many are one body in Christ. Now if all are by creation in Christ, there could be no ground for this distinction. It would be a distinction without a difference. And especially the decisive declaration of Paul, 2 Cor. v, 17. If any man be in Christ he is a new creature. Nothing is more obvious than that the Apostle, in making this declaration, spoke of a peculiar characteristic which all did not possess. To this we might add Eph. ii, 10. "For we are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus, unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them;" and iv, 24, where the Apostle speaks of "Putting on the new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." Now, if all men are by nature in Christ, what are we to understand by this new creation? A new creation necessarily implies an old creation. And if these passages have any meaning, they teach that such as are in Christ, have undergone a radical change in heart and life—have not the same characteristics which they once possessed. And hence our Lord urges upon man the absolute necessity of being born again. All of which passages are totally inexplicable upon the visionary theory of Ballou. Well might Nicodemus

enquire in astonishment, "How can these things be!" After the above specimen of the honesty and skill, in interpretations, of this famous champion of universalism, judicious minds will appreciate, at their just value, his claims to guide his fellow-men to the correct knowledge of the word of God. But (to use the language of inspiration) if any man be ignorant, let him be ignorant.

The serious enquirer after truth will also beware, remembering the solemn, precautionary warning of the spirit, "If the blind lead the blind, they shall both fall into the ditch." But as noxious plants are generally prolific, so this erroneous sentiment soon gave birth to another, no less unscriptural, absurd and dangerous. That the soul is material and mortal, or in other words, that the principle of perception and thought is not a substance distinct from the body, but simply the result of corporeal organization. That man is no more than what we now see of him; his being commences at the time of his conception, or perhaps at an earlier period. The corporeal and mental faculties grow, ripen and decay together. And whenever the system is dissolved, it continues in a state of dissolution, until it shall please the Almighty Being who called it first into existence, to restore it to life again. Thus they maintain that the whole man dies a temporal death, and that the resurrection is the grand event that will introduce all mankind into heavenly and eternal felicity. Such is the unscriptural and unphilosophical dogma upon which Walter Balfour and his followers found their visionary scheme of universal salvation. This theory of materialism has for the most part found its advocates in the ranks of scepticism. But it has also received the support of some professed believers in christianity. The arguments brought forward in favor of this irrational and anti-scriptural sentiment by the votaries of human reason, have met with a complete and satisfactory refutation in the able and condensed argument of Wollaston, in his "Religion of nature delineated;" from which it may not be amiss to offer a brief abstract.

The soul cannot be mere matter; for if it is, then either all matter must possess the power of thinking, or the difference must arise from the peculiar system of organization; or a faculty of thinking must be superadded to some systems of it which is not superadded to others.—But, in the first place, that position which endows all matter with the power of thinking, is contrary to all the apprehensions and knowledge we have of the nature of matter; nor can it be true, unless our faculties and senses be contrived only to deceive us. Why does the sense of thinking lie in our heads, and all the ministers of sensation make report to something there, if all matter be apprehensive and cogitative? For in that case there would be as much thought and understanding in our heels and every place else, as in our heads. If, indeed, all matter be cogitative, or possessed of the power of thinking, it must be as matter, and thinking must be essential to it, and belong to the definition of it; but if so, we should not only continue to think always until the matter of which we consist, be annihilated; and so the assertion of this doctrine would stumble on immortality unawares; but we must also have thought always in time past, ever since that matter was in being; nor could there be the slightest intermission of actual thinking, which does not appear to be the case with man. In the next place, the faculties of thinking, &c. cannot arise from a peculiar system of organization, because by organization bodies only change their form, color, solidity, &c. becoming greater or less, round or square, rare or dense, all which ideas are very

different from that of thinking; nor can there be any relation between them, except that of an instrument to an agent. These modifications and affections of matter, so far from being the causes of thinking and acting, are themselves but effects, resulting from the action of some other matter or thing upon it, and proofs of its passivity, deadness and utter incapacity of becoming cogitative. This is evident to sense. The third and last refuge to which materialists fly, is, that the property or faculty of thinking is superadded to certain systems of matter, fitly disposed by virtue of God's omnipotence. This, although it be termed a faculty or property, must in reality amount to the same thing with another being or substance possessed of the faculty of thinking; for a faculty of thinking alone will not make up the idea of the human soul, which is endued with many faculties; apprehending, reflecting, comparing, judging, making deductions and reasoning, willing, putting the body in motion, continuing the animal functions by its presence and giving life. Hence, whatever it is that is superadded, it must be something endued with all those other faculties. And whether that can be a faculty of thinking, and so these other faculties be only faculties of a faculty; or whether they must not all be rather the faculties of some spiritual principle, substance, or nature, which being by their own concession superadded to matter, must necessarily be something different from it, we leave to the serious, candid and unprejudiced to determine. If men would but look seriously into themselves, the soul would not appear to them merely as a faculty of the body, or a kind of appurtenance to it, but rather as some intelligent being, properly placed in the body, not only to use it as an instrument and act by it, but also to govern it in all its several parts, as the tongue, hands, feet, &c., according to its own reason. For we think it is plain enough that the mind, though it acts under great limitations, does however, in many instances govern the body by its own will; and to suppose this governor to be nothing, but some fit disposition or accident superadded to that matter which is governed, is grossly absurd. A ship, it is true, would not be fit for navigation, if it was not built and properly provided; but still, when it has received its proper form, and is become a system of material fitly disposed, it is not this disposition that governs; it is the man (that other substance) who sits at the helm, and those who manage the sails and tackle, that do this. In like manner our bodies, without a proper organization and conformity of parts, would not be capable of acting as they do. But still, it is not the shape or modification, or any other accident that can govern them. The capacity of being governed or used, can never be the governor applying and using that capacity. No; there must be at the helm something distinct, that commands the body, and without which the vessel would run adrift, or rather sink.

The above is a brief outline of Wollaston's reasoning. We shall now take some notice of those passages of scripture which are supposed to favor this irrational opinion. 1st. Those passages are thought to teach this sentiment in which the re-urrection is spoken of as necessary to man's happiness. Such as 1 Cor., xv, 16-18. "For if the dead rise not, then is Christ not risen; and if Christ be not risen, your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins. Then they also that are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." And again, v. 32. "If the dead rise not, let us eat and drink for to-morrow we die."

In these and parallel passages, it is argued there is not only no allusion made to the doctrine of happiness or misery without the body, but

the contrary is plainly inferable. In order to ascertain correctly the meaning of the inspired penman in the texts already quoted, it is only necessary to consult the contexts, from which we learn that certain individuals in the church of Corinth, denied the doctrine of the resurrection, v. 12. And this being a fundamental article in the religion of Jesus, which Paul preached; if it be false, the whole system tumbles to the ground. Nothing is plainer, therefore, than that the Apostle's design was to teach the Corinthians that the resurrection of the body was an essential article of the glorious gospel of the blessed God, and consequently the denial of it was virtually a denial of the whole scheme of salvation as taught in the scriptures, and hence to make a profession of christianity, and at the same time deny this, one of its essential articles, would be glaringly absurd. The same being true also with respect to all passages of similar phraseology. But 2d. Materialists also lay hold of those passages as favoring their sentiment, in which the dead are represented as sleeping in their graves, as if in a state of insensibility, such as 1 Thess., iv, 14, and 1 Cor., xv, 32. Those and similar texts, it is thought, prove conclusively that the soul dies with the body, or rather that it is nothing distinct from the body; and, consequently, when the body becomes insensible, the whole man is insensible. In refutation of this doctrine, I shall merely offer a brief abstract from Dr. Campbell's reasoning, in his sixth preliminary dissertation.

Having shown conclusively that the Greek terms used for sleep are used metaphorically, and relate simply to the resemblance between a body sleeping and a body dead, the Dr. proceeds to remark, 2d. That many expressions of scripture do, in their natural and obvious sense imply, that an intermediate and separate state of the soul is actually to succeed death. Such are the words of our Lord to the penitent thief upon the cross, (Luke xxiii, 43.) "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." Stephen's dying petition, (Acts vii, 59.) "Lord Jesus receive my spirit." The comparison which the Apostle makes in different places between the enjoyment which true christians can attain by their continuance in this world, and that which they enter on at their departure out of it, such as 2 Cor. v, 6. "Therefore, we are always confident, knowing that whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord." (Phil. i, 21.) "For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labor; yet what I shall choose I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better;" and several other passages. Let the words be read by any judicious person, either in the original or in the common translation, which is sufficiently exact for this purpose; and let him, setting aside all theory or system, say candidly, whether they would not be understood by the gross of mankind as presupposing, that the soul may and will exist separately from the body, and be susceptible of happiness or misery in that state. I remark 3rd, continues Campbell, "That even the curious equivocation (or perhaps more properly mental reservation,) that has been devised for the inspired penman, (by the materialists) will not in every case, save the credit of apostolical veracity. The words of Paul to the Corinthians are: "Knowing that whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord." Again, "We are willing rather to be absent from the body and present with the Lord." Could such expressions have been used by him, if he held it impossible to be with the Lord, or to be any where without the body; and that whatever the change was, which was made by death.

he could not be in the presence of the Lord until he returned to the body? Absence from the body and presence with the Lord were, therefore, never more unfortunately combined than in this illustration.

Things are combined here as coincident, which, on the hypothesis of those gentlemen, are incompatible. If recourse be had to the original, the expressions in Greek are, if possible, still stronger. They are (*oi endemountes*) those who dwell in the body, who are (*ek demountes*) at a distance from the Lord; as, on the contrary, they are (*oi ekdemountes ek ton somatos*) those who have travelled out of the body, who are (*oi endemountes*) those who reside or are at present with the Lord. In the passage in Phil. also, the commencement of his (Paul's) presence with the Lord is represented as coincident not with his return to the body, but with his leaving it; with the dissolution, not with the restoration, of the union between soul and body. Such are the remarks of this able philologist, and we may add further in conclusion, that the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, recorded in Luke xvi., 19-3, affords the strongest argumentative evidence as well as a most pointed illustration of the doctrine of a conscious intermediate state of the soul. No sooner was Lazarus dead, than "He was carried (not his body surely, but his soul) into his rest in Abraham's bosom." In like manner also, the rich man no sooner "died and was buried," than "in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments." Now, it would certainly do violence to the language of our Lord, even supposing it to be pure imagery, to suppose the intervention, not only of years, but of thousands of years, between events so intimately connected in the narrative. In Rev. vi. 9, 11, the souls of those who had been slain for the testimony which they had borne to the truth of the Gospel, (alluding no doubt to those who suffered martyrdom during the bloody persecution of the third century,) are represented as crying with a loud voice from under the altar and with one consent, inquiring of the Lord as holy and faithful, How long he would endure the provocations of those persecutors before he would avenge the blood of his people upon the inhabitants of the earth. This representation (as Lowman justly observes) seems much to favor the immediate happiness of departed saints, and hardly to consist with that uncomfortable opinion, the insensible state of departed souls, till after the resurrection. But in a word. Those visionary theorists should be confounded and hold their peace, on reading the declaration by which our blessed Redeemer stopped the mouths of the conceited Sadducees, (Matthew xxii., 31, 32.) But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.

The conclusion which his audience deduced from this declaration, and which he designed they should draw, is obvious. The Sadducees denied both the existence of spirits and the resurrection of the body. But our Lord would convince them that this was at variance with the testimony of Moses, the authority of whose writings they admitted. Accordingly, with this design he makes the quotation, and draws from it the inevitable conclusion, that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob must necessarily be alive; that is, their souls with which their bodies must in due time be united. By a parity of reasoning, then, we would say to the advocates of mortal materialism, "Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures nor the power of God." For, if the whole man dies a temporal death, no more to experience life or consciousness, happiness or misery,

until the resurrection morn; then it unquestionably follows, that during the period intervening between their death and resurrection, whether longer or shorter, Jehovah is not the God of those that die. He is not the God of the unnumbered millions now lying in the silent tomb. For he is not the God of the dead, but of the living.

But in conclusion, what could be more decisive on this point, if the above were not sufficient, than the declaration of our Lord, Math. x. 28. And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in Hell! If the whole man dies a temporal death, then he that kills the body destroys the soul. But the text teaches that though men can kill the body, the soul is beyond their power.

With the foregoing remarks we shall now conclude our examination of the two grand and primary principles on which the whole system of modern Universalism is founded; and perhaps we are already chargeable with some degree of prolixity, but since, like all other errorists, the advocates of this wild and pernicious system have endeavored to keep its true foundation and native consequences concealed from vulgar eyes, by surrounding it with artful sophistry and bold declamation—exhibiting only such parts of the system as are most palatable, and which can be supported with some degree of apparent plausibility, it seemed necessary to be somewhat particular. And having now brought to view the true foundation of this heartless system, and humbly endeavored to expose its rottenness, leaving the matter to the decision of the judicious, candid and serious inquirer, we might suffer the unscriptural fabric to tumble to the earth. But since the infection has already spread far and wide, and that with almost unexampled rapidity—(from the statistics of the denomination we learn that in 1801 there were but 22 avowed Universalist preachers in the Union, and in 1834 they numbered about 300. In 1779, the first Universalist society was organized at Gloucester Mass., and in 1834, there were seven hundred societies professing the same faith)—duty seems to require that some notice be taken of those passages of Scripture in which the doctrine of future retribution is either plainly affirmed, or necessarily implied, and these are numerous.

1st. Such as teach that a just and equitable retribution does not take place in time. (Job xxi, 7–13. Ps. lxxiii. 3. 17. Jer. xii. 1, 2.) In all these, the temporal prosperity, power, wealth and happiness of the wicked, are spoken of as surpassing that of the righteous. So also Paul declares, (1 Cor. xv. 19. and iv. 9, 13.) that the most worthy have the severest lot in this world. The Psalmist prays to be delivered from those who in this life have their part and portion.

But our opponents will say, conscience is a hell in which the wicked suffer the demerit of their crimes,—a sentiment equally at variance with the testimony of Scripture and universal experience. We read of some, speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron. (1 Tim. i. 2.) And does not all experience testify that conscience, becoming callous, the severity of its reprovings does not increase with the increase of crime, but on the contrary decreases; so that men come at length to perpetrate, without remorse, crimes which once would have made them shudder. Hence, if all men are made perfectly happy at the commencement of the next state of existence, they are not rewarded according to their deeds.

2nd. I shall only add to the above those passages which speak of a period of judgment after death, and call upon men to act in this life, with

reference to that event. (John v. 28, 29. Acts xvii. 30, 31. 1 Heb. ix. 27, 28. 2 Cor. v. 8-11. 2 Pet. ii. 9. Mark x. 28. and xi. 24.) If these and similar passages do not convey the idea of punishment beyond the boundaries of the present life, there cannot be found, we believe, in the English language, words capable of expressing such an idea. Let any judicious and unprejudiced person carefully examine the above, and then candidly say, whether any individual capable of reading plain English grammatically, and whose mind was not prepossessed by vain philosophy, could peruse them without being convinced that they taught expressly the doctrine of future retribution. Upon the hypothesis of Universalists, such passages appear to me to be totally inexplicable, upon any rational principle of interpretation, and so unequivocally do they teach the contrary sentiment, that it would be a matter of astonishment to find any one disputing it, were it not written, "And for this cause God shall send them strong delusions that they should believe a lie, that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." (2 Thess. ii. 12.)

It has already been intimated at the beginning of this essay, that among those who believe in a punishment after death, of different degrees of severity, proportioned to the character and conduct of the guilty, a difference of sentiment exists with respect to its design and duration. Since the days of Origen, (a mystical and allegorical divine of the second century,) some have maintained that future punishment is remedial in its design, or intended to effect the reformation of the wicked, and that the means of grace are still afforded them, until all shall ultimately be restored to holiness and happiness. These were the sentiments avowedly maintained until lately, by the sect denominated Universalists. But some having denied all future retribution whatever, and the great majority of the convention having espoused this sentiment, in 1831, a few resolving to obey the apostolic injunction, came out from among them and formed an independent association, assuming the title of Universal Restorationists. In 1834 they numbered fourteen preachers and ten or twelve societies.

Having then, in the preceding part of this essay, endeavored to prove that the awful consequences of sin extend into a future state of existence, in opposition to the sentiments of those who limit all punishment for sin to the present life, it remains, 2d, to offer some remarks on the duration of future punishment.

The position believed to be taught in the Scriptures, is this—That all sinners who do not repent and take refuge in the Saviour, in the present life, shall in the life to come, suffer everlasting punishment as the necessary and just retribution of their sins. That this doctrine, however awful, has obtained credence among the vast majority of professing christians since the earliest ages, cannot be questioned. This, however, is not the criterion by which we are to judge of its correctness; and since it is a question which cannot be settled by abstract reasoning, a direct appeal must be had to divine revelation. And I would urge in the first place those passages of Scripture which declare that certain sinners shall not enter into the kingdom of Heaven; Math v, 20. For I say unto you that except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of Heaven. Also vii, 21. Not every one that sayeth unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in Heaven. And 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10. Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived; neither

fornicators, nor idolators, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God. These and a multitude of kindred passages, such as Luke xiii, 24. Gal. v. 19-21 and Eph. v. 5, evidently teach that persons of a certain description shall not gain admittance into the mansions of the redeemed, nor enjoy the favor and fellowship of him in whose presence is fulness of joy, at whose right hand are pleasures evermore.

And if indeed persons of a certain description shall be excluded from the holy city Jerusalem, which is above, they must necessarily sink down to Hell, there being no intimation given in the Scriptures of a middle state, or intermediate place. Purgatory is an invention of the latter ages, an artful device of "that man of sin, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, so that he as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." (2 Thess. ii. 4.) And such as receive it must obviously belong to that company who bear "the mark or the name of the Beast, or the number of his name." Do not the above passages therefore taken in connection with a second class which plainly intimate that a change of heart and a preparation for heaven are confined to this life, teach most conclusively that the condemnation of the unbelieving and impenitent is endless? Notice a few of these. Isa. xxxviii. 18, and lv. 6-7. Prov. i. 24-28. Luke xiii. 24-29. John xii. 36. 2 Cor. vi. 1, 2. Heb. iii. 1-10. Mat. xxv. 5-13.

If, then, according to the obvious import of the former quotations, persons of a certain description are excluded from all participation in the peace and felicity of heaven so long as they retain that character, and if there is a period approaching, beyond which there can be no change of moral character, and if the character of some be then unholy and unjust, then it follows incontrovertibly, that some shall suffer punishment without end. And what other rational, consistent interpretation can be given to those passages which set limits to the accepted time, and which plainly affirm that the day of salvation shall be succeeded by a night in which no man can work, and which assure us that some shall be unable to enter in until the door of acceptance shall be closed against them? Either these and similar declarations were designed to teach men the eternity of punishment, or they were not. If this was the design of the sacred penmen, these are the words of truth and soberness. But if not, their language is not only incautious, but deceptive and unwarrantable.

3d. The reader is referred, in the next place, to such passages of the Book of God as describe in contrast, the future, final state of the righteous and the wicked, for proof that the punishment of the latter is endless. Such as Ps. xvii. 14, 15. Dan. xii. 2. Math iii. 12. and vii. 13-21 also xiii. 30-43 and 47-50. and xxiv. 40-51. xxv. 23-46. Mark xvi. 16. John v. 28, 29. Rom. vi. 21-23. ix. 21-23. 2 Tim. ii. 19, 20. Phil. iii. 17-23. Gal. vi. 7, 8. 2 Thess. i. 5-12. Heb. vi. 8, 9. and many others. That these passages have a reference to the final state of men, is evident from the following reasons.

1st. Because in several of them this state is expressly called their *end*.

2d. Because the state of the righteous and wicked being put in exact opposition to each other, if it be not denied that they refer to the final state of the former, they must, upon the principles of correct interpretation, also refer to the final state of the latter.

3d. Because there is a total silence in them all, with regard to any succeeding state.

4th. Because the phraseology of some of them will admit of no other rational and consistent interpretation. If, therefore, the passages above referred to, teach that the future, final state of some men will be happy, they also as plainly teach that the future, final state of some men will be miserable. And if, according to the Scriptures, the final state of some men will be miserable, then there will be some who will suffer everlasting punishment, for no other state can succeed that which is final, or last.

4. In proof of the eternal condemnation of unbelieving and impenitent sinners, I would further adduce those passages of Scripture in which the terms *everlasting*, *eternal*, *forever*, and *forever and ever* are applied to this future state. Dan. xii. 2. Math xviii. 8. xxv. 41-46. 2 Thess. i. 9. Mark iii. 29. Jude vii. and 13. 2 Pet. ii. 17. 2 Cor. iv. 18. Rev. xiv. 10-12. xix. 3. xx. 10. &c. The advocates of Universal restoration set aside the force of these and similar declarations, by the sweeping assertion, that since these expressions are sometimes employed in a limited sense, being applied to things which we know have an end, they determine nothing in the question at issue. But the reader should remember, 1st, that these terms are as strong as any in the Greek language, to express endless duration. If therefore these terms do not teach this doctrine, words cannot be found in that very copious language, to express such an idea; and 2d, that although sometimes used improperly to express the idea of limited duration, it is only when there is something in the context, or the nature of the subject itself, which necessarily requires such limitation.

The mode of interpretation adopted by the champions of Universalism with respect to these expressions, betrays either a total ignorance of the philosophy of language, or an unwarrantable zeal to establish a favorite hypothesis. The sound rule of interpretation is always to give a word its usual and proper signification, unless something appears in the subject or connection in which it occurs, which determines it to be used in a figurative or improper sense. This rule allows every word to have a distinct and proper meaning of its own, only limited by the connection in which it is introduced. But the rule of interpretation adopted by the advocates of a limited duration, is this: That where a word is used in relation to different things, it has no meaning in itself but that which it derives from the subject, or context. But to argue that words have no proper meaning of their own, and that they are to stand for nothing in the decision of any question, but are to mean any thing that the subject to which they relate can be proved to mean without them, is grossly sophistical. It reduces words to mere ciphers, and if adopted universally in philological interpretation, would totally annihilate language as the vehicle of communicating ideas. Words of the most definite and clearly established meaning, are sometimes employed in a loose, improper, or hyperbolical sense; but this fact does not deprive them of their literal and proper signification. Take for example the English word, *endless*; no word in the language has its meaning more distinctly defined or clearly established. No one will hesitate a moment to declare, that with regard to time, it properly signifies unlimited duration. Yet how often do we hear of endless talkers, endless disputers, &c.

To argue from the occasional use of the word that we should attach to it no particular meaning but that which the context may be shown to mean without it, is manifestly absurd. Would not the merest tyro in En-

glish literature say, let the word have its proper and usual signification, except as in the instances above, its meaning is necessarily restricted by the subject and connection in which it stands. Nor is there the least danger of mistaking its import, for this is the very rule of interpretation which men universally adopt.

With respect to the two Greek terms *Aion* and *Aionios*, translated *forever, eternal, &c.*, the first question to be settled, according to the above rule of interpretation, is, what is the usual and proper import of these terms as employed by the sacred writers; and this may be ascertained, 1st, from their etymology, concerning which there can be no dispute. All lexicographers agree that *aion* is a derivative from *aei*, always; and *on*, the present participle of the verb *einai*, to be, or exist. Its primary and proper signification, therefore, is *always being*, or which is the same thing, *everlasting*. It may be defined, strictly, *duration without interruption and without end*. But since in this, as in all other words, usage always modifies the original meaning, its etymology is not sufficient to determine its proper signification as used in the Scriptures.—Hence it is of the utmost consequence to understand how far the meaning of *aion* was affected among the Greeks by usage, and more especially in what sense it was understood when the Old Testament was translated into Greek.

That version called the septuagint, which was in common use among the Jews in the days of our Lord, was made, as is well known, from the original Hebrew, about 300 years before Christ; and since he did not condemn the use of it, but on the contrary makes quotations from it, it cannot well be charged with great inaccuracy. In that translation then, the Hebrew term *oulm* or *olim*, which occurs three hundred and eight times, is, with the exception of about twenty instances, invariably translated by the word *aion*, in some one of its various forms. Hence the two words were evidently regarded by the learned translators as equivalent in signification, or at least more nearly so than any other. If, therefore, we can ascertain how *aion* was then understood among the Greeks, we shall be able to ascertain what sense the translators attached to the Hebrew *oulm*, and happily, as a late writer observes, we have one of the best of witnesses to the usage of *aion* at that time and by the earliest Greek writers, in Aristotle, the illustrious preceptor of Alexander the Great.

In his treatise, *De Caelo*, in describing the highest heaven as the residence of the Gods, he says, "It therefore is evident that there is neither place, nor vacuum, nor time beyond. Wherefore the things there are not by nature adapted to exist in place; nor does time make them grow old; neither under the highest (Heaven) is there any change of any one of these things, they being placed beyond it; but unchangeable and passionless, having the best, even the self-sufficient life, they continue through all (*aiona*) eternity. For, indeed, the word itself, according to the ancients, divinely expressed this. For the period which comprehends the time of every one's life, beyond which, according to nature, nothing exists, is called his (*aion*) eternity. And for the same reason, also, the period of the whole heaven, even the infinite time of all things, and the period comprehending that infinity, is (*aion*) eternity; deriving its name from (*aei, einia*) always being, immortal and divine. Whence, also, it is applied to other things, to some indeed (*akribesteron*) accurately, but to others (*amouroteron*) in the lax signification of (*to einai to kai zen*) being, and even life."

Nothing can be more explicit and satisfactory than this testimony, as to the origin and usage of *aion*; and a more competent witness never lived than Aristotle. Such we may say, therefore, with certainty, was the meaning attached to this word at the very time in which the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament was made. When used in the sense of eternity, it was used "accurately;" but when used in a modified, or limited sense, it was used figuratively, or improperly. Nor is there the smallest danger of a misunderstanding, since a very moderate degree of care and candor will suffice to prevent any mistake from such an occasional use of the word. It is the caviller only that is caught in the snare of his own scepticism, or in the partiality of his prejudiced investigation. If, then, the terms *aion*, &c. according to their etymology and the usage of the best authorities, have, when accurately or properly used, the signification of endless or unlimited duration, the next question to be settled, is, whether any thing appears in the subject or connexion in which they are found, which requires them to be taken in a limited or improper sense. If not, on the principles of sound interpretation, we must receive them in their full and proper acceptation.

Now in all those passages adduced by the advocates of a limited duration in support of their interpretation, there is to be found something in the subject or connection, which plainly forbids their proper and usual signification, or in other words, determines them to be used in a figurative, lax, or improper sense. Whereas, on the contrary, the passages in which these terms occur as already referred to, in support of the eternity of future punishment, contain nothing which either plainly or impliedly forbids their being understood in their full and proper signification — Yea, further, the antithesis which occurs in some of them, fixes the meaning beyond all rational doubt. In them, the happiness of the righteous and the misery of the wicked, are contrasted, or set in opposition to each other, and the Spirit of God has chosen the very same terms to express the duration of future punishment, which he has employed to denote the duration of future happiness. If then in one branch of the antithesis they signify unlimited duration, and all admit this with regard to the happiness of the righteous, rational and consistent interpretation requires that they be taken in the same acceptation with regard to the misery of the wicked. In short, the evidence which these passages afford in support of the eternity of future punishment, is so overwhelming, that in order to evade their force, Universalists are constrained to have recourse to a very licentious mode of interpretation—a mode which would by no means be tolerated by the learned, in the interpretation of the Greek and Latin classics. But omitting what might be said further on these passages, I would urge,

5th, such texts as express future punishment by phrases which necessarily imply eternity. John, xvii. 9. Math. xii. 31, 32. Mark iii. 39. 1 John v. 16. Heb. vi. 6. and x. 26, 27. Luke ix. 25. Math. x. 28. [Mark ix. 43–48 Luke xiv. 26. John iii. 36. and viii. 21. Phil. iii. 9. James ii. 13.

How can these and parallel passages be rationally understood, if the condemnation of the wicked be not in the fullest sense eternal? What consistent interpretation can we put upon them? Let the judicious and candid inquirer answer. If there be some for whom Christ refuses to intercede, some who shall not be forgiven, neither in this world nor in the world to come, but are obnoxious to eternal condemnation. If there be some whose sin is unto death, and not to be prayed for—some whom it is impossible to renew unto repentance, who are nigh unto cursing, whose end is to be burned; and if there be some who draw

back unto perdition, who lose their own souls, or are cast away, for whom it had been good if they never had been born—Then, however awful the thought, there are some who will suffer eternal punishment, for these phrases unquestionably imply it.

Moreover, if there be a Hell, a fire that never shall be quenched, where their worm dieth not and their fire is not quenched, if between this dread abode and the world of bliss, there be an impassable chasm; if they who believe not the Son of God shall not see life but the wrath of God abideth on them; if they die in their sins and where Christ is they cannot come; if they shall have judgment without mercy and their end is destruction, then there will be some who will suffer endless punishment. If after a careful, candid and prayerful examination of the Scripture passages cited in this essay, in proof of the eternal condemnation of all unbelieving and impenitent sinners, there be some who will not still be persuaded of the truth of this doctrine, I fear such will lie under the awful charge, "They would not be persuaded though one rose from the dead." That man would not act more irrationally, who would obstinately close his eyes, and in the full blaze of day pertinaciously deny the existence of the noon-day sun.

To this accumulated mass of Scripture evidence, one subtle objection has been made. These passages, say some, are but the voice of the law denouncing merely what sinners deserve to suffer, but the gospel, notwithstanding, secures the salvation of all.

To this it is only necessary to reply, the Gospel ascertains the salvation of none except true believers. John iii. 16. Rom. i. 16. But all manifestly do not repent and believe the gospel, and therefore the Scriptures abound with warning declarations respecting such. 2 Thess. i. 6-9. Seeing it is a righteous thing for God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you, and to you who are troubled, rest with us; when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power. Also Ps. ii. 12. Prov. xxix. 1. Acts xiii. 40-46. 2 Cor. iv. 3, 4. 1 Pet. iv. 17, 18. &c. Should not the thought of such a tremendous catastrophe awaiting the unbelieving, impenitent sinner, excite all to take heed lest there be in any of them "an evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God?" Should it not stimulate us to make every effort for the salvation of others? "Knowing the terror of the Lord, we persuade men." J. D.

---

#### ART. IV. *Extracts from a Clergyman's Diary.*

Alembert, a celebrated French mathematician, lived about thirty years in the house of his nurse, where he pursued his studies with unwearied activity. His nurse had heard him spoken of as the writer of many books, and a great scholar, but never imagined that he was a great man: on the contrary, pitying him as the victim of a foolish delusion, she said to him one day:—"You will never be any thing but a philosopher;—a

fool, who toils and plagues himself during his life, that people may talk of him when he is no more."

Whatever we may think of the humble nurse's estimate of philosophy, there is no doubt she was correct in judging of this sober deist's motives; and right, too, in pronouncing him a fool. All human learning, without the knowledge of "Jesus Christ, and Him crucified," will leave the heart unhappy and unsatisfied, and when "they go to the dead," will be found in the day of judgment worse than vanity. Alembert died in 1783, and how seldom is he spoken of now. The dust of his grave begins to cover his name and his works, and in the "days to come shall all be forgotten."

Miserable and mistaken man! Of what avail was it, when he entered eternity, that his name stood high in the estimation of men, adorned with the honors of science, while he remained destitute of that learning which alone can save the soul! Alas, it is too true, that such philosophers are fools; spending their lives in toil and anxiety, and even when the literary laurel crowns their brow, are they satisfied? The sciences are indeed delightful and profitable, when studied in connection with the gospel, and in subserviency to the glory of God. In this way only, however, can they minister comfort to the heart. Let the christian scholar then say:—May I never pen a line, nor pursue a study, but may, in some way, be made conducive to the glory of my God, the welfare of my fellow-men, and the salvation of my own soul. Then, though I should never be talked of "when I am no more," though my name should never find a place on the roll of science, on the page of history, I may yet have reason to cherish the humble hope, that I shall not die as a fool dieth, nor yet have lived in vain: and though my name may not be found in human records, it shall, through the merits of my Saviour God, be found inscribed, by the hand of mercy, in a record more lasting than brass or marble: a record, which will stand untouched by that fire which will reduce to ashes every monument of earthly glory; and when time itself shall be no longer, will invest me with *eternal fame, immortal glory*,

The ancients, in their heathen mythology, represented death as the daughter of night, and sister of sleep. Homer speaks of sleep and death as twins; while Hesiod names them the sons of night. The body, touched by death, does indeed seem only to sleep. Beautiful it is yet, for corruption has not begun its work: but ah! whither hath the spirit fled? The soul—the deathless soul, is it convulsed with agony, and sinking deeper and deeper in the everlasting burnings; or, covered with glory, is it rising higher and higher, with the angels around the throne, in the happiness and joys of heaven? The body sleeps indeed, and will sleep, till the trumpet of the archangel awakes, and summons it to judgment. But the soul cannot sleep. While eternity rolls on, it will live—live, convulsed with agony; or filled every moment with a fulness of joy, so sweet and holy, that the enraptured spirit can wish for nothing more. O my soul, when death seizes on thy body as its prey, how will it be with thee? "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." "God be merciful to me a sinner." "Lord, I am thine, save me."

The christian, however, is the only one who has any just ground to look forward to death as a friend—as a sweet and gentle sleep. Yes, it

is, properly speaking, true of the believer, that he does not die at all. He falls asleep in Jesus. Death breaks the chains of sin and mortality, which held the soul in bondage. The conflict is over. The spirit is free. It is in heaven. It is encircled with glory. May we not then well expostulate with the christian; why should you fear death? The night of death, to you, will usher in the morning of glory. And can it, christian, be indeed so painful and gloomy, and sad to die; to lay down the body in its bed of rest; that the soul may ascend to where your "sun shall no more go down—but the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy glory?" Is it painful to be freed from this body of sin and death, which would drag the soul down to the earth, and lead it to seek for its portion the serpent's curse—to "pant after the dust of the earth?" Is it indeed so terrible to leave a world of changes, of storms or tempests, of pain and sorrow, for the rest, and peace, and unfading joy of the Heaven of Heavens? Can it be a subject of regret and sorrow to exchange this miserable, dying life, of three-score years and ten, for the life of angels, the life of glory? Your body must indeed be hidden in the grave: but soon your buried dust shall rise again, and proclaim the power of Him who hath destroyed death, and "Him that hath the power of death." You must encounter the king of terrors—but fear him not; his power is broken, his sting is gone. The heathen Greeks, ignorant of the true nature of death, and the eternity to which it introduces the soul, yet represented death as a gentle being, a beautiful youth: and some of the Jewish Rabbis speak of Samael, the angel of death, as removing, with a kiss, those who die in early youth.

*To you, christian,* it is true that death is an angel of mercy, sent to bring you to your Father's house in peace: a chariot sent by your Redeemer to bear you to glory; and the grave, the gate through which you pass to your home.

Yes, you must go through the valley of death. But fear not. To you, it will be the valley of vision and glory, beyond which, clouds, and darkness, and sorrows are known no more. You must wear the garments of the grave. But the voice from heaven shall be heard in that house of silence: "Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust, for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead:—Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise," and the garments of death shall be exchanged for the robes of glory. Death, to *you*, is a sleep; and the grave a sweet bed of rest for the body, while the soul is away in glory. Perhaps death has even now breathed upon you, and the damp of the grave is on thy brow. But fear not. The Lord of life, O death, has been in thy gloomy mansions, and stripped them of all their terror. The gloom of the grave is scattered. The sun of righteousness has dispelled its darkness. "The breaker is gone up before you," and the eye of faith can now see through this land of darkness, the mansions of peace opened for us, by the power and love of an incarnate God. Grave, boasting grave, thy victory is lost: death, offspring of sin, thy dreadful sting is gone. "Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ."

Voltaire, surrounded by the praises of his infatuated country men, yet died in all the horrors of agony and despair. "Crush the wretch," (meaning precious Christ,) had been the motto of this blasphemer and his associates in crime; and now, stricken by the just judgments of the Saviour he had scorned, he dies, calling sometimes in despairing anguish

on the name of Jesus; and at others, pouring out bitter imprecations against his infidel companions, as the cause of his destruction. He had blasphemed the God of heaven, and, like Herod, in the hour of his pride, by the hand of the Almighty he is smitten, confessing that "he had come to Paris to find his glory and his grave." "Doctor," said the miserable man to the physician who attended him, "I will give you half of what I am worth, if you will give me six months life." The doctor answered, "Sir, you cannot live six weeks." Voltaire replied, "then I shall go to hell and you will go with me;" and thus tortured by the fearful forebodings of coming wrath, in all the horrors of despair, he continued sometimes crying out on the name of Christ; sometimes complaining that he was abandoned by God and man; sometimes blaspheming, till in agony he expired.

Now, what infidel, standing on the ashes of the guilty Voltaire, would willingly purchase the applause which a deluded world paid to his perverted genius, and take with it the tortures of his terrible death-bed? When struggling with death, and trembling at an opening eternity, what unbeliever then would reject the joyful hopes, the blessed prospects of the humble christian, and choose the fearful forebodings, the racking apprehensions, the awful agony of this idol of France; an agony which the Mareschal d'Richelieu, when he retired from the bed-side, declared to be a sight too dreadful to be sustained?

But David Hume, say the enemies of the gospel, "died as a philosopher dies." Yes, Hume did try to forget death and the judgment; did try, by playing at whist, to calm the agony of his mind; to jest and laugh when on the brink of eternity:—and, even if his attempts at wit had not been feigned, and his apparent indifference a desperate effort to conceal from the world the agony of his soul, yet, is it "philosophy" or folly, in the criminal, which leads him to jest and dance as he is led to execution; which leads one, who boasts of the dignity of human nature, to *affec to die like a brue*?

It is, however, now well known, that in all Hume's jesting and buffoonery on his death-bed, he was pretending to a calmness which he did not feel; trying to die as a fool dieth; while his heart was convulsed with terror: and that he sunk down at last with a fearful looking for of judgment.

We know, indeed, that there are some who have led godless lives, who have neglected or denied the atonement, and disbelieved the divine declaration, that through the blood of Christ alone is the remission of sin: we know that some such have died, in the language of a careless world, "as a lamb," and have "no bands in their death:" but we also know, that such die with a "lie in their right hand." Have you, reader, seen such an individual on a death-bed, careless about escaping the coming wrath, trusting to his moral life and his freedom from gross vice,—trusting in any thing else than the blood of Jesus for salvation; relying on any thing else for acceptance with a Holy God, than free justification through the atoning sacrifice of the Son of God? Have you seen him, when death was at the door, and eternity opening before him, *thus* trusting, and then dying without a pang, without remorse of conscience, or any apparent dread of the just judgment of the Almighty?—yet be not deceived. It was ignorance of his true state before God; ignorance of his guilt and danger; or hardness of heart, or a seared conscience, or a strong delusion, to which the God he had insulted had given him up; or the agony of bodily pain, or the langour of disease, that spread this

deadly calm over his soul. Ah! this is indeed saying peace, peace, when there is no peace: "for when they shall say peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh upon them—and they shall not escape." "There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked." However men may think and talk, and live in the time of health, yet, when they must stand before God, instead of choosing between the deaths of a Hume and a Voltaire, would they not all, in the spirit of true philosophy and right reason, say with Balaam, "Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his." Preparation for death does not, however, consist in wishing, nor is it the work of a moment. It does not consist in repeating prayers and uttering sighs on a death bed, as a kind of charm to draw down the blessing. Let every day, let your whole life be devoted to this great work, by glorifying God, believing on Jesus, and seeking to be found in Him. Remember that the day of *your death* is drawing near. Remember that God will soon command death to do unto you, as to the dead who have gone before you; "and because I will do this unto thee, prepare to meet thy God." MAXTON.

#### ART. V. *Precious Remedies against Satan's Devices.*

(Continued from Vol. XIV., page 568.)

### PART II.

The second thing to be shewed, is, the several devices that Satan (as to draw souls to sin, so) to keep souls from holy duties, to hinder them in holy services, and to keep them from religious performances. "And he shewed me Joshua the high priest, standing before the angel of the Lord and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him." Zach. iii. 1. The truth of this I shall shew you in the following particulars:

**CHAPTER I.** *The first Device that Satan hath to draw souls from holy duties, and to keep them from religious services, is,* By presenting the world in such a dress, and in such a garb, as to insnare the soul, and steal upon its affections; he represents the world to them in its beauty and bravery, which proves a bewitching sight to a world of men:\* (It is true, this took not Christ, because Satan could find no matter in him for his temptation to work upon) so that he no sooner casts out his golden bait, but we are ready to play with it; he no sooner throws out his golden ball, but men are apt to run after it, though they lose God and their souls in the pursuit. Ah! how many professors in these days have for a time followed hard after God, Christ, and ordinances, till the devil hath set before them the world in all its beauty and bravery, which hath bewitched them first to have low thoughts of holy things, and then to be cold in their affections to them, and then to slight them; and at last, with the young man in the gospel, to turn their backs upon them.†—Where one thousand is destroyed by the world's frowns, ten thousand are destroyed by its smiles. The world, siren-like, it sings us, and sinks us; it kisses us, and betrays us, like Judas; it kisses us, and smites us under the fifth rib, like Joab. The honor, splendor, and all the glory of

\* The beauty of the world foils a Christian more than the strength; the flattering sunshine more than the blustering storm. In storms we keep our garments close about us.

† The inhabitants of Nilus are deaf by the noise of the waters; so the world makes such a noise in men's ears, that they cannot hear the things of heaven.

this world, are but sweet poisons, that will much endanger us, if they do not eternally destroy us. Now the remedies against this device of Satan, are these :

*Remedy 1.* Against this device of Satan, dwell upon the impotency and weakness of all things here below ; they are not able to secure you from the least evil :\* they are not able to procure you the least desirable good. The crown of gold cannot cure the head-ache, nor the velvet slipper ease the gout ; nor can the jewel about the neck take away the pain of the teeth. The frogs of Egypt entered into rich men's houses as well as the poor ; our daily experience evidences this, that all the honors, riches, &c. that men enjoy, cannot free them from the cholic, nor the fever.† Nay, what is more strange, a great deal of wealth cannot keep men from falling into extreme poverty, Judges 1. 6. you shall find seventy kings with their fingers and toes cut off, glad like whelps to lick up crumbs under another king's table, and shortly after, the same king that brought them to this penury, is reduced to the same poverty and misery. Why then should that be a bar to keep thee out of heaven, that cannot give thee the least ease on earth ?

*Rem. 2.* Dwell upon the vanity and impotency of all worldly good. This is the sum of Solomon's sermon, 'Vanity of vanity, and all is vanity.'‡ This our first parents found, and therefore named their second son Abel, or Vanity. Solomon who had tried these things, could best tell the vanity of them, and he preached this sermon over again and again, 'Vanity of vanity, and all is vanity.'§ It is sad to think how many thousands there are that can say with the preacher, 'Vanity of vanity, all is vanity,' nay, swear it, and yet follow after these things, as if there were no glory, nor felicity, but what is to be found in them. Such men will sell Christ, heaven, and their souls for a trifle, who call these things vanity, but do not cordially believe them to be so. They set their hearts upon them, as if they were their crown, the top of all their royalty. Oh ! let your souls dwell upon the vanity of all things here below, till your hearts are so thoroughly convinced and persuaded of the vanity of them, as to trample upon them, and make them a footstool for Christ to get up, and ride in a holy triumph in your hearts.

Chrysostom said once, 'That if he were the fittest in the world to preach a sermon to the whole world, gathered together in one congregation, and had some high mountain for his pulpit, from whence he might have the prospect of all the world in his view, and were furnished with a voice of brass, a voice as loud as the trumpet of the arch-angel, that all the world might hear him, he would choose to preach upon no other text than that in the Psalms, 'O mortal men, how long will ye love vanity, and follow after leasing.'¶

Tell me, you that say all things under the sun are vanity, if you really believe what you say ? Why do you spend more time and thoughts on

---

\* The Prior of Melancthon, rolled his hand up and down in a bason full of angels, thinking thereby to have charmed his gout ; but it would not do.

† Nugas the Seythian, despising the rich presents and ornaments that were sent unto him by the emperor of Constantinople, asked whether those things could drive away calamities, diseases, or death.

‡ Giltimex, king of the Vandals, led in triumph by Belisarius, cried out, "Vanity of vanity, all is vanity."

§ The fancy of Lucian, who placeth Charon on the top of an high hill, viewing all the affairs of men living, and looking on their great cities as little bird's nests, is very pleasant.

¶ Ah, did we but weigh man's pain with his payment, his crosses with his mercies, his miseries with his pleasures, we should then see, that there is nothing got by the bargain, and conclude, "Vanity of vanity, all is vanity."

the world, than you do on Christ, heaven, and your immortal souls?— Why do you then neglect your duty towards God, to get the world?— Why do you then so eagerly pursue after the world, and remain so cold in your pursuit after God, Christ, and holiness? Why then are your hearts so exceedingly raised, when the world comes in, and smiles upon you; and so much dejected and cast down, when the world frowns upon you, and with Jonah's gourd, withers before you.

*Rem. 3.* Consider the uncertainty, mutability, and inconstancy, of all things under the sun.\* Man himself is but the dream of a dream, the generation of a fancy, an empty vanity, and a poor, feeble, dying flash. All temporals are as transitory as a hasty torrent, a shadow, a ship, a bird, an arrow, a post that passeth by; 'Why shouldest thou set thine eyes upon that which is not?' saith Solomon. And saith the apostle, 'The fashion of this world passeth away. Heaven only hath a foundation, earth hath none, but is hung upon nothing,' as Job speaks. The apostle willed Timothy, to 'Charge rich men that they be not high-minded, nor put their trust in uncertain riches.† They are like bad servants, whose shoes are made of running leather, and who will never tarry long with one master; as a bird hoppeth from tree to tree, so do the honors and riches of this world pass from man to man; let Job and Nebuchadnezzar testify this truth, who fell from great wealth to great want. No man can promise himself to be wealthy till night; one storm at sea, one coal of fire, one false friend, one unadvised word, one false witness, may make thee a beggar and a prisoner all at once. All the riches and glory of this world are but as smoke and chaff, that vanisheth; 'As a dream and vision in the night, that tarrieth not.‡ As if a hungry man dream, and think that he eateth, and when he awakes, his soul is empty; and like a thirsty man which thinketh he drinketh, and behold when he is awaked, his soul is faint, as the prophet Isaiah saith.§ Where is the glory of Solomon? The sumptuous buildings of Nebuchadnezzar? The nine hundred chariots of Sisera? The power of Alexander? The authority of Augustus, that commanded the whole world to be taxed?— Those that have been the most glorious, in what men generally account glorious and excellent, have had inglorious ends; as Sampson for strength; Absalom for beauty; Ahitophel for policy; Haman for favor; Asael for swiftness; Alexander for great conquest, and yet after twelve years was poisoned; you may see the same in the four mighty kingdoms, the Chaldean, Persian, Grecian, and Roman, how soon were they gone and forgotten! Now rich, now poor; now full, now empty; now honorable, now despised; now health, now sickness; now strength, now weakness.|| Oh! let not these uncertain things keep thee from those holy services, and heavenly employments, in which you may be happy here, and in which thy soul may be eternally blessed, when all these transitory things shall bid it an everlasting farewell.

\* Riches were never true to any that trusted in them; they have deceived men, as Job's brook did the poor traveller, in the summer season, Job xi. 15.

† 1 Cor. vii. 31. intimateth, "That there is nothing of any firmness, nor solid consistence in the creature."

‡ The most renowned Frederick lost all, and sued to be made but sexton of the church that himself had built.

§ I have read of a poor fisherman, who, while his nets were a drying, slept upon the rock, and dreamed that he was made a king, on a sudden he starts up, and leaping for joy, fell down from the rock, and in the place of his imaginary felicities, loses his little portion of pleasures.

|| The pomp of this world John compareth to the moon, which "increaseth and decreaseth," Rev. xii. 1.

*Rem. 4.* Seriously consider, that the great things of this world are very hurtful and dangerous to the outward and inward man, through the corruptions that are in the hearts of men. Oh! the rest, peace, comfort, and content that the things of this world deprive many men of. Oh the fears, cares, envy, malice, dangers, and mischiefs, that they subject men to.\* They oftentimes make men carnally confident, 'The rich man's riches are a strong tower in his imagination. I said in my prosperity I should never be moved.' They often swell the heart with pride, and make men forget and neglect God, and despise the rock of their salvation.† 'When Jeshurum waxed fat, and was grown thick, and covered with fatness, then he forgot, and forsook God that made him, and lightly esteemed the rock of his salvation,' as Moses spake. Ah! the times, the thoughts, the spirits, that the things of the world consume and spend. Oh! how do they hinder the actings of faith upon God? Interrupt our sweet communion with him! Abate our love to his people, cool our love to the things of God, and induce us to act like those that are most unlike him? Oh! the deadness and barrenness that attend men under great outward mercies.‡ Oh! how the riches of the world choke the word; so that men live under the most soul-searching, and soul-enriching means, with lean souls. They have full purses, but their hearts are empty of grace. In Gen. xiii. 2, it is said, that 'Abraham was very rich in cattle, in silver, and in gold.' According to the Hebrew, it is, 'Abraham was very heavy;' to shew, that riches are a heavy burden, and a hinderance many times to heaven and happiness.§

King Henry the fourth asked the Duke of Alva, 'If he had observed the great eclipse of the sun which had lately happened?' 'No, (said the duke) I have so much to do on earth, that I have no leisure to look up to heaven.' Ah! that this were not true of most professors in these days; it is sad to think, that their hearts and times are so much taken up with earthly things, that they have scarce any leisure to look up to heaven, or after Christ, and the things that belong to their everlasting peace.

Riches, though well got, yet are but like manna, those that gathered little had no want, and those that gathered more, it was of no use to them. The world is troublesome, and yet it is loved; what would it be, if it were peaceable? You embrace it, though filthy; what would you do if it were beautiful? You cannot keep your hands from the thorns; how earnest would you be then in gathering the flowers?|| The world may be fitly likened to the serpent Scytale, whereof it is reported, that when she cannot overtake the flying passengers, she doth with her beautiful colors so astonish and amaze them, that they have no power to pass away, till she has stung them. Ah! how many thousands are there now on earth, that have found this true by experience; they have spun a fair thread to strangle themselves, both temporally and eternally, being bewitched by the beauty and glory of this enticing world.

---

\* Henry the second hearing Mentz, his chief city, was taken, used this blasphemous speech, "I shall never," said he, "love God any more, that suffered a city so dear to me, to be taken from me."

† When one presented Antipater, king of Macedonia, with a book treating of happiness, his answer was, "I have no leisure."

‡ That four good mothers begat four bad daughters: great familiarity begets contempt, truth hatred, virtue envy, riches ignorance. A French proverb.

§ Policrates bestowed five talents for a gift upon one Anacreon, who for two nights after was so troubled with care how to keep them, and how to bestow them, that he carried them back again to Policrates, saying, "They were not worth the pains he had already taken for them."

|| Sicily is so full of sweet flowers that dogs cannot hunt there: and what do all the sweet contents of this world, but make us lose the scent of heaven.

*Rem. 5.* Consider, that all the felicity of this world is mixed: our light is mixed with darkness, our joy with sorrow, our pleasures with pain, &c. If our light be spiritual, clear, and quick, we may see in the felicity of this world, our wine mixed with water, our honey with gall, our sugar with wormwood, and our roses with thorns. Sorrow attends worldly joy, danger, worldly safety; loss, worldly labors; tears, worldly purposes. As to these things men's hopes are vain, their sorrow certain, and their joy feigned. The apostle calls this world, 'A sea of glass;' a sea for the trouble of it, and glass for the brittleness and bitterness of it. 'The honors, profits, pleasures, and delights of this world, are true gardens of Adonis, where we can gather nothing but trivial flowers, surrounded with many briars.'

*Rem. 6.* Get better acquaintance, and assurance of more blessed and glorious things.\* That which raised up their spirits, Heb. x. and xi. to trample upon all the beauty and glory of the world, was the acquaintance with 'and assurance of better and more durable things; they took joyfully the spoiling of their goods, knowing in themselves, that they had in heaven a better and a more enduring substance. They looked for a house that had foundations, whose builder and maker was God: and they looked for another country, even an heavenly. They saw him that was invisible, and had an eye to the recompence of reward.† And this made them count all the glory and bravery of this world, too poor and contemptible for them to set their hearts upon. The main reason why men dote upon the world, and damn their souls to get it, is, 'because they are not acquainted with a greater glory.' Men ate acorns, till they were acquainted with the use of wheat. Ah! were men more acquainted with what union and communion with God means; what it is to 'have a new name, and a new stone, that none knows, but he that hath it;' did they but taste more of heaven, and live more in heaven, and had more glorious hopes of going to heaven, how easily would they have the moon under their feet?

It was an excellent saying of Lewis of Bavaria, emperor of Germany, 'Such goods are worth getting and owning, as will not sink, nor wash away, if a shipwreck happen, but will wade and swim out with us.' It is recorded of Lazarus, 'that after his resurrection from the dead, he was never seen to laugh, his thoughts and affections were so fixed in heaven, though his body were on earth; and therefore he could not but slight temporal things, his heart was so bent and set upon eternals.'— There are goods of the throne of grace, as God, Christ, the Spirit, adoption, justification, remission of sin, peace with God, and peace with conscience; and there are goods of the foot-stool, as honors, riches, the favors of creatures, and other comforts and accommodations of this life. Now he that hath acquaintance with, and assurance of the goods of the throne, will easily trample upon the goods of the foot-stool.‡ Ah that you would make it your business and work, to mind and make more sure to your own souls, the great things of eternity, that will yield you joy in life, peace in death, and a crown of righteousness in the day of Christ's

\* Let heaven be a man's object, and earth will soon be his object.

† Luther being at one time in some wants, it happened that a good sum of money was unexpectedly sent him by a nobleman of Germany, at which being something amazed, he said, "I fear that God will give me my reward here, but I protest I will not be so satisfied."

‡ When Basil was tempted with money and preferment, saith he, "Give me money that may last for ever, and glory that may eternally flourish; for the fashion of this world passeth away, as the waters of a river that run by a city."

appearing; that will lift up your souls above all the beauty and bravery of this bewitching world, and raise your feet above other men's heads. When a man comes to be assured of a crown, a sceptre, the royal robes, &c. he then begins to have low, mean and contemptible thoughts of those things that before he highly prized; so will assurance of more great and glorious things, raise in the soul a holy scorn and contempt of all these poor trifling things, which the soul before valued above God, Christ, heaven, &c.

*Rem. 7.* Seriously consider, that true happiness and satisfaction is not to be had in the enjoyment of any worldly good. True happiness is too big and glorious a thing to be found in any thing that is below that God that is a Christian's chiefest good.\* The blessed angels, those glittering courtiers, have all felicity and blessedness; and yet they have neither gold nor silver, jewels, nor any of the beauty and glory of this world; certainly, if happiness were to be found in these things, the Lord Jesus, who is the right and royal heir of all things, would have exchanged his cradle for his crown, his birth-chamber (a stable) for a royal palace; his poverty for plenty; his despised followers for shining courtiers; and his mean provisions for the choicest delicacies, &c.† Certainly 'happiness lies not in those things that a man may enjoy, and yet be miserable for ever.' Now 'a man may be great, and graceless, with Pharaoh; honorable, and damnable, with Saul; rich, and miserable, with Dives,' &c. therefore happiness lies not in these things. Certainly happiness lies not in those things that cannot comfort a man upon a dying bed: is it honors, riches, or friends,‡ &c. that can comfort thee when thou comest to die? Or is it not rather faith in the blood of Christ, the witness of his Spirit, the sense and feeling of his love and favor, and the hopes of eternally reigning with him? Can happiness lie in those things that cannot give us health, strength, or ease, a good night's rest, an hour's sleep, or a good appetite? Why, all the honors, riches and delights of this world cannot give us these poor things; therefore, certainly happiness lies not in the enjoyment of them, &c. And surely happiness is not to be found in these things that cannot satisfy the souls of men: now none of these things can satisfy the soul. He that loveth silver, shall not be satisfied with silver, nor he that loveth abundance with increase; 'this is also vanity,' said the wise man.§ The barren womb, the horse-leech's daughter, hell and the grave, will as soon be satisfied, as the soul of man will by the enjoyment of any worldly good. Some one thing or other will be for ever wanting to that soul that hath nothing but outward good to live upon. You may as soon fill a bag with wisdom, a chest with virtue, or a circle with a triangle, as the heart of man with any thing here below. A man may have enough of the world to sink him, but he can never have enough to satisfy him, &c.

*Rem. 8.* Solemnly consider the dignity of the soul. Oh, the soul of man is of more worth than a thousand worlds; we cannot abase it more than by letting it dote upon a little shining earth, a little painted beauty

\* True happiness lies only in our enjoyment of a "suitable good, a pure good, a total good, and an eternal good; and God is only such a good, and such a good can only satisfy the soul of man."

† Philosophers could say, "That he was never a happy man, that might afterwards become miserable."

‡ Gregory the great used to say, "He is poor whose soul is void of grace, not whose coffers are empty of money."

§ The reasonable soul may be busied about other things, but it cannot be filled with them.

and fading glory, when it is capable of union with Christ, communion with God, and of enjoying the eternal vision.

Seneca could say, 'I am too great, and born to greater things, than that I should be a slave to my body.' Oh, do you say, my soul is too great, and born to greater things than that I should confine it to the heap of white and yellow earth.

I have been longer upon the remedies that may help us against this dangerous device of Satan, because he doth usually more hurt to the souls of men by this, than by all other devices. For a close, I wish, as once Chrysostom did, that that sentence, Eccl. ii. 11. 'Then I looked on all the works that my hands had wrought, and on the labor that I had labored to do; and behold all was vanity and vexation of spirit, and there was no profit under the sun,' were engraven on the door-posts into which you enter, on the tables where you sit, on the dishes out of which you eat, on the cups out of which you drink, on the bedsteads where you lie, on the walls of the house where you dwell, on the garments which you wear, on the heads of the horses on which you ride, and on the foreheads of all them whom you meet, that your souls may not, by the beauty and glory of the world, be kept from those holy and heavenly services, in which you may be blessed while you live, and happy when you die; that you may breathe out your last into his bosom who lives for ever, and who will make them happy for ever that prefer Christ's spirituals and eternal, above all temporal, transitory things.

(To be continued.)

#### ART. VI. *The General Synod of the Reformed Dutch Church.*

This Judicatory met in this city on Wednesday, the 6th ult. We extract the following from a report of their proceedings in the *Christian Intelligencer*:—

The Committee appointed at the last Synod to open a correspondence with the Reformed Presbyterian Church, reported a plan for maintaining this correspondence which had received the sanction of the Synod of that Church, and being read by paragraphs, it was adopted by the General Synod of the Dutch Church. The following is the plan:—

I. The Synod of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church and the General Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, shall each appoint a minister with an alternate, to sit in the highest judicatory respectively, with the privilege of deliberating on all subjects coming before them, and of making suggestions on matters affecting the interests of both bodies mutually or pertaining to the general interests of religion—but not of voting.

II. There shall be fraternal intercourse between ministers of each body; and private members shall be received by each church, from the other, on proper credentials: subject to the rules which govern each, in the admission of members.

The two bodies respectively shall honor each others acts of discipline, reserving, however, to themselves, the right of reviewing all such cases.

A report was received from the Delegates appointed to attend the meeting of the last General Assembly, stating that in consequence of the division which has taken place in that body, they did not produce

their credentials from this Synod, but felt that their duty was discharged by simply informing the General Synod of the fact of such division.

This report elicited considerable discussion before the Synod, and the subject was not disposed of when the Synod adjourned.

*Thursday, 7th June.*

After the call of the roll this morning, the Rev. John McLeod, of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, was announced as the delegate to the Synod, from that body, and was invited to take his seat as a corresponding member. At a late period of the session to day, the plan of correspondence with that respected body, which had been adopted yesterday, was reconsidered, with a view of introducing a substitute to the 2d Article. This was adopted without any hesitation, it being the Article which had been agreed upon by the General Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church.

It is as follows:

“The ministers, members and judicatories of these churches, (treating each other with christian respect,) shall always recognize the validity of each others’ acts and ordinances consonant to the word of God; it being understood that any ecclesiastical judicatory belonging to either body, may examine persons or review cases of discipline or points at present peculiar or distinctive to themselves respectively.”

**CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.**—The Synod, after hearing the above mentioned reports, had submitted to them the report of the Committee on Correspondence, to whom had been referred the Report of the Delegates to attend the last meeting of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. This subject elicited very considerable discussion, and was not finished when the hour of adjournment arrived.

*Thursday Afternoon.*

After the opening of the Synod this afternoon, they resumed the unfinished business of the morning. Several amendments to the report were proposed, and much debate of an animated character was had upon the whole subject. The Synod appeared to be divided upon one of two courses—either to suspend all correspondence with the Assembly at present, and of course receive the delegates of neither party—or to recognize the Assembly called the Old School, and admit their delegates upon the floor of the Synod. But at length it was thought best not to give any expression of the Synod upon the difficulties existing in that highly respected church—but for the present, suspend all correspondence. In this, they considered themselves justified, not only from the circumstances of the case, but from the fact that the General Assembly, last year, did not appoint any delegates to the General Synod of the Dutch Church. The original report of the Committee, which was framed upon these principles, was at length adopted by a very large majority. The report is as follows:

The Committee on Correspondence, to whom was referred the report of our Delegates to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, respectfully submit for the adoption of Synod, the following preamble and resolution:

*Whereas*, Your delegates represent that they refrained from offering their credentials, in consequence of the occurrence of peculiar circumstances, not contemplated at the period of their appointment, by which, on the organization of the Assembly, two bodies were created, each claiming to be the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church.

*And Whereas*, While we deeply sympathize with our beloved sister

church in her trials, and earnestly pray that they may be overruled by Divine Providence for the furtherance of truth and purity, yet neither duty claims, nor propriety allows that this Synod, either by its delegates, or its own official acts, should even appear to assume the authority of an arbitrator between the opposing portions of another ecclesiastical body.

Therefore, *Resolved*, That, under the circumstances of the case, Synod approve the course pursued by said delegates.

*Resolved*, That, for the present, Synod will abstain from all action under the terms of correspondence, existing between the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church and the General Synod of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church, so far as relates to the interchange of delegates between the two bodies.

By order of the Committee,

THOMAS E. VERMILYE, Chairman.

[This action of the Synod in relation to the division in the General Assembly is very strange. We had hardly supposed it possible that there could have been any debate in a professedly orthodox body, or hesitation in any individual mind of a Presbyterian stamp, respecting the question whether the *Orthodox Presbyterian* General Assembly or the *Pelagian Congregationalist* General Assembly should be recognized as the true, regular, and genuine General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. On this proceeding of the Dutch Synod, THE PRESBYTERIAN remarks as follows: "Our readers will learn with surprise that the Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church at its recent sessions, has virtually refused to recognize the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. We abstain from any further comment than the expression of our regret, that this respectable body should have done an act, which may, in all probability, prevent any future interchange of delegates between it and the General Assembly."}]

ASSOCIATE REFORMED CHURCH.—A communication was received from the Stated Clerk of the General Synod of this Church, containing an extract from their minutes relative to the proposed correspondence of the Synod of the Dutch Church with them. They decline the proposition to send delegates from each body, but express simply their willingness to correspond by letter. The communication was referred to the Committee on Correspondence.

CONVENTION AT PITTSBURGH.—On retiring from the Synod, the Rev. Mr. McLeod handed to the President a letter from the Rev. Mr. Wilson, inviting the General Synod of the Reformed Dutch Church, to unite, by delegation, in a Convention which the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church have recommended, to be held at the city of Pittsburgh, in October ensuing, for the purpose of effecting, if possible, a closer union between these churches, who approximate in doctrine, in worship and in order. The communication was read and referred to the Committee on Correspondence.

*Tuesday June 12th.*

CORRESPONDENCE.—The report of the Committee on Correspondence was then presented. One item in this report excited great interest and much discussion. It was that in reference to the proposed Convention to be held in Pittsburgh in October next. The Committee submitted the propriety of appointing certain persons to be present in the Convention, that the Synod might be apprized efficiently of the objects and acts of the Convention. This proposition was much opposed by some, and warmly advocated by others. But as they could not arrive to any defi-

nite conclusion on the subject, and some amendments had been proposed which the Synod were not ready to act upon, and there was not time to consider them, the whole subject was recommitted, with a view to its being presented for the action of the Synod to-morrow.

Wednesday, 13th June.

**CORRESPONDENCE.**—The Committee on Correspondence, whose report had been recommitted yesterday afternoon, submitted it again this morning. It now caused very little debate, and was soon adopted. It is as follows:

The Committee on Correspondence, in addition to the report already adopted by Synod, would respectfully submit, that various documents have been referred to their notice, claiming the consideration of this body, in regard to which severally they would suggest the following action:

1st. The Chairman of your Committee on Foreign Correspondence, states that he has no communication to present from the General Synod of Edinburgh. He "hopes that the Committee may be continued and instructed to publish in the Christian Intelligencer, any communication which may be received from the General Synod of the United Associate Church in Scotland, and any which they may make to the aforesaid Synod." He also suggests that as the Rev. Dr. Brodhead has resided to a distance from the city of New-York, and another member of the Committee resides at Somerville, N. J., it will be proper to place another member on the Committee, resident in New-York, for the sake of convenient consultation."

Your Committee would respectfully propose, with reference to the foregoing communications, the following resolutions:

*Resolved*, The said Committee on Foreign Correspondence be continued, and that they be authorised to make such publications in the Christian Intelligencer, of letters received or sent, as in their judgment may be advisable.

*Resolved*, That the Rev. Dr. Ferris be substituted as a member of said Committee, in the place of Rev. Dr. Brodhead.

2d. From the Stated Clerk of the Associate Reformed Synod of New-York, a communication has been received in relation to the proposed plan of correspondence between that Synod and the General Synod of the Reformed Dutch Church. It will be recollected that at the last annual meeting of our body, a Committee of the aforesaid Associate Reformed Synod appeared, and a plan of correspondence by delegates mutually approved by said Committee, and a Committee of this Synod was presented, and on our part ratified. Said plan having been submitted by their Committee to the Associate Reformed Synod, the following resolution was adopted, and is communicated to this house.

*Resolved*, That the Synod of the Associate Reformed Church, entertaining sentiments of brotherly affection towards our Brethren of the Reformed Dutch Church, propose and agree to carry on a friendly correspondence by the interchange of letters touching the general interests of religion in our country and the world.

These sentiments of brotherly affection, we would warmly reciprocate, and pray that divine influences may be poured down richly upon our brethren of the Associate Reformed Church. But as your Committee can discover no important ends to be attained by an interchange of letters on the general interests of religion, between neighbors in such immediate proximity, which would not be attained by an inspection of the

published minutes of each body, they refrain from proposing any specific action on the subject.

3d. From the minutes of the particular Synod of New-York, the following preamble and resolutions, found on the minutes of the Classis of Poughkeepsie, have been referred to us.

‘ *Whereas*, The unpleasant intelligence has reached our ears that, in Holland—the land of our fathers—a persecution for righteousness sake has been carried on with the approbation, if not by the authority of the Government; and *Whereas*, the Reformed Churches of some other countries have addressed the Dutch authorities in relation to this matter, and expressed their sympathies for the suffering: Therefore *Resolved*, That we feel deeply distressed at what appears to us not only contrary to the light and liberal principles of the age in which we live, but to be a strange work in our father land, which, in a former age, proved the house of refuge for all Europe. *Resolved*, That it be recommended to General Synod to express the sentiments and feelings of our portion of the Reformed Dutch Church, by addressing a letter of respectful remonstrance to the Dutch Government, or one of sympathy to the persecuted, or both, or in any other way deemed more appropriate.”

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN MANLEY. Chairman.

While the subject to which allusion is here made, is one well calculated to awaken and enlist the sympathies of our communion, if the allegation set forth in the above preamble be well founded, it is also one of the utmost delicacy and difficulty. And as your Committee have no facts nor documents within their reach from which to form an enlightened judgment that might be the guide of official acts on the part of the Synod, if such acts were deemed proper and desirable, they therefore offer no resolution or recommendation in the premises.

4th. An affectionate fraternal letter, addressed to the President of the Synod, and signed by Rev. Wm. Wilson, has received the consideration of your Committee. The writer states that he has been appointed by the General Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, a delegate to represent that body in a proposed “Convention of such evangelical denominations as may be disposed to accede to the measure, for the purpose of promoting, and if possible effecting on a scriptural basis, the visible unity of those departments of the church of God;” and he asks respectfully that this Synod may be represented in such Convention. By a reference to the minutes of the General Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, where is found a deeply interesting report on the subject, it appears that the plan of this Convention embraces “those Reformed Churches that approximate the nearest to each other in doctrine and worship;” and has received the favorable notice of several evangelical denominations. The Convention is appointed to be held at *Pittsburg, on the third Wednesday of October, 1828.*

The entire subject your Committee deem to be one of profound interest and vast importance. Is it to be regarded as one of the signs of the times? Is it true that the light begins to break upon the darkness and confusion which have so long held terrific empire over the Churches of our land? Is this the morning dawn spreading upon the mountains the delightful harbinger of a bright and sunny day? Have we in this movement another evidence that man’s extremity is God’s opportunity? We know that he can compose the troubled elements, and at a moment and by means the most unexpected, can bring order out of confusion. Does

he mean now to interpose, and by such methods to make righteousness and truth, and purity, and peace to spring forth before all people? We would attend, ready, as we hope, to follow the leadings of his providence. We would feel our dependance, and realize his absolute sovereignty. "He speaks and it is done, he commands and it stands fast for ever and ever." The operation of his spirit can bring the watchmen to see eye to eye.— We acknowledge that the subject in its whole aspect is well worthy of all the consideration it can receive.

As regards definite action, your Committee have found no small difficulty in suggesting a course proper to be pursued in the present state of the matter. Their individual feelings would lead them strongly to recommend that a Committee be appointed by this Synod to attend on the deliberations of the proposed Convention. They certainly desire to meet and respond to the invitation in the same spirit of fraternal affection in which it has been extended. But not feeling authorized in the present stage of the business to recommend the formal appointment of delegates as to a corresponding body, they have deemed it best to remit this point to the determination of Synod itself. Should it be considered inexpedient at present to adopt decisive steps, and no Committee be sent, they still ask for the subject solemn and prayerful reflection. They would earnestly commend it to the most attentive consideration of all who love the peace of Jerusalem, and bear upon their hearts the Saviour's petition uttered as in anticipation of the divisions which subsequent times should develope, the touching supplication that *his disciples might all be one.*

All of which is respectfully submitted.

THOMAS E. VERMILYE, *Chairman.*

CONVENTION AT PITTSBURG.—In relation to the proposed Convention at Pittsburg, to be held next October, which is referred to in the above Report, Synod adopted the following resolution :

*Resolved,* That in the present state of information on the subject of the contemplated Convention, this Synod are not prepared to take any further order in the case.

CLOSE OF THE SYNOD.—The minutes were now read and the roll called for the purpose of recording the names of such persons as had left the Synod without leave. The names of one minister and two Elders were put upon this black list.

---

### ART. VII. *Missionary Intelligence.*

[Facts collected from the *Missionary Herald* for May.]

CEYLON.—*Schools.*—All the native free schools except fourteen have been discontinued,—in consequence of the embarrassments of the Board, no new class could be received into the Seminary in September; the less promising of the students dismissed, and building operations suspended; and yet even these retrenchments afford but very partial relief, though they thrust five thousand children out of school. Yet these schools were filling the land rapidly with intelligent readers; preparing the way for the Bible and tract distributor; securing large, attentive, and comparatively intelligent congregations on the Sabbath; bringing the children into Sabbath Schools, and the teachers into Bible Classes every Sabbath, beside imparting strictly religious instruction

every day in the week. And the expense of each school is small. A school of forty-five boys cost the mission but \$20 or \$30 a year; and twenty of them only from \$400 to \$600. The system connects the missionaries closely with the people; displaces the heathen schools, and divests the language of its heathen and mythological sense, and gives it a christian meaning. Ought such a system to be relinquished? Will the American churches permit it?

**MADRAS.**—In this single city alone of more than four hundred thousand souls, there is a providential opening for several mission stations; calls for schools of every description; and a pressing demand for the scriptures and other books. Ten thousand portions of the Bible have been distributed. A large and efficient book manufactory is demanded.

**Schools.**—In August last, this mission had under its care thirteen villages or out-schools at each of its stations; (Chintedrepettah and Rayapoorham) embracing more than six hundred children. The schools had been somewhat diminished by the threats and injunctions of the Catholic priests, who denounced bitter curses on all who went to them for instruction.

**Congregations.**—At both stations, encouraging. Bible class and Sabbath School in a pleasing state. Some enquiries from among the natives have at times appeared anxious about their souls. A considerable native church might be gathered at once, if the missionaries would receive all the nominal christians, or even all the heathen who offer themselves. But they prefer being too cautious, rather than too rash in admissions.

**An interesting fact.**—The number of those among the English population of India who are decidedly pious, has much increased within a few years, and is still increasing. Mr. D. found two gentlemen connected with the army, and their wives, who seemed to possess piety of an uncommon character.

**Native Free Schools.**—Under date, April 1, 1837, Mr. D. states that he had already established thirteen of those schools, numbering three hundred and forty boys and sixty girls. These are frequently visited by the "helpers," not only to examine, but to teach and impress on the pupils the truths of scripture. These schools are becoming more and more popular; the number has since been increased to seventeen, and might be doubled were pecuniary means at command. The boarding school is composed of twenty boys, of from eight to ten years of age.

**Romanism.**—"It is in fact only a union of the rites and ceremonies of heathenism, with those of popery, as seen in America; heathenism being predominant." The Catholics are numerous in D. and in a peculiar state. They seem to be generally dissatisfied with their professed spiritual guides, and convinced that their religion is corrupt. This has resulted from the oppression of their priests, and their exorbitant demands for compensation for every rite they perform. Fewer of them are able to read than the heathen. Some of them attend the religious services of the missionaries. These services are held at four different places in D. every sabbath, and there is an encouraging attendance.

**MADURA.**—Here in the fort, and the adjacent villages, were forty-three schools, embracing one thousand seven hundred and thirty children. They have been disturbed in their operations, though not broken up, by the craft and subtlety of enemies. Evil, and of course ground-

less reports have been put in circulation to prevent the attendance of the children. The devil never sleeps.

**CHINA.—Canton.**—The foreign residents have lately come forward, with praiseworthy zeal, to procure a chapel, and provide it with suitable furniture, for the more respectable maintenance of public worship. The Bible class and two weekly prayer-meetings are continued at C. and Macao; and religious instruction is given to a few Chinese, as opportunity offers.

*Mr. Bridgeman* is occupied in writing for the Chinese, and editing the "Repository."

*Mr. Williams* has resided at Macao; engaged in printing Medhurst's Dictionary; in studying the language, and translating for the Repository.

*Dr. Parker* has been engaged in the duties of the Ophthalmic hospital, with increased usefulness. The number of patients for the last term has been one thousand three hundred. He studies the language, and instructs his three medical assistants.

**Beneficent Institutions for the Chinese.**—Within three years a society has been formed for the "Diffusion of Useful Knowledge." A Medical Missionary Society is getting into operation, to patronize the Ophthalmic hospital. A building has been purchased for \$2,000. The Morrison Education Society has been organized, and has already collected a considerable sum for a library and the support of a teacher, when he can be procured. A Bible Society is organized at Singapore, and also a Temperance Society; both of which meet with favor.

**INDIAN ARCHIPELAGO.**—Nearly nine pages of the Herald are occupied with the journal of Rev. Mr. Dickinson, on his missionary voyage to the maritime parts of the countries of S. E. Asia and the adjacent islands, for the distribution of the scriptures and religious tracts, and to open the way for establishing new missions. The journal does not admit of satisfactory abridgement within our assigned limits; and relates wholly to the southern part of the large Island Celebes, E. of Borneo, embracing much geographical and statistical information. This island is under the Dutch Government nominally, though many of the native tribes are independent. It opens a large, important and unoccupied field of missionary labor; but whether the permission of the Dutch Government to enter it can be obtained is doubtful.

**RECENT INTELLIGENCE.**—*Mr. Wilson* writes from Cape Palmas, S. Africa, that in consequence of the instructions of the Board, his two day schools are discontinued; the teachers discharged; the operations of the press are suspended; and the boarding school reduced to two-thirds. The trial is a painful one.

*Mr. Winslow* writes from Madras, that nearly all the schools are suspended. The English school is continued.

**Sumatra.**—*Mr. Ennis*, of the Java Mission, has visited this Island, and finds it densely peopled; highly cultivated; the inhabitants more civilized than those of Java, and favorable to Europeans. He thinks that twenty missionaries might find wide fields of labor immediately. "Sumatra is waiting for many missionaries."

The whole amount of donations and legacies acknowledged in this No. of the Herald, is \$16,433 68—only one half of what it should be every month of the year. Suppose that every contributor to these funds should double his contributions for the year to come, would he be

a whit poorer in this world? Would he not be inconceivably richer in that world, where wealth is estimated according to the good it accomplishes in Zion's enlargement?

The whole number of Missionaries on Pagan ground, in connexion with the various Protestant societies or boards is 797, besides 222 European and American assistants. The much larger part of these are married men.—*Boston Recorder*.

**BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.**—On Thursday evening, 25th May, pursuant to arrangements, a public meeting was held in the Tenth Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, in behalf of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church. The Rev. Samuel Miller, D. D. President of the Board, presided.

The meeting was opened with prayer by the Rev. Dr. Alexander.

A statement of the operations of the Board for the past year was made by the Corresponding Secretary, from which it appeared that the receipts of the year amounted to .....	\$45,498 62
Balance of last year .....	3,106 99
<hr/>	
Making together the sum of .....	\$48,605 61
The expenditures for the year were.....	44,405 17
<hr/>	

Leaving a balance in the Treasury of ..... 4,200 41

During the year sixteen missionaries and assistant missionaries were sent out to the following stations:

To North India.....	10
To China .....	3
To the Western Indians .....	3

The missionaries and assistants in the service of the Board are thirty-eight, of whom fifteen are ordained ministers of the Gospel, one a licensed preacher, four teachers, and one printer, and seventeen are females, wives of the missionaries. Of these there are among the Western Indians eight; in Western Africa two; in North India twenty-four; in China, three; and one on a visit to the United States.

From various details that were given, it appears that the missions were generally in a prosperous condition, but all greatly in need of more laborers.

Addresses were made by the Rev. Dr. Hoge, of Ohio; Rev. Professor Maclean, of Princeton; and the Rev. Wm. S. Plumer, of Virginia. The meeting was closed with prayer, and the apostolic benediction, by the Rev. Dr. Miller.—*Presbyterian*.

#### ART. VIII. *American Bible Society.*

The twenty-second anniversary of the American Bible Society was held on Thursday morning at the Tabernacle. The President, the Hon. JOHN COTTON SMITH, presided; several of the Vice Presidents from various parts of the Union were present, and many other distinguished gentlemen. The exercises of the day commenced by the reading of a portion of the Scriptures by the Rev. Dr. Humphrey; this was followed by an address from the presiding officer. The report of the Treasurer was

read by Mr. Joseph Hyde, Treasurer *pro tem.*, which was followed by the manager's report, read by the Rev. J. C. Brigham, the corresponding Secretary.

The following is an abstract of this document:—

The report commences with an affecting notice of the decease of JOHN NITCHIE, Esq. the late lamented Treasurer, who had been a devoted servant of the society for nineteen years.

In the course of the year 22 new auxiliary societies have been formed in the different States, making the present total about 900. Some of these societies are in a declining state, and made no report the last year. Others are highly prosperous.

The receipts of the year from all sources, amount to \$85,676 83, being \$4,902 less than those of the preceding year. This is a less reduction than was anticipated, considering the pecuniary embarrassments of the times. Some moneys collected in distant parts of the country have not yet been remitted to New York, and could not have been without a great loss on exchange.

New stereotype plates have been prepared during the past year for a French, a Spanish and a German Testament. These books are now nearly ready for delivery. A new pocket Bible of diamond type is now in press, and will be ready for delivery in the course of two or three months.

Bibles and Testaments have been imported, to the number of 975 copies, in Portuguese, Italian, Welsh and other foreign tongues.

The number of Bibles and Testaments printed in the course of the year were, in all, 142,000 copies. The number issued amounted to 158,208 copies, in eighteen different tongues. This number is less than that distributed last year by some thousands. In some sections of the country, owing in part to the times, few orders have been made by the societies. The board cannot but hope that such societies will double their diligence the coming year.

The entire series of the society's reports, from the beginning, is now reprinting, and will be sold in one large volume at cost.

The managers have caused a careful collation of their present Bible, with the first edition of King James', in 1611. The departures are found to be of trivial character, relating to punctuation, Italic words, &c., not affecting the sense. The collation has increased the confidence in our unparalleled version.

Distributions of the Bibles or Testaments have been made the past year, not only in all our different States and Territories, but in Canada, Texas, Mexico, New Grenada, Brazil, at Havre in France, in Greece, and at the Sandwich Islands. They have also been furnished (for use of the missionaries and mission schools,) to the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, to the Protestant Episcopal Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society, to the Baptist Board for Foreign Missions, to the Methodist Episcopal Missionary Society, and to the Reformed Presbyterian Board of Missions.

The managers have paid out \$17,000 towards publishing and circulating the Scriptures in foreign countries, viz: in Germany, Russia, Syria, Africa, Bombay, Madras, Siam, Ceylon, and the Sandwich Islands. They have appropriated \$17,500, which they have not yet been able to pay.— They have requests before them for a still larger amount than the latter, for which no appropriation is made. It is earnestly desired that the auxiliaries may ponder these facts. Fifty thousand dollars, at least, will be required for the foreign field next year.

The Board have now seven agents in the home field, and one in Syria. They are earnestly entreated to send an agent to Texas, and one to Singapore. Inquiries are instituted for a suitable man for each station.

In conclusion, they say, that while their labors have been temporarily retarded by the pecuniary embarrassment of the times, the friends of the Bible cause were never more numerous, and the prospects for circulating the word of life at home and abroad, were never brighter. They call on the auxiliaries to assemble their respective Boards as early as they can, to prosecute the work of supplying destitute families with the Bible and children with the New Testament, and also to contribute as far as they are able, the coming year, toward the work of foreign distribution.

*Christian Intelligencer.*

**ART. IX. Comparative Strength of Parties.**

*Messrs. Editors.*—As some inaccurate statements have appeared in the papers in relation to the number of Commissioners who seceded from the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, at its recent organization in this city, you are respectfully requested to publish the following statistical statement, made up from the printed rolls of the two bodies now in session. The roll of the (Orthodox) Assembly, it should be stated, embraces only the names of those delegates who were duly commissioned by Presbyteries connected with the General Assembly, and who placed their commissions in the hands of the clerks, in the usual way, at the opening of the session. The roll of the New-school body must have been copied, in the main, from the above roll, since the greater part of the commissions have never been seen by the clerks of that body; and it embraces also the names of the delegates from the excinded Synods and the Third Presbytery of Philadelphia.

Whole number of names on the roll of the (Old School) General Assembly .....	221
Of this number acting with the Assembly up to this time .....	156
Acting with neither body .....	5
Leaving as the aggregate of seceders .....	60
Whole number on the roll published by the seceding body meeting in the First Presbyterian Church .....	282
Of this number from the excinded Synods and Third Presbytery of Philadelphia .....	58
Leaving from Presbyteries in connexion with the General Assembly	224
From this number deduct as follows, viz: Those (named on this list) acting with the Orthodox General Assembly .....	154
Those acting with neither body.....	5
The two Commissioners from the Salem Presbytery, and the two elders from Charleston Union, (neither of whom have been in the city this season) .....	•4

163

There remain from Presbyteries connected with the General Assembly, to form the seceding body .....	61
The relative strength of the two bodies, therefore, (omitting the excinded Synods,) is, according to one roll, as 156 to 60, and according to the other roll, as 154 to 61; in other words, the Orthodox majority, (assuming 156 and 61 to be the true numbers) is	95
Orthodox majority over the seceding body, including the 58 in the excinded Synods.....	37

*National Gazette.*

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,  
AND  
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

AUGUST, 1838.

---

ART. I. *An Address to the Students of the Theological Seminary on the subject of Foreign Missions.*—BY ONE OF THE STUDENTS.

(Continued from page 55.)

Thus we have endeavored to establish the duty of the church to extend her operations to heathen lands, even while there may be many destitute at home, by an authority, which, if correctly applied, no one can question. And is not the view we have expressed as reasonable as it is scriptural? In the 10th chapter of Isaiah and 17th verse, it is said, "The light of Israel shall be for a fire and his Holy One for a flame, and it shall burn and devour his thorns and his briars in one day." Here the light of Israel and his Holy One are compared to fire and a flame—the wicked to be consumed, to briars and thorns, and the time in which it is to be effected, one day.

Now let us suppose that the task of consuming an extensive prairie were assigned, and the shortest possible time allotted in which this work was to be performed—would we kindle a fire in the centre and wait until the destructive element would spread itself over the extensive plain? Or would we not rather, while the fire was spending its fury *here*, run with torches in our hands, and enkindle it in distant and different portions? Surely reason would dictate the latter course, and experience attest its propriety. "And is not my word like fire, saith the Lord?" And is it not the duty of those who are appointed to bear this fire to endeavor to scatter it as extensively as possible throughout the vast empire of Satan that the finally impenitent may be consumed in its flames, and the elect of God lighted up in their pathway to glory?

We might adduce other scriptural illustrations of the nature of the gospel, and the duty of those who are called to preach it; but we have drawn largely upon your patience.

Dear Brethren—Do not suppose that the church necessarily weakens her strength at home by attending to the wants of the heathen. No. This we think is a too common though sadly mistaken view. If the

wants of the heathen are regarded, and the gospel is seen to triumph over pagan idolatry, it strikes a chord which vibrates even in the very heart of the christian church. What can be more encouraging to the follower of Jesus than to behold the darkness of heathenism fast receding before the light of the gospel? What can heighten his joy and elevate his songs of praise, more than the reflection that the God and Father whom he worships is the God and Father of those, who, but a short time since, prostrated themselves before their "idols of wood and stone?" That they now all meet around the same throne of grace and shall shortly meet around the same throne of glory, to unite for ever in songs of praise to him that redeemed them to God by his blood out of every kindred and tongue, and people and nation? O, if ever the soul feels a triumph of joy, it is in such a thought as this! If ever the christian sees a power in that religion which he professes, it is when he sees it prostrating the ancient monuments of superstition and idolatry, and swaying a sceptre of love and grace over a once benighted but now redeemed people! No wonder, then, is it, that we are told of Paul and Barnabas, "That being brought on their way by the church to Jerusalem, declaring the conversion of the Gentiles, they caused great joy unto all the brethren." And not only does it strengthen the hands and encourage the hearts of the *friends* of christianity, but who can tell the convincing effect which it is calculated to produce upon the minds of infidels? Is there an evidence which more clearly establishes the claims of the Bible as a revelation from God, than the change which it produces upon those over whom a long dark night of superstition has reigned? True, it effects a change upon those whom it converts here, but it is a change which the infidel cannot so fully comprehend or appreciate. Here it is a change from a spiritual darkness, often times illuminated with the lights of science and adorned with all the refinements of civilization. There it is a change from a spiritual darkness, rendered deeper still by an ignorance degrading in its nature and disgusting in its appearance. For there no false light shines to delude the infidel, or lead him to imagine that nature's lamp is sufficient for the soul, but all around a moonless and starless night.

But not only is the christian at home encouraged and the infidel convinced by the *change* which the dispersion of the Bible produces upon the hearts and conduct, but our holy religion is continually receiving additional confirmation from the discoveries which the researches of Missionaries have made in the manners and religions of the heathen. Here tradition, though degenerated, confirms the antiquity and divine origin of that revelation from which it sprang. Here, in the rights and ceremonies of pagan idolatry, are discovered the funeral obsequies of a once living but now departed religion—a religion, however, which has only changed its abode, not from earth to heaven, but to the land of the christian, where it still lives in its heaven-born purity.

And think you, my friends, that a testimony yielded even by superstition and idolatry, to the claims of christianity, will exert no influence upon her friends and foes even *here*? May it not strengthen the faith of the former, and from the ranks of the latter call out a host of firm and faithful friends? Even anti-christ, that great enemy which has attacked christianity on her throne, and against which her friends at home have been struggling with so little success, may at last receive her overthrow from a foreign source—a source the more fatal, because the least

expected. Has it not of late been ascertained that the idolatry of India bears at least twenty-five points of resemblance to Romanism? If this be really the case, who can estimate the influence which a testimony so direct will exert in falsifying the claims of popery to christianity?

It may now be inquired—what is the present duty of the Secession Church in this all-important matter? To answer this inquiry as its importance demands, requires one of greater age and experience than he who now has the privilege of addressing you. I shall, however, with due deference to the opinions of those who may differ from me, express the views which I at present entertain on this subject. Let me, however, by way of preface remark, that the fundamental duty of sending the gospel to the heathen, when the season demands it, is recognized by that church to which we have the honor of being connected; and on this point, I feel assured that there is no diversity of sentiment among her members. This remark I would deem unnecessary, were it not sometimes asserted that the Secession Church is opposed to the principle of Missions. Justice demands that this reproach should be repelled, for it is a reproach uttered by the tongue of slander. However remiss the Secession Church may have been in *Missionary operations*, yet, as it regards her principles on this subject, charity forbids misrepresentation. It is the *season* proper for sending the gospel to the heathen, and the means by which it is to be accomplished, that, to her, has been a subject of inquiry.

And, in addition to this, I would suggest to those who are disposed to draw comparisons between the respective churches of Christ as to the extent of their *Missionary operations*, to remember, at the same time, the amount of men and means possessed by those churches respectively, among whom this comparison is drawn. I believe that this is not intentionally passed by, but when we hear of any great work going on by any particular church, we are too apt to form our opinion of the agent by the work, and not of the work by the agent. If the magnitude of the work excels, we associate corresponding ideas of merit to the church by whom the work has been performed, without taking particularly into view her situation and resources.

These few remarks are by no means intended to exculpate our own church, or disparage the laudable efforts made by our sister churches, to disperse, by the benign influence of the gospel, that moral gloom that hangs charged with death over so vast a portion of our sinful globe. We only claim in return from our christian brethren of other denominations, that charity which we would not withhold from them. Is it so that we have not obeyed the calls of mercy heard afar? It has not been because we considered the heathen unworthy of our regard, but that we might attend to those within our reach. That we might feed them with the bread of life—that we might watch over the tender lambs of Christ's flock, and by what we considered a faithful testimony for the truths of God's word, endeavor to preserve the churches of Christ in our own favored land from the influence of those who would turn them from the faith once delivered to the saints. How far this has been effected by the instrumentality of the Secession Church, becomes not us to say. This is known only to Him, who only can say of any church, "*I know thy works.*" We may have been guilty of a criminal hesitancy as to the "*tempus operandi,*" but may not others be equally chargeable with a culpable precipitancy as to the "*modus operandi.*"

In all things we sin and come short of the glory of God. Let us, dear brethren, humbly lament our unprofitableness in the service of our Divine Master, and seriously inquire what course does the Lord call upon us now to pursue as a church of Christ on this all-important subject—a subject in which the perishing condition of millions are concerned?

I then conceive it to be the present duty of the Secession Church immediately to occupy a foreign field, on the supposition that the necessary means, and persons suitably qualified, can be obtained. The correctness of this sentiment stands or falls, we think, with the truth or fallacy of our foregoing remarks. If the general spread of the gospel is that which was predicted should characterize the New Testament dispensation; if the apostles received a command from their Divine Master to go and teach *all* nations; and if in obedience to this command they went from city to city, and from country to country, so that according to our Saviour's prophecy the gospel was preached to *all* nations, even before the destruction of Jerusalem; if the spread of the gospel in heathen lands is in its own nature calculated to strengthen the cause of Christ at home; and, in fine, if it be reasonable to suppose from the nature of things, that a general, and to some degree proportionate division of the spiritual forces of a church, is calculated to exert a more extensive and effectual influence—then may we infer, that the heathen should possess a share of that influence which God in his providence may enable us to exert; a *share*, we say, because, although we conceive it to be the duty of the Secession Church to send the gospel, if possible, immediately to the heathen; yet it never can be her duty to send away her *main* force from that ground which she now occupies. Here is the citadel of her strength, and consequently the main force of the enemy will be directed towards it. This is her vantage ground, and should she relinquish it, it may be her grave. A regard for her own safety then requires, that while distant parts should, if possible, be occupied, that part where her strength lies, and where her banner has been so long waving in the sight of her enemies, should be most anxiously watched and faithfully guarded. But while we would not have the forces of the church scattered in such a way as to destroy them, no more would we have them combined and concentrated in such a way as to confine their influence and retard their progress. Between these two extremes lies the scriptural medium, and it is for this medium we would plead.

Now, according to Woodbridge's Geography of 1831, there are within the bounds of the United States, including the territories, thirteen millions five hundred thousand inhabitants. Of this number, five hundred thousand are reckoned savages. Now the very lowest calculation makes the population of the whole globe to be eight hundred millions. Of this eight hundred millions, two hundred millions are christians by name, though of this number the two-thirds belong either to the Greek Church or the Church of Rome, and well deserve the name of heathen. But including these under the denomination of christians, and subtracting the whole two hundred millions from the population of eight hundred millions, leaves six hundred millions of perishing heathen, who know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. Would you believe it, dear brethren, that one thousand eight hundred years after the apostles received their commission to go and teach all nations, six hundred millions of immortal beings are posting onwards unprepared to the tremendous bar of God! Since I have arisen to ad-

ress you, how many guilty souls have taken their departure from this world to meet their fearful sentence, and according to the ordinary calculation, forty years hence, should they remain as they now are, six hundred millions shall have passed the confines of time! O what a call for you and me, and all of us, to consecrate ourselves and our *all* to the service of our Divine Master. According to the latest statistics, there are within the bounds of our church, ninety-two ministers, and these, with a few exceptions, confined to the United States. Here, then, are ninety-two ministers, divided among thirteen millions of civilized inhabitants, and six hundred millions of degraded and idolatrous heathen left *entirely* destitute!

Is this the christian's charity? But to render the contrast still more striking, there are in our church fifteen thousand communicants, which, divided among ninety-two ministers, will leave to each minister about one hundred and sixty-three communicants. This is the average proportion. Some of our ministers have more and some less. Now is there any thing so *remarkable* in these people that points them out with such unerring certainty as deserving the attentions and ministrations of God's ambassadors, to the neglect of so vast a multitude of perishing heathen? Nay, when we look at the number of years which some of our ministers of piety and worth itinerated without receiving a call, may we not fear that these are too evident indications to the contrary? Have you not sometimes seen competition and rivalry for a very ordinary congregation in our own country, and yet no striving to carry the bread of life to the vast regions of heathenism—regions teeming with a crowded population of famishing souls? Ah! here are the posts of danger and self-denial to the Missionary!

But there is another consideration which presents this subject, if possible, in a still stronger light. We presume no one present will dispute the correctness of this principle, viz.—That where there is the least knowledge of Christ, and the least probability of attaining this knowledge, there (other things being equal) are the greatest claims upon the ambassador of Christ.

To illustrate this principle, let us suppose two individuals are laboring under a bodily disease—one of them is cut off from all access to physicians or medical advice; the other, it is true, is affected with the same disease, but is within the reach of physicians, or is so situated, that he may receive the necessary instructions. Now, with regard to one, a recovery is impossible, absolutely impossible. But with regard to the other, a recovery is at least practicable. For, although the physicians to whom he has access may be very unskillful, yet they *may* render *some* aid to the afflicted patient, and suggest some remedy that will stay the progress of the disease. Would not humanity—would not *charity*, direct a physician to him, for whom, if left destitute, there can be no hope? Now the application of this illustration to the case before us, is simple and plain. We have seen that the number of our ministers in this country is ninety-two. These added to the number of ministers in the various protestant churches will make at least twelve thousand. Now the number of ministers, including all who are employed in giving instructions in heathen countries, are not more than seven hundred. Here, then, upon the most favorable calculations, are twelve thousand allotted to fifteen millions in this country; while among the poor heathen are not more than seven hundred allotted to

six hundred millions. To the former we have given a little less than one minister to every thousand souls. To the latter we have given a little more than one to every million. The proportion of Missionaries in Burmah is one to two millions seven hundred and fifty thousand. In China, the proportion is at present, or within a short time has been, about one to seventy-five millions—according to that proportion, the United States would not be entitled to one Missionary until it had reached five times its present population.

And now, my friends, I put this question to your christian understandings—When we look back at the vast and almost inconceivable disproportion of ministers, between our own and heathen countries, and then from this judge of the relative opportunities which those who are laboring under a spiritual disease in this country and in heathen lands, enjoy of obtaining relief—does not christian charity call upon the spiritual physician of Christ to hasten with the gospel of our blessed Lord to the rescue of the poor heathen ?

But there is another consideration which must make the claims of the heathen appear still stronger. It is well known that the Bible—the only book of life, is widely circulated in our own country ; and there are, I presume, but few who cannot obtain at least the reading of this holy book. Now we all know that this is a privilege of which the darkened heathen know *nothing*. No, the light of divine truth never beams from the pages of this sacred book upon their souls. It never tells them of a Saviour to redeem them from sin and death, and a Holy Spirit to sanctify and cleanse them. Ah ! how little do we who are surrounded with gospel privileges know of the moral desolation that reigns over three-fourths of our globe ?

If we cast our eyes upon the moral map of this globe, we will find but here and there a bright spot, upon which the eye can rest with satisfaction, and this bright spot is the land of the christian. And as you recede from it, you behold the strokes become thicker and heavier, until it terminates in the blackness of *heathenism*—and over this dark waste your eye travels, and as it travels, you reflect upon the millions of immortal souls whom a few years shall find in the eternal world—souls over whom the wrath of God hangs, and whom this blessed gospel which we enjoy alone can save. Look to China and her vast contiguous countries, and there you will find three hundred millions of our fellow beings, worshipping in all the sincerity of divine adoration the Grand Lama, the spirits of departed ancestors, and numerous imaginary deities. Take a view of Hindostan, and there you will find millions of the deluded worshippers of the deity under the form of Brahma Vishna and Siva, attended with their countless train of subordinate deities. Leave the vast regions of Asia and follow this dark and gloomy picture, and it will conduct you to poor benighted Africa, and you reflect upon the countless numbers of her sable sons worshipping “ gods which are no gods,” but beasts and devils. Yes : We thus behold Africa, who has received from christian lands, instead of the messengers of peace, the ministers of oppression and slavery. But look at the religious character of twenty millions of immortal beings that inhabit the various islands of the ocean. The eye finds but little satisfaction in traversing these, after leaving the continents of Asia and Africa. Here idolatry, if possible, assumes a still deeper and darker shade.

Thus you see, dear brethren, the whole heathen world are emphati-

cally without God, and therefore without hope. Their moral character is no less awfully degraded. Read the picture of heathen abominations as it is drawn by Paul, the great apostle of the Gentiles, in the first chapter of his epistle to the Romans, and you will find that is an exact portrait of their present degraded state. Here are to be found all the horrors of despotism and superstition. Who could describe the amount of suffering occasioned by bodily inflictions for the purpose of appeasing their incensed deities that delight in human blood? Who could tell the hundreds of human sacrifices that are daily agonizing upon the altars of their idolatry—consuming in the fires of the funeral pile or sinking beneath the waters of the sacred rivers? Who could imagine the crime and misery of those whose almost only employment is savage warfare, unrestrained by natural affection, and embittered by the unbridled indulgence of every malign and debased passion? Here the husband degrades and oppresses his wife and deems his conduct *noble* and *manly*! Here the mother sheds the blood of her innocent and calls the act *religious*! On such a scene we shall not dwell. Let us unite with the Psalmist in his prayer, "Have respect unto the covenant, for the habitations of the earth are *full* of horrid cruelty."

But we are pointed to the thousands of slaves who are in a state of at least comparative heathenism in *our own country*, and speaking *our own language*. Why would you not direct your labors towards these degraded sons of Africa, whose only comfort can be a hope of happiness beyond the grave? We would not, because we cannot—we *dare* not. We are *legislatively* prevented. The slave-holder presents to us the laws of his State, as a barrier between us and his slave. Gladly would we give him the Bible, the richest boon of heaven, but such an act would be *treason* against the laws of a *christian* people. Against this systematic legalized prohibition of the slave-holder, the Secession Church has uttered the voice of warning and lifted a solemn testimony. And this is all that, as a church, we can do, but weep over the benighted slave, and pray to the God of all grace that he would hear the groanings of the prisoner and save them that are doomed to die.

But to return to the point before us—knowing the condition of the heathen world to be such as I have described, I have one question which I would submit for your serious reflection:—Would it not be the duty of our church to send to these degraded heathen one or more of our itinerant ministers, or even of those already settled, who would offer themselves, on the supposition that they possessed the necessary qualifications? Or, in other words, would it be a violation of *christian charity*? Here it may be replied, with regard to those who are ordained over congregations—that they are commanded to feed the flocks over which the Holy Ghost has made them overseers. To this it may be remarked, that this injunction respects rather the *present* duty which a minister owes to his flock, than the extent of time which he is to remain over them. He is to feed them with suitable instructions so long as he sustains the character of an overseer. Any other view, we conceive, would render it inconsistent with our conduct as a church. For have not ministers been separated *judicially* from their congregations, when it was supposed they had a prospect of doing more good in another quarter? And might not a minister thus situated have a louder call to labor among the heathen than his own congregation? True, he would thereby leave them destitute of the stated ordinances of the gospel for awhile. But they considering the number of our itinerant and placed

ministers, would be favored with occasional supplies of preaching—and, in addition to this, they would never be without their Bibles, Commentaries, and other valuable helps, whilst the heathen have none of these things.

But it may be replied, unless persons thus qualified come forward and devote themselves, the church cannot send them. But I ask, why has not this devotement been made? Why have not young men in our church consecrated themselves to this work? Has it not been because their attention has not been directed towards it? Have they been made acquainted, as they should have been, from the pulpit and at the fire-side, with the millions of perishing heathen in our own and foreign countries? Has the awful condition of these heathen been presented before their minds in its full extent? Has the duty of parents, to devote their children like Hannah to the service of God, been sufficiently pressed upon fathers and mothers? Has the command of our Saviour, to go and teach all nations, been enforced and urged upon the minds of old and young, rich and poor, with that earnestness which its importance requires? Have young men been selected from our congregations, and encouraged, and instructed, as they should have been, by the counsels of the old, to come forward and prepare themselves for the work of the ministry? And have the poor, who might have been willing but not able, always received assistance of the rich?

When the great Head of the church calls any to his service, he does it not in a *miraculous* manner by audible voices and visions of the night. But he effects it by leading parents to devote their children to him, and to favor them with such an education as will qualify them for judging for themselves in this all-important matter? He effects it by bringing home to their hearts and consciences the duty of all to extend the Redeemer's kingdom. He effects it by endowing them with the necessary gifts and graces to qualify them for the ministry. And, finally, he effects it by presenting to their minds the mournful condition and fearful doom of sinners, and excites within them a love for their immortal souls. Have the ministers of our church, have we, as students in this seminary, acted the part of faithful instruments of God in this matter, in our several stations and relations? In this inquiry I entertain no allusions; but I fear that this is the cause why the principles of our church are not loved and maintained more than they are at present, amid the crowd of error that threatens to bury them—why more are not coming up to the help of the Lord against the mighty—why the cries of the poor heathen for help, as they have been wafted to us on almost every breeze that sweeps across the ocean—re echoed by the groans of the destitute at home, have not awakened our attention and enkindled our zeal to a greater degree for the spread of the blessed gospel of Jesus Christ. Am I mistaken? If so—my own experience has deceived me.

But we are again told, that were the church provided with men she has not the means. But why has she not the means? I ask, why has she not the means? Is it so that the members of our church have them not in their *possession*? Is it so, that among a population of more than fifteen millions, in a rich and prosperous country, there does not exist a sufficient amount of gold and silver that might be spared, for the purpose of sending and supporting the gospel among the heathen?—Especially when we consider the *trifling* expense to which many of our most wealthy congregations are subjected by the maintenance of a stated

ministry among them. O! I fear this excuse will not prove sufficient in the great day of accounts.

I ask you, dear brethren, to take a comprehensive view of the Secession Church, (to her I confine myself, because an inquiry into her state and condition is more particularly the object of our society,) I ask you to glance at the particular congregations with which each of you may be respectively acquainted. I ask you to take into consideration the probable amount of wealth which each has in its possession, and then the probable amount which each gives for the support and extension of that gospel, which should be to them the dearest blessing which they can enjoy, and which has made them what they are, heirs of immortal glory.

Look back to the primitive days of the church, and, alas! what a contrast does she present when compared with her present state! what self-denial and self-devotedness to the cause of Christ! what liberality! what fervent zeal for the glory of God and the extension of his kingdom! Then the gospel triumphed in every place. Then covetousness fled, dashed from the presence of a christian. "And all that believed were together, and had all things common; and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need." Then they went every where, preaching the gospel. They felt that they had a rich and immortal treasure to impart, and they could not be restrained by a love for the world, until their destitute neighbors realized its preciousness. They knew they were constituted but the trustees of that property which God had given them, and with hearts burning with a holy love, they were ready to lay it out in his cause. Danger and death confronted them at every step, yet none of these things moved them. They went on in their work of love, and He in whose cause they were engaged, was with them and blessed them. Had the gospel continued to have been preached as it then was; had christians continued by their self-denial and their zeal to manifest to the world that the kingdom of their Divine Master was not of this world; and had the spirit of God *continued* to be felt in its power and seen in its effects as it then was—O! what happy times we should now have! But, alas! the gospel has been corrupted by error. The zeal of its advocates has cooled; and the spirit of God has, in a great measure, departed.

True, the present age is called an age of the out-pouring of God's spirit, and an age of benevolence. But is this spirit a spirit whose fruits are love, joy and peace? And does this benevolence spring at all times from a supreme regard to God's word, and a sincere and *unostentatious* love for the souls of sinners? Let the error and discord that abound every where in the christian church; let the gold and silver that lie in the coffers of the rich; and let the parade and show, and even *surprise*, that generally attend an extraordinary sacrifice of wealth to the cause of religion, give the reply.

Does not a spirit of worldly-mindedness and covetousness prevail among us to an alarming extent at the present day. Money! Money! Land! Land! is the general cry. How few among the rich are bringing their wealth to the cause of God, and consecrating it to the service of the sanctuary? The Jews were required to give the one-tenth, and where is the man that gives that sum *now*, when the gospel is not to be confined to one nation as it then was. How few are the number of those whose self-denial and liberality would every where show that the glory of God was their chief and highest end? How few are the number

of those whose Bible, a heathen would conclude from their conduct, contained such passages as these: "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth—Labor not to be rich—We brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out. And having food and raiment, let us be therewith content. But they that will be rich fall into temptations and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is the root of *all* evil.—Whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath cannot be my disciple. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him, in store, as God has prospered him." Do these, and many other passages of a similar nature, regulate the conduct of those from whom we hear the cry—We have not the means to send the gospel to the heathen? O shame! To rob God when he is calling upon us by the woes and wants of others, to bring our tithes and offerings into the store-house, and then to insult him with a show of poverty!

These things ought not so to be. But where is the fault? It is with the church, both ministers and people. To this, there no doubt are exceptions. But it is the sin of the church. Let us then, as a church, in an humble and prayerful dependence upon God's blessing, consecrate the means we have to his service; and although it may not be as great as that of other churches, yet will God receive it as an acceptable offering; and, as he is free to work above means, may manifest the power and grace of his gospel, in making it the unworthy instrument of bringing many sinners to Zion.

Dear Brethren, I have thus presented to you my views on the subject of *Foreign Missions*. I have laid before you what I conceive to be the duty of the church in general, and of our own in particular, as to this matter. In looking abroad upon the wide waste of heathenism, that desolates so great a proportion of our globe—in reflecting upon the laws, languages, customs, prejudices, and tempers, that every where rise up to impede the progress of the gospel, we are for a moment almost left to doubt its success. But such a doubt is the doubt of the sceptic and infidel. The promise of God standeth sure. For Zion's sake will I not hold my peace, and for Jerusalem's sake I will not rest, until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth, and the Gentiles shall see thy righteousness, and all kings thy glory.

The gospel is the wisdom of God and the power of God. In this gospel, you and I expect, ere long, in the providence of God, to labor, and let us not forget that it is the only means which God will ever make use of for saving sinners. Should he commit this gospel to us, what a responsibility will there be resting upon us, lest we should withhold it from those to whom God is requiring us to carry it! How diligent, then, does it become us to be in putting into practice the great design of our society, viz: "Of inquiring into the nature, prospects and demands of ministerial labor in our own and foreign climes." In this respect, I think you and I must confess that we have been guilty of a sinful neglect. How can we know what Israel ought to do in this matter, unless we are acquainted with the signs of the times? And how can we become acquainted, unless we diligently and constantly observe them. How often do we hear it said, that "*it is not time yet to send the gospel to the heathen,*" by those very persons who are ignorant of the movements of Providence in those benighted parts of our globe. They

spend a life-time under the droppings of the gospel without ever anxiously or seriously inquiring what God is doing for the poor heathen. Revolutions and changes are taking place that will tell on the kingdom of Christ, and on the souls of millions, and they know it not. Dear brethren, I think it is time. Why, Hindostan alone spreads out her countless inhabitants before us, and offers us the liberty to teach them the way of life. Can we, in the face of this offer say, "it is not time;" and that, too, when thousands of her deluded sons have discovered by the first light which they have received, that their religion is false, and are at this moment trembling on the verge of idolatry and infidelity. Prosecute, then, the great work of your society.

And in conclusion I would say, let us not forget that we are witnesses for the truth, and that is only the pure preaching of the truth, that God will bless, for the salvation of either Jew or Gentile. As we value this truth, then—as we value the beauty, and strength, and glory of the church, we must maintain and preserve our testimony here, that we may gradually transmit the light which we possess to the isles of the sea and the nations far hence. For we were once as ignorant as they are; and shall they not be as we are? O then, beholding the condition of those who know not God, let us not trample our profession under our feet, but glory in it, and bind it as a diadem to our brow. Let us show to the world that we are sincere in our attachment to this profession, by endeavoring to bring as many as possible to the knowledge of the truths of the gospel, and by exerting our influence with others, to come up to the help of the Lord against the mighty.

Why should we be discouraged by the smallness of our number? You know God is not confined to the use of means always proportionate to the end to be accomplished. The Moravians, in point of numbers, are but a feeble band, and yet their influence has been felt in those parts of the world where superstition and idolatry assumed their darkest shade. And shall Seceders, though few, be lukewarm and inactive in the extension of Christ's kingdom? Let us bear in mind the exhortation that is given us in the conclusion of our "Declaration and testimony," to consider the distresses of others, that, according to the ability which the Lord has given us we may relieve them; and especially let us bear in mind the solemn scripture appeal by which this exhortation is there enforced. Whoso hath this world's goods, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him. We forget that we have declared ourselves "to be under the most solemn obligations by the word of God, and by vows agreeable to it lying on us in this church, to study the advancement of the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." Has this been our study?

McCrie, in his life of Melville, gives us an account of the king and other members of the assembly entering into a most solemn vow and pledge to God, to discharge their duties as members of the church. Immediately we hear of this same church sending Missionaries among the uncivilized parts of Scotland and the Western Isles, who were in a state of complete barbarism. O that our covenant engagements were followed by the same zeal for the extension of our holy religion.

Dear brethren, I have but one word and I have done. Let us study to acquaint ourselves with the true condition of the "*world lying in wickedness,*" and to impart all the information we receive to those over whom, in the providence of God, we may be placed. O how melan-

choly is the ignorance and indifference that abound among the friends of Christ respecting the state and condition of so many millions of immortal souls—and the opportunities of sending them the gospel—and how awfully melancholy is this ignorance and indifference when found among the watchmen that are placed upon the wall to descry the signs of this dark and dismal night.

Let our conduct then, dear brethren, should Christ honor us with this high and responsible station, show that we are not unfaithful to our trust. Let us endeavor to live in an humble dependence upon God's spirit, to render effectual the means that may be used for the extension of his kingdom. For without his gracious and benign influences, his word preached, either at home or abroad, shall be like seed sown upon the dry and parched desert, bringing forth nothing but "*briars and thorns.*" But with his spirit, the means, however insignificant, shall be abundantly effectual. The desert shall become like the garden of the Lord; joy and gladness shall be found therein, thanksgiving and the voice of melody. The inhabitant of the Celestial Empire, that has long adored the gods of his father; the Hindoo, that has sacrificed his own offspring to the fury of the Ganges; the follower of Mahommed—the son of Abraham, shall, together with the Ethiopian, stretch forth their hands to God, and being ransomed of the Lord, shall return and come to Zion, with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads.

---

#### ART. II. *On Changing a Religious Profession.*

In the Edinburgh Christian Magazine for 1800, we meet with the following Letter on the subject of "changing a religious profession," which we judge worthy of being republished in the Monitor, on account of its peculiar appropriateness to the case of many at present in our own church. A witnessing profession, solemnly made and even sworn to, is often thoughtlessly abandoned and another taken up from mere convenience, or prejudice, or carnal attachment. The Letter below solemnly calls on these *changelings* to consider their ways, and especially to look well to the character and deportment of those, at whose hands they would receive the ordinances of Jesus Christ, remembering the words of Paul, "I know that grievous wolves shall enter in not sparing the flock: also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." We trust the Letter will be read with profit. It is as follows:

DEAR FRIEND:—In consequence of the step you have now taken, the relation in which we once stood to one another, frequently presents itself to my thoughts. "You acknowledged us in part, that we were your rejoicing, as we wish you to be ours, in the day of the Lord Jesus." And viewing it in that solemn light, in which both you and I should seriously reflect upon it, you will not be surprised at this form of address; you will not be offended at this attempt to fix your mind on a subject confessedly of high importance. It is now a considerable time since you walked unto the house of God in company with us, and as we may not again have opportunity of taking sweet counsel together, I take this method to call you to a particular review of your conduct. Before you changed your place of public worship, before you went to another

society, with which you may eventually join in the strictest bonds of christian communion, it either was, or at least should have been, matter of serious enquiry, whether you should take this step or not. If what you have done proceeded either from mere indifference, or from that instability which so strongly marks the character of the present times, you are conscious that you cannot answer for it, either to God or to men. You must credit him who says, "Woe to them that are at ease in Zion." You need not be told how remote levity should be from the matters of God. Can the unstable hold fast the profession of the faith? Can they adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things, who are carried about with every wind of doctrine? Is it folly to act without consideration in the affairs of this life? and is it not a great impiety in the things of God, who requires our whole heart, in all that we think concerning him; in all that we say when we come into his presence; and in all that we do in his service? Charity forbids me to conclude that you have acted wholly without deliberation. Were you directed, therefore, to your inquiry, by the law and the testimony? With this in your hands, did the Spirit lead you into all truth? Did he shine into your heart; did he illuminate your path; did he break up the way before you? Was it while you poured out your heart at the throne of grace for divine counsel, that your eyes were opened? Was it in consequence of seeing light in his light clearly, that you meditated a change; that you resolved upon it; and that you carried the resolution into effect? Are you convinced that you pursued the path of duty? Is your persuasion such, do you suppose, as shall not forsake you in any after period of life? Is it such as will enable you to count the reproach of Christ greater riches than all the treasures of Egypt; such as will enable you to meet without confusion the grim tyrant, and to behold the face of the glorious Judge, when he shall sit on his great white throne? Nothing less than this will carry you out now; nothing less can support you under the cross, can bear you up in the day of death, and give you boldness at the appearing of Christ Jesus. Such too is the nature, such is the effect of that confidence with which the Holy Spirit fills the hearts of his own people. Were you impelled to this change, that you might be more closely united to that noble company who follow the Lamb; that you might be more valiant for the truth upon the earth; and that God might be more glorified by your confession of his name before a sinful and an adulterous generation? Lower considerations, weaker motives, and inferior ends, will class you with those of whom Christ will be "ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father, with the holy angels."

If in this matter the word has been a light to your feet and a lamp unto your path; if you have been drawn to this step by the constraining influences of the Holy Spirit; if Christ hath filled you with a more pure, with a more ardent zeal; if he hath brought you more into the way of his steps; if he hath written his Father's name more conspicuously on your forehead, you are more resolved than ever to buy the truth; more determined to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints. Without ostentatiously saying, "Come, see my zeal for the Lord of hosts," you endeavor, through the strength of divine grace, to take a firmer hold of the testimony of Jesus, in communion with them who "do not shun to declare the whole counsel of God;" with them who, united in the love of the truth as it is in Jesus, "walk by the same rule, and mind the same thing." Will the Bishop of souls

lead you to hear the word, where many of the leading and peculiar doctrines of the gospel are either carefully concealed, artfully disguised, or openly denied? Can the chief Shepherd guide you with his eye to the unwholesome pastures, where he does not cause his flock to feed and lie down? Can you gather your food where the doctrine of predestination, of particular election, of the covenant entered into with the first man, of his fall from that state of perfection and happiness in which he was placed in paradise, are either openly controverted, or at least cast entirely into the back ground? Will Christ grace with his presence ordinances, where you will scarcely know, from all that you hear, that ever God entered into covenant with his own eternal Son from everlasting; that in that solemn transaction, he accepted of Christ as the surety of lost sinners; that Christ put himself in their place; that in their stead, he in our world obeyed to the death; or in other words, that having fulfilled all righteousness in his life, he, through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot unto God, to purge the conscience from dead works; that by one offering he perfected for ever all them that are sanctified; that this sacrifice of a sweet smelling savour unto God, was offered by him in the character of Mediator of the New Testament, (or covenant,) that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance? Are you in no danger of being misled, where Christ is not exhibited as the Lord our righteousness; where he is not commended to your acceptance, as made of God to us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and complete redemption; but where, on the other hand, you are taught that your pardon and acceptance is not of faith, that it might be by grace, but of works; that you must do many things to prepare yourself to come to Christ; and that you may lean to your own understanding, and trust to your own arm, in the discharge of the duties that are incumbent on you as a Christian? Is it likely that the Spirit will take of the things of Christ, and shew unto you, where he is not worshipped and glorified as the true God; where his influences and grace are contemned, and where you are directed to substitute your own exertions, in the acquisition of knowledge and of faith; in promoting your love, increasing your peace; in augmenting your joy, enlarging your hopes; in expanding your desires, in seeking after further degrees of contrition, of meekness, patience, gentleness, instead of the energy of the Spirit of all grace? In waiting on such instructions, and in being a member of a church where these and similar doctrines are most commonly taught and believed, can you expect the accomplishment of that promise, "In all places where I record my name, I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee?" Can such doctrines build you up, and give you an inheritance among all them that are sanctified?

In order to be satisfied with your change, must you not have the clearest evidence, that the pastors of the church of which you are about to become a member, come into office in the manner enjoined by the great Head of the church? After they take upon them the cure of souls, are they more careful than those you have deserted, in stirring up the gifts that are in them; more anxious to feed you with knowledge and understanding? As they that must give an account, are they more attentive in watching for your souls? Are they more studious to preach the word, to be instant in season and out of season; to reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and doctrine? Are they more

gentle unto all men, more apt to teach, more patient in meekness instructing those who oppose themselves? Are they less influenced by filthy lucre? Do they entangle themselves less with the affairs of this life? Do they give themselves wholly to the duties of their office; and does their profiting appear to all? Do they set you a better example in the path of duty? Is the worship of God, on the morning and evening of every day, observed regularly in their own families? By which of the two is the holy Sabbath most attentively kept? On the day which the Lord hath made, are their houses never the rendezvous of company assembled, not with the intention to provoke one another to love and to good works, not for religious services, but for entertainment, for mere amusement, or for secular affairs? Which of the two most frequently sanction, by their presence, such meetings in the houses of others, especially in the houses of the great, after the public services of the Sabbath are over, to which parties they have no call by the duties of their office?

Is unity in the faith a prominent feature in the character of the ministry of that church where you now attend public ordinances? Or is there no evidence to be met with, that, however scrupulous they are in requiring the subscription of the same formula, when entering into office, their real creeds are so different, and so opposite to one another, that they will not hold ministerial communion in preaching the word, and dispensing the sacrament of the supper. If the people will not communicate in neighboring congregations, except where particular ministers officiate, shall you have no scruple to join with the one or the other? What agreement is there, what concord can there be, between the Materialist, the Arian, the avowed Socinian, the professed Arminian, and such as firmly believe the doctrines taught in the articles even of that church of which you are about to become a member?

For your own satisfaction, it may be necessary to take into the account the manner in which admissions to the fellowship of the church are conducted. Do her ministers, do her sessions, excel in their care of the youth under their inspection; in their endeavors to have their minds early stored with religious knowledge? For this end, do they watch with anxious care the schools under their care, and see with their own eyes, whether, by their teachers in school and by their parents at home, they be taught what be the first principles of the oracles of God? When they grow up, and apply for admission to the full communion of the church, is more care employed in previous examination; is there more attention paid to moral character, in order to communicating, than by those you have forsaken? Or are the grossly ignorant, the profane swearer, the sabbath-breaker, they who are not afraid to speak evil of dignities, the injurious, the unclean, the covetous, he that telleth lies, the discontented, never seen sitting at the holy table of the Lord? Are the censures of the church, in the connection you are about to form, more faithfully applied; or can total exemption from these, in any case, be purchased with money? Is the government of the house of God conducted in all things according to the will of the God of the house? Are your christian privileges better maintained than in your former connection? Are you permitted to look out from among yourselves such as bear rule, and to give your vote for such as break the bread of life among you? If you have nothing to say in this matter, may I ask, whether you would give up the choice of your market, of

your merchant, of your physician, or of your food and raiment, with as little concern as many part with their right to choose those that are over them in the Lord and admonish them ?

The usual reply, "There is no church perfect, there are good and bad in every communion," cannot satisfy a well-informed mind. Though there be no church on earth perfect, are not some nearer to the unerring standard than others ? and should we not try the spirits, whether they be of God, because many false prophets have gone out into the world, and if we find one superior to others, in regard to purity of doctrine and communion ; if she approach nearer to perfection than others, however far she may be from it, should we not take part with her ? Whereunto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule. Because some good men may not see their way clear to leave a church though she hath left her first love, and because bad men, because hypocrites, may be found in the purest church, are we to reckon it a matter of indifference to which of the two we adhere ? Because Judas was one of the twelve, was it equally safe to return to the weak and beggarly elements of the Jewish church, now so exceedingly corrupt, as to continue with him who preached righteousness in the great congregation ? Because some were found in the christian church in the days of the apostles, who had but a name to live while they were dead, were the doctrines of these inspired men, was the communion of their church, to be viewed in the same light, and regarded with the same indifference, as the doctrines and fellowship of the Pharisees and Sadducees ? We must go higher for our warrant to forsake, or to join, a particular church, than to the character of some that may be in her communion. We must ask, is she organized on the scriptural model ? Are the proper means for gathering in sinners, and building up saints in their most holy faith, employed ? Do the ministry set the trumpet to their mouth, and faithfully shew the house of Jacob their sins ? Do they set life and death before them, and plainly teach the way of avoiding the one, and of entering into the other ? Is it likely that the spiritual and eternal concerns of men will be most promoted under their ministry ? Can they say, Though Israel be not gathered, yet shall I be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, and my God shall be my strength ?

You may yet add, "Though in this communion every thing be not according to my wish ; though the sermons which I hear be not, in respect of orthodoxy, unexceptionable, I can refuse the evil and choose the good ; I can pick out the wholesome from the noxious ; the chaff can be separated from the wheat." And would you run the same risk with your natural food ? Were you told that there is death in the pot, would you eat on, as if there were no such thing ; when in the very next vessel you had food, in eating of which there is no danger ? What horror would seize you, lest the whole mass were infected ? And are we to feel no alarm, lest poison be served up with our spiritual food ?

Is it likely that your love to the truth, and your aversion to error, your attachment to pure ordinances, and your dislike to an impure communion, will increase in a place where the former is often made to give way to the latter ? Besides, can you suppose that God will accept of your sacrifices, where, according to your own confession, the whole counsel of God is not declared ; where, to use your own expression, you have only heard the "outside of the subjects" discoursed on

in your place of worship? Is not this plainly offering the torn and the lame, which he will not accept at your hand? Offer it now unto thy governor. Does the Spirit of God direct us to conduct ourselves thus, in the matters of truth, and of Christian duty? Is this contending earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints? Is this following the Lord fully? Is it holding fast the profession of the faith without wavering? Was it thus that the first christians, was it thus that our godly reforming ancestors, conducted themselves? Did not they stand on much higher ground? With such inferior notions of truth, and with a profession hanging so loose about them, could they have laid their necks under the axe of the executioner? Could they, with undaunted resolution, have mounted the scaffold, and embraced the stake? They had bought the pearl of great price for a very different sum. They knew better how to prize the treasure hid in the field: they had counted the cost far otherwise than too many who profess to be followers of them who through such faith and patience now inherit the promises. By making no difference between the precious and the vile, between him that serveth God and him that serveth him not, is it possible to hand down the truths of God pure to the succeeding race? Is it thus that race unto race shall praise the Lord, and show forth his mighty deeds? that the father to the son shall make known the truth? What would have been the complexion of the christian church at this day, in our land and abroad, had there not been another spirit in the Luthers and Calvins of the continent, in the Knoxes, the Wisharts, and the Renwickes of Scotland, together with all that noble company who, for the testimony of Jesus, suffered the loss of all things?

The apology, founded on the inconvenience of going a few miles further to a place of worship, cannot surely be sustained in a matter of such moment. Mere distance can be no reasonable ground on which to change our religious profession; much less that of two or three miles. This would imply, that he who fixes the bounds of our habitations, permits us to join the nearest congregation, whether it held by the Koran, embraced the creed of the Catholic, of the Episcopalian, or of the Presbyterian church. Is it not more reasonable to suppose, that he thus brings our steadfastness to the test? Can he be ranked among the witnesses of Jesus, who in the sunshine cries out, "What a weariness is it," when he is required to go half the way for his spiritual provision, one day in seven, that he would go with the greatest alacrity, on each of the other six, for the bread that perishes? How would he face persecution? How would he wander in sheeps skins and goats skins on the mountains, in dens and in caves of the earth, destitute, afflicted, tormented? How would he seek his bread, like them that jeoparded their lives in the high places of the field, in the days of our fathers, when they waited on ordinances, in peril of the sword of the wilderness? The argument of advancing years, and growing infirmities, is equally untenable. Who supports you under affliction? Who hath said, "In six troubles I will be with thee, in seven I will not forsake thee" "I have made, and I will bear to old age and hoary hairs: I am he." Who but the God of our life can remove affliction, or lay his hand more heavily upon us? By acting perfidiously in his covenant, by casting his cords behind our backs, by going back and walking no more with him, can we look, with the same confidence, for the accomplishment of his great and precious promises? Can we trust in him, and expect from him every thing that we need, while we sigh and go backwards?

Is he that putteth his hand to the plough and looketh back fit for the kingdom of God? Is it not the character of the first christians, that they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine, in breaking of bread, and in prayers? You are better informed than to rest your defence on matrimonial connexion. Its influence may be employed, that the unbelieving husband may be sanctified by the believing wife, and so on the contrary. You well know, however, that the husband is by no means to lord it over the conscience of the wife. He has no claim to obedience in so far as he may dictate articles of faith to his wife. Nor, on the other hand, may he give way to the solicitations of his wife, when she endeavors to alienate his affections from that profession and communion to which he hath been drawn by the Spirit of all truth.

Nor will you take refuge under that indifference to all kind of principle in religious society, which so strikingly characterizes so many even of the professed friends of truth, in the present time. How low do the lukewarm rank in the estimation both of God and men? "How long halt ye between two opinions? if the Lord be God, follow him: if Baal be God, follow him." "I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So then, because thou art lukewarm, I will spue thee out of my mouth." Rather than be driven out of every refuge, you may have recourse to the names of many who have left the same religious connection, and gone some of them to one society, and some to another. In the front of this list you may place the names of pastors, of elders, and of preachers of the gospel. To these you may subjoin a number who occupied a less conspicuous station. Those came into office, and these made their profession, under the most solemn ties to abide in the truth. You never, however, thought seriously of making the conduct of poor fallible men your rule; though you may eagerly lay hold on their example as part of your apology. This is a proof that they cannot always withstand the temptations with which they are more beset than many others. Solomon, after he was honored to build and dedicate a house to the name of the true God, erected temples to them that were no gods. Peter was not the only person who denied his Lord with oaths and curses, nor Judas the only traitor. Who can tell how many after him have held the truth in unrighteousness? It is not in the first ages of the church only, that there were false apostles, deceitful workers. The race of Demas hath multiplied exceedingly. Nor were Hymeneus and Alexander the only men who have made shipwreck of the faith and a good conscience. The race of Theudas are not all slain, nor his followers dispersed and brought to nought. It is no strange thing, to them who know any thing of the human character, to see the ignorant, the vain, the proud, the ambitious, when their humors are crossed, going back and walking no more with Jesus. The eyes of office-bearers in the church have been dazzled by the lure of gold as well as others. The direful consequences of private pique, of secret umbrage, and of thirst for revenge, are seen in some part of the church or other every day. Will not your sin be aggravated above theirs, if you follow their steps, without being impelled by their temptations?

Can you with a safe conscience persuade your children, your relations, all who are dear to you, so far as your influence reaches, to copy your example. If you can be completely at ease, while there is one of them in another communion, is it no proof that you blame yourself for what you have done? Do you sincerely wish them to succeed in your place, when you are numbered with the dead? Or would you enter-

tain a secret grudge in your own mind, were you conscious they were guided by the same motives which directed your choice? Were your parent to rise out of the dust, are you in possession of arguments to persuade him, that he did not train you up in the way in which you should go; that he did not direct you to the purest communion, nor endeavor to enlist you among the most eminent followers of the Lamb? Whether would he or you be first put to the blush? You must one day meet, when this will come under the most solemn review, when no evidence can be admitted in favor of either party, that is not brought from the law and the testimony! Can this, or any similar step be taken, in the face of the word and of conscience? Do both, when fairly consulted, say you are wrong? Learn from the word in what you have erred; take the reproof of conscience, while it can be of benefit. Follow its admonitions, in so far as it is well informed. If in this matter you try to sear it as with a hot iron, you do what you can to lay it fast asleep in other respects; and who can tell how long it may be, ere it act the part of a faithful monitor? During its slumber you may have made much greater progress in apostacy than you now think of: and it may awaken to tear you in pieces, when there shall be none to deliver. You may find it too late to retrace your steps, when it may tell you, that what you now deem matters of doubtful disputation, or at least truths of very inferior consideration, rank among the great things of God, in the faith and practice of which we should be faithful unto death, that we may obtain the crown of life. Still you may urge, "It is but a small change, the shades of difference are so imperceptible, that it can be a matter of very small moment whether I worship with the one or the other; besides, I will change no more." Many well-informed christians, however, reckon the change great, however small it may appear to you. Your former profession said it was greater than you should go into. Minds enlightened in the knowledge of Christ Jesus can discern a great difference. It is promising too much, when you say you will change no more. Can the waxing flood confine itself to the small opening through which the first drops made their way? Can the stone arrest its progress down the tremendous precipice? Who shall promise that the mound shall not be swept clean away, and that the stone shall not be dashed in pieces by its increasing velocity! Being persuaded of this perhaps in part, you may have a wish to return. If this wish be the fruit of real conviction that the step you have made is false, cherish it. You cannot, however, brook the idea of so much instability. You cannot return without tacitly acknowledging that it was an error. If you have been ensnared, the sooner you escape the better. Have you been led away by false lights, the sooner you open your eyes on the true, that cannot mislead, you are in the greater safety. It is the glory of a man to confess his faults both to God and to men. "Confess your faults one to another." You are habituated to this exercise, if you be not a stranger to the exercise of the true penitence. Before, therefore, you take your final resolution, be intreated to pause, and seriously, as in the sight of God, review the confession which you witnessed before many witnesses. If in every article, either taken by itself, or in connection with the whole, you find it right, you can with no safety recede from it. "Remember, therefore," saith Christ, "how thou hast received and heard, and hold fast, and repent. If therefore thou shalt not watch, I will come on thee as a thief. Hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown. Thus saith the

Lord, stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls; but they said, we will not walk therein. Also, I set watchmen over you, saying hearken to the sound of the trumpet; but they said, We will not hearken." To such the Lord saith, "To what purpose cometh there to me incense from Sheba? and the sweet cane from a far country? Your burnt offerings are not acceptable, nor your sacrifices sweet unto me." If what I have said have no influence, let the arguments of the Spirit of God have their due weight upon your heart.

July, 1800.

I am, yours, &c.

### ART. III. *Precious Remedies against Satan's Devices.*

(Continued from page 86.)

CHAPTER II.—*The second device that Satan hath to draw souls from holy duties, and keep them from religious services, is,* By presenting to them the danger, losses, and sufferings that attend the performance of such religious services. By this device Satan kept those that believed on Christ, from confessing him, in John xii. 42. 'Nevertheless among the chief rulers also, many believed on him; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue.' I would walk in all the ways of God, and give up myself to the strictest way of holiness; but I am afraid dangers and losses will attend me on the one hand, and likely many sufferings on the other, saith many a man. Oh! how should we set ourselves against this temptation and device of Satan. Now the remedies against this device of Satan, are these that follow:

*Remedy 1.* Against this device of Satan, consider, that all the troubles and afflictions that you meet with in a way of righteousness, shall never hurt nor harm you. 'And who is he that shall harm you, if you be followers of that which is good?\*' saith the apostle, i. e. 'none shall harm you.' Natural conscience cannot but do homage to the image of God, stamped upon the natures, words, works, and lives of the godly; as we may see in the carriage of Nebuchadnezzar and Darius towards Daniel. All afflictions and troubles which attend men in a way of righteousness, can never rob them of their treasure, their jewels; they may rob them of some outward things, but their treasures are the presence and favor of God, union and communion with God, pardon of sin, joy of the Spirit, peace of conscience; these are jewels none can give but Christ, nor can any take away but he. Now, why should a gracious soul keep from a way of holiness, because of afflictions? when no afflictions can strip him of his heavenly jewels, his holy ornaments, nor rob him of his safety here, nor his happiness and glory hereafter.†—Why should that man be afraid, or troubled for storms at sea, whose treasures are sure in a friend's hand upon land? Why, a believer's treasure is always safe in the hands of Christ; his life, his soul, his

\* "No body is properly hurt but by himself," and his own fault.

† Gordius, that blessed martyr, accounted it no loss to him to suffer many kinds of tortures; he saith, tortures are but tradings with God for glory. The greater the combat is, the greater is the following reward.

grace, his comfort, and his crown, are all safe in the hand of Christ.\* 'I know him in whom I have believed, and that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him, until that day,' saith the apostle.—The child's most precious things are most secure in his father's hands, so are our souls, graces, and comforts, safe in the hand of Christ.

*Rem. 2.* Consider, that other precious saints, who were shining lights on earth, and are now triumphing in heaven, held on in religious services, notwithstanding all the troubles and dangers that surrounded them.† Nehemiah and Ezra were surrounded with dangers on the left hand and on the right, and yet in the face of all they hold on building the temple, and the wall of Jerusalem: so Daniel, and those precious worthies, Ps. xlv. under the want of outward encouragements, and in the face of a world of very great discouragements, their souls clave to God and his ways 'though they were sore broken in the place of dragons, and covered with the shadow of death; yea, though they were all the day long counted as sheep for the slaughter, yet their hearts were not turned back, neither did their steps decline from his ways.' Though bonds and imprisonments attended Paul, and the rest of the apostles, in every place, yet they held on in the work and service of the Lord; and why then should you degenerate from their holy examples, which is your duty, and your glory to follow.

*Rem. 3.* Consider further, that all the troubles and dangers that attend the performance of holy duties, and heavenly services, are but temporal and momentary; but the neglect of them may lay thee open to all temporal, spiritual, and eternal dangers. 'How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?' He saith not, if we reject or renounce so great salvation? No; but 'if we neglect or shift off so great salvation, how shall we escape?‡' That is, we cannot by any means, or device, in the world, escape? Divine justice will be above us, in spite of our very souls. The performing of religious services, may lay you open to the frowns of men, but the neglect of them will lay you open to the frowns of God; the doing of them may render you contemptible in the eyes of men, but the neglect of them may render you contemptible in the eyes of God; the doing of them may be the loss of thy estate, but the neglect of them may be the loss of God, Christ, heaven, and thy soul, for ever; the doing of them may deprive thee of some outward, temporal enjoyments, the neglect of them may shut thee out from that excellent matchless glory, 'that eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of men.'§ Remember, there is no man that breathes, but shall suffer more by neglecting those holy and heavenly services that God commands, commends and rewards, than he can possibly lose by doing of them.

*Rem. 4.* Consider also, that God knows how to deliver from troubles, by troubles; from afflictions, by affliction: from dangers, by dangers.

\* That was a notable speech of Luther, "Let him that died for my soul, see to the salvation of it."

† Will. Flower (martyr) said, "That heaven should as soon fall, as he would forsake his profession, or depart in the least degree from it." So Santus, being under as great torment as ever was read of, cried out, "I am a Christian." No torment could compel him to decline the service of God. I might produce a cloud of witnesses; but if these do not animate you to be noble and brave, I am afraid more will not.

‡ Disregard, not care for it.

§ Francis Xaviorias counseled John the third, king of Portugal, to meditate every day a quarter of an hour upon that text, "What shall it profit a man to gain the whole world, and lose his soul?"

God by small troubles and afflictions, doth oftentimes deliver his people from great ones so that they shall say, 'We had perished, if we had not perished; we had been undone, if we had not been undone.' God will so order the afflictions that befall you in a way of righteousness, that your souls shall say, we would not for all the world, but have met with such troubles and afflictions; for surely, had not these befallen us, it might have been much worse with us. Oh! the carnal security, pride, formality, lukewarmness, censoriousness, and earthly-mindedness, that God hath cured us of, by the troubles and dangers that we have met with, in the ways and services of the Lord.

I remember a story of a godly man, that as he was going to take ship for France, he broke his leg; and it pleased Providence so to order it, that the ship he would have gone in, in that very voyage was cast away, and not a man saved.\* So the Lord many times breaks our bones, but it is in order to the saving of our lives, and our souls for ever; he gives us a potion that makes us heart-sick, but it is in order to the making us perfectly well. Therefore, let no danger nor misery hinder thee from thy duty.

*Rem. 5.* Consider lastly, that you shall gain more in the service of God, and by walking in righteousness and holy ways, though troubles and afflictions attend you, than you can possibly suffer or lose, by being found in the service of God. 'Godliness is great gain.' Oh! the joy, peace, comfort, and rest, that saints meet with in the ways and service of God. They find that religious services are not empty things, but things in which God is pleased to discover his beauty and glory to their souls.† 'My soul thirsts for God,' saith David, 'that I might see thy beauty, and thy glory, as I have seen thee in thy sanctuary.' Oh! the pleasant looks, words, and hints, the comfortable influences, and sweet love-letters, that gracious souls have from heaven, when they wait upon God in holy and heavenly services, the least of which will darken and eclipse all the glory of this world, and richly recompense the soul for all the troubles, afflictions, and dangers that have attended it in the service of God. O the saints can say under all their troubles and afflictions, that they have meat to eat, and drink to drink, that the world knows not of: that they have such incomes, refreshments, and warmings, &c. that they would not exchange for all the honors, riches, and dangers, of this world. Ah! let but a Christian compare his external losses, with his spiritual, internal, and eternal gain, and he shall find, that for every penny that he loses in the service of God, he gains a pound; and for every pound that he loses, he gains a hundred; for every hundred lost, he gains a thousand; we lose pins in his service, and find pearls;‡ we lose the favor of the creature, and peace with the creature, and it may be the comforts and contents of the creature; but we have the favor of God, peace with conscience, and the comforts and contents of a better life. Ah! did the men of this world know the sweets that saints enjoy in afflictions, they would rather choose Manassah's iron chain, than his golden crown; they would rather be Paul

\* Anaxagoras. "Had not these things perished, I could not have been safe," said this philosopher, when he saw great possessions that he had lost.

† Tertul, in his book to the martyrs, hath an apt saying, "That's right and good merchandiz, when something is parted with to gain more." He applyeth it to their sufferings, wherein though the flesh lost something, yet the spirit got much more.

‡ When the noble general Zedizlaus had lost his hand in the wars of the king of Poland, the king sent him a golden hand for it. What we lose in Christ's service he will make up, by giving in some golden mercies.

a prisoner, than Paul caught up to the third heaven. For light afflictions, they shall have a weight of glory; for a few afflictions they shall have those joys, pleasures, and comforts, that are as the stars of heaven, or as the sands of the sea, that cannot be numbered; for momentary afflictions,\* they shall have an eternal crown of glory. 'It is but winking, and thou shalt be in heaven presently,' said the martyr. Oh! therefore, let not afflictions nor troubles induce thee to shun the ways of God, nor to quit that service that ought to be dearer to thee than a world, yea than thy very life, &c.

**CHAPTER III.**—*The third Device that Satan hath to hinder souls from holy and heavenly services, and religious performances, is, By presenting to the soul the difficulty of performing them; saith Satan, it is a hard and difficult thing to pray spiritually, and wait on God constantly, and walk with God closely, and to be as lively, warm, and active in the communion of saints, as thou shouldst; it were better ten thousand times to neglect these duties, than to meddle with them; and doubtless by this device Satan keeps off thousands from waiting upon God, and giving him that service which is due to his name. Now the remedies against this device of Satan are these:*

*Remedy 1.* Against this device of Satan, dwell more upon the necessity of the service and duty, than on the difficulty that attends it; you should reason thus with your souls, 'oh! our souls, though these services are hard and difficult, yet are they not exceedingly necessary for the honor of God, and the keeping up his name in the world; for the subduing of sin, and the strengthening of weak graces; for the reviving languishing comforts, and for the keeping clear and bright your blessed evidences; for the scattering of your fears, and for the raising of your hopes; for the gladdening the hearts of the righteous, and stopping the mouths of unrighteous souls, who are ready to take all advantages to blaspheme the name of God, and throw dirt and contempt on his people and ways? Oh! never leave thinking on the necessity of these duties, till your souls are lifted up far above all the difficulties that attend them.'

*Rem. 2.* Solemnly consider, that the Lord Jesus will make his services easy to you, by the sweet discovery of himself to your souls, whilst you are in his service. 'Thou meetest him that rejoiceth and worketh righteousness, those that remember thee in thy ways,' as the Prophet Isaiah saith.† If meeting with God, who is goodness itself, sweetness itself, beauty itself, strength itself, glory itself, will not sweeten his service to thy soul, nothing in heaven or earth will.

Jacob's meeting with, and enjoying of Rachel made his hard service easy and delightful to him; and will not the enjoyment of God, and meeting with God, render his service to the soul much more easy and delightful? Doubtless it will. The Lord will give that sweet assistance by his Spirit and grace, as shall make his service joyous, and not grievous; a delight, and not a burden; a little heaven to believing

\* Though the cross be bitter, yet it is but short; a little storm, as one said of Julian's persecution, and an eternal calm follows.

† Most take the word here, to meet a soul with those bowels of love and tenderness, as the father of the prodigal met the prodigal with. God is 'the Father of compassion,' he is all bowels; he is as swift to show mercy, as he is slow to anger.

souls. The confidence of this Divine assistance raised up Nehemiah's spirit far above all those difficulties and discouragements that attended him in the work of the Lord,\* as you may see in Neh. ii. 19, 20. But when Sallathiel the Horonite, and Tobiah the servant, the Ammonite, and Geshem the Arabian, heard it, they laughed us to scorn, and despised us, and said, What is this thing that ye do, will ye rebel against the king? Then answered I them, and said unto them, The God of heaven he will prosper us, therefore we his servants will arise and build: but you have no right, nor portion, nor memorial in Jerusalem.' Ah souls! while you are in the very service of the Lord, you will find by experience, that the God of heaven will prosper, encourage and strengthen you, and carry you through the hardest service, with the greatest cheerfulness that can be. Remember this, that God will suit your strength to your work, and in the hardest service you shall have the greatest assistance.

*Rem. 3.* Dwell upon the hard and difficult things that the Lord Jesus Christ hath past through for your temporal, spiritual, and eternal good. Ah! what a sea of blood, wrath, sin, sorrow and misery, did the Lord Jesus go through, for your internal, and eternal good!† Christ did not plead, this cross is too heavy for me to bear, this wrath is too great for me to lie under, this cup, (which hath in it all the ingredients of Divine displeasure) is too bitter for me to drink, even to the very dregs of it! No, Christ pleads not the difficulty of the service, but resolutely and bravely goes through all, as the Prophet Isaiah shews, 'The Lord God hath opened my ear, and I was not rebellious, neither turned away back, I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair; I hid not my face from shame and spitting.' Christ shrinks not from his Father's wrath, the burthen of your sins, the malice of Satan, and the rage of the world; but cheerfully and triumphantly passes through all. Ah souls! if this consideration will not raise you above all the discouragements you meet with, to own Christ and his service, and to cleave to them both, I am afraid nothing will.‡ A soul that is not lifted up by this, to be resolute and brave in the service of God, notwithstanding all dangers and difficulties, is a soul left of God to much blindness and hardness.

*Rem. 4.* Consider, that religious duties, holy and heavenly exercises, are only difficult to the ignoble part of a saint; they are not to the noble and better part, the soul, and renewed affections of a saint:§ holy exercises are a heavenly pleasure and recreation, as the apostle speaks, 'I delight in the law of God, after the inward man: with my mind I serve the Law of God.' To the noble part of a saint, 'Christ's yoke is easy, and his burden is light;' all the commands and ways of Christ, (even those that tend to the pulling out right eyes, and cutting off right hands) are joyous, and not grievous; all the ways and services of Christ

\* Luther spake excellently to Melancthon, who was apt to be discouraged with doubts and difficulties, and fear from foes, and to ease the service they had undertaken. "If the work be not good, why did we ever own it? If it be good, why should we ever decline it? Why, (saith he) should we fear the conquered world, that have Christ the conqueror on our side?" Is. xl. ult.

† "It is not fit, since the head was crowned with thorns, that the members should be crowned with rose buds, saith Zanch."

‡ Godfrey of Bullien, first king of Jerusalem, refused to be crowned with a crown of gold, saying, "It became not a Christian there to wear a crown of gold, where Christ for our salvation wore a crown of thorns."

§ As every flower hath its sweet savour, so every good duty carries meat in the mouth, and comfort in the performance of it.

are pleasantness (in the abstract) to the better part of a saint. A saint, so far as he is renewed, is always best when he sees and tastes most of God, when he is highest in the enjoyments of God, and most warm and lively in his service. Oh! saith the saint, that it might be always thus: Oh! that my strength were the strength of stones, and my flesh as brass, that my worse part might be more serviceable to my noble part, that I might act by an unwearied power in that service, that is a pleasure, a Paradise to me.

*Rem. 5.* Solemnly consider, the great reward and glorious recompense that attend those who cleave to the service of the Lord, in the face of all difficulties and discouragements; though the work be hard, yet the reward is great: heaven will make amends for all: yes, one hour in heaven, will abundantly recompense you for cleaving to the Lord and his ways, in the face of all difficulties.\* This carried the apostle through the greatest difficulties: 'He had an eye to the recompense of reward; he looked for a house that had foundations, whose builder and maker is God, and for a heavenly country,' yea, this bore up the spirit of Christ, in the face of all difficulties and discouragements. 'Looking unto Jesus, the Author and Finisher of faith, who for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.'

Christians that would hold on in the service of the Lord, must look more upon the crown, than the cross; more upon their future glory, than their present misery; more upon their encouragements, than their discouragements. God's very service is wages; his ways are strewed with roses, and paved with joy that is unspeakable and full of glory; and with peace that passeth understanding. Some degree of comfort follows every good action; as heat accompanies fires, and as beams and influences issue from the sun. 'Moreover, by them is thy servant warned, and in keeping of them there is great reward;' not for keeping, but in keeping of them, there is great reward; the joy, the refreshing, the comforts, the contents, the smiles, the incomes that saints now enjoy in the ways of God, are so precious and glorious in their eyes, that they would not exchange them for ten thousand worlds.— Ah! if the vails be thus sweet and glorious before pay-day come, what will be that glory that Christ will crown his saints with, for cleaving to his service in the face of all difficulties: when he shall say to his Father, 'Lo, here am I, and the children which thou hast given me!' If there be so much to be had in a wilderness, what then shall be had in Paradise, &c.?

(To be Continued.)

#### ART. IV. *Abbreviated Creeds.*

The New School Gen. Assembly sufficiently show the *Elective Affinities* by which they are drawn together and governed in the adoption of the following Report:

"The committee on abbreviated creeds reported: That there have

\* Basil speaks of some martyrs that were cast out all night naked, in a cold frosty time, and were to be burned the next day, how they comforted themselves in this manner, the winter is sharp, but Paradise is sweet; here we shiver for cold, but the bosom of Abraham will make amends for all.

been put into their hands printed or written formularies of abbreviated creeds, from the following Presbyteries, as approved by them and recommended to the churches under their care, viz: Geneva, Buffalo, Cleveland, St. Joseph, Monroe, Ottawa, Peoria, and the Northern Associated Presbytery. Also from individual churches within the Presbyteries of Wilmington, Montrose, Columbia, and Maumee. The commissioners from Crawfordsville, Marion, Union, Holston, and French Board Presbyteries have informed the committee that there are no creeds other than the Bible and the Confession of Faith in use in the churches within their bounds. These Presbyteries and churches, be it observed, are from widely distinct portions of the Presbyterian church. But still the number of Presbyteries that have reported upon this subject and the number of these creeds received by the committee is obviously too small, for the committee or the Assembly to form any intelligent or just judgment in regard to the character of such formularies as may be in use in the great majority of the churches that employ them in admission of members. Your committee however, after a careful examination of all the documents put into their hands touching this subject, have come to the following results, viz :

"1st. That, agreeably to the import of these abbreviated creeds, they are short summaries of the leading or more important doctrines of the word of God and the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

"2d. That these abbreviated creeds or summaries, as far as they go in the statement of doctrines, notwithstanding slight and unessential discrepancies in the terms used, are none of them at variance with the system of doctrine taught in the Confession of Faith. And although, in a few cases, they are not as full and explicit as might be desired, yet they are but summaries, and like the Confession of Faith itself, to be more fully explained and enlarged upon in the whole course of scriptural instruction in doctrine and practice.

"The committee therefore recommend the following resolutions for the adoption of the Assembly, to be sent down to all the Presbyteries.

"*Resolved*, 1. That from an examination of several abbreviated creeds or forms of confession from distinct and widely scattered portions of the church, being all that have been sent up, the General Assembly discover no cause thus far of complaint, alarm or suspicion in regard to the use of these formularies in our churches.

"2. That it be earnestly recommended to all the Presbyteries, to collect and send up by their commissioners to the next General Assembly, copies of all the abbreviated creeds or Confessions of Faith in use by the churches under their care, that a more full and complete report may be had upon this subject.

"3. That it be and hereby is recommended to all the Presbyteries, to take special pains to have the book containing the Confession of Faith and Form of Government of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America more generally circulated among the churches under their care."

"Some discussion arose on this report, in which Messrs. Waterbury and Vandeman, Judge Darling, Mr. Frost and others participated. The only point of difference of opinion was in regard to the best method of carrying into more complete effect the object aimed at in the resolution

of the last Assembly. A unanimous feeling seemed to prevail, that the disclosures so far made were most gratifying to all who love Zion and "hope all things" for her."—*N. Y. Observer.*

---

**ART. V.** *Act of the General Assembly (Orthodox) in relation to the further Reformation of the Presbyterian Church.*

Report of the committee on the state of the church, as adopted May 30th, 1838 :—The church, led and supported by the God of Zion, has, within the last few years, commenced a great reform, which had become indispensable to its very existence, as organized on the principles of the doctrine and order of its own constitution. The General Assembly of 1837, carried forward this reform, in several measures of great and momentous importance, for the details of which we refer to its records. The voice of the church uttered in a multitude of forms, and especially by the commissioners to the present General Assembly, is clearly and decisively in favor of consummating the reform thus auspiciously commenced. But a portion of the Ministers and Ruling Elders, sent to this Assembly, forgetting or violating, as we apprehend, their duty to God and to the church, and choosing to depart from us, have, in connexion with other persons not in the communion of our church, constituted a new ecclesiastical organization, which they improperly and unjustly assume to call the true General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. To meet the present crisis at once, with the temper and spirit becoming our high vocation, and to preserve in it, and carry safely through it, the church committed in so great a degree to our guidance, in times of so much trial and disorder, the three following acts are now ordained and established by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

**ACT I.**

**SECT. I.** That in the present state of the church, all the Presbyteries in our connexion ought to take order, and are hereby enjoined to take such order as is consistent with this minute, for the general reform and pacification of the church, and they are directed so to do, sometime between the dissolution of the present General Assembly, and the fall meetings of the Synods; either at stated or at *pro re nata* meetings of the Presbyteries, as shall seem most advisable to them respectively. And those Presbyteries whose commissioners to this Assembly have united with others in the formation of another Assembly, in the presence of this, and with tumult and violence in open contempt of it: or who have advised the formation of said body, or adhered to, or attended it, as members thereof, after its formation:—or who, without taking any part therein, have, after its formation, renounced, or refused to recognize this true and only General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, are hereby required to take proper order in regard to their said commissioners.

**SECT. II.** In case the majority of any Presbytery whose commissioners have acted as aforesaid, shall take proper order touching their conduct in the premises, and are willing upon the basis of the Assemblies of 1837 and 1838, to adhere to the Presbyterian Church in the United

States—then, and in that case, the acts of their said commissioners, in advising, creating, or uniting with said secession, or in refusing to attend on this Assembly, as the case may be, shall not prejudice the rights or interests, or affect the integrity of said Presbytery, or its union with the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, as an integral portion thereof.

Sect. III. In case the majority of any Presbytery shall refuse or neglect to take proper order in regard to its seceding commissioners, or shall approve their conduct, or adhere to the new sect they have created, or shall decline or fail to adhere to the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, upon the said basis of 1837 and 1838, for reform of the church—then, and in that case, the minority of said Presbytery shall be held and considered to be the true Presbytery; and shall continue the succession of the Presbytery by its name and style, and from the rendition of the erroneous and schismatical decision, which is the test in the case, be the Presbytery; and if sufficiently numerous to perform Presbyterian acts, shall go forward with all the proper acts and functions of the Presbytery.

Sect. IV. In case the minority of any Presbytery should be too small to constitute a Presbytery, and perform Presbyterian acts, said minority shall still remain unattached in its existing state, until the next subsequent meeting of the Synod to which it properly belongs, which will then take order on the subject. Otherwise, there is a possibility that several Synods might be unable to constitute, if majorities of part of their Presbyteries should adhere to the secession, and the minorities attach themselves to other Presbyteries, or several unite into one, before the Synods meet.

Sect. V. The principles of this act shall be applied to churches, with their majorities and minorities—and to church sessions, as far as they are applicable. And the Presbyteries are hereby required so to exercise their watch and care, that, as far as possible, all the churches may be preserved: and where unhappily this cannot be done, then that the minorities in the sessions and churches shall be cared for, and dealt with on the general principles now laid down.

The Assembly is fully sensible that in divided Presbyteries and churches, every thing depends, under God, upon the promptitude, firmness, wisdom, and moderation of the friends of Christ, in this great crisis. In this conviction, the whole of that part of the subject which relates to churches and private christians, is especially commended to the christian zeal, prudence, and fidelity of the Presbyteries and church sessions. In regard to the temporal interests of the churches, and the difficulties which may arise on their account, the Assembly advise that, on the one hand, great liberality and generosity should mark the whole conduct of our people, and especially in cases where our majorities in the churches are very large, or our minorities are very small: while on the other hand, it would advise, that providential advantages and important rights, ought not, in any case, to be lightly thrown away.

Sect. VI. It is enjoined on the Synods to take order on this subject—to see that the principles here laid down are duly enforced—to take care that the Presbyteries act as truth and duty require in the premises—to make such needful modifications in the Presbyteries as their altered circumstances may require—and to promote, by all proper means, the speedy pacification of the churches, by delivering and saving them from the leaven of heresy, disorder and schism, which having so long

worked among them, is at length ready, by God's mercy, to be purged away.

Sect. VII. The Synods in all cases shall be considered lawfully constituted only when formed by or out of those Presbyteries recognized as true Presbyteries by this Assembly, according to the true tenor and intent of this act.

---

#### ART. VI. *Reformed Presbyterian Synod in Ireland.*

We have lately received several numbers of the COVENANTER, a very interesting Periodical, published in Belfast, Ireland; from which we extract the following:

At the last Annual Meeting of the Reformed Presbyterian Synod in Ireland, an adjourned meeting was appointed for disposing of unfinished business. This meeting was held at Cullybackey, on Tuesday, 10th October, [1837,] and subsequent days. At twelve o'clock on Tuesday the Synod met, and was constituted by the Moderator, the Rev. SAMUEL CARLILE, with prayer. There was a good attendance of ministers and elders. The first subject in the unfinished business was a petition from the congregation in Linen-Hall street, under the care of Rev. John Alexander, Belfast. The first part of this petition, relating to the fourth term of Communion, had been disposed of by the decision of Synod at Moneymore: the two remaining parts contained requests—1. That in one of the questions of the Formula, proposed to Licentiates for ordination, instead of requiring the approval of all the Acts of Assembly, from 1638 to 1649, the statement should be as in the Scottish Formula, "the Acts confirming Reformation;" and 2. That the Synod should direct petitioners whether the 23d and 31st chapters of the Westminster Confession are to be received according to the words of the Confession, or according to limitations mentioned in the Act of Assembly of 1647. A discussion ensued, relative to the expression of the petition, and to the objects which it contemplated. It was shown that in both items, the petition was chargeable with inaccuracy. The petitioners appeared not to have been acquainted with the Scotch Formula, as, after some inquiry, the expression in the question was ascertained to be the Acts "ratifying and approving the Reformation." It was, moreover shown, that the Act of 1647 makes no mention whatever of the 23d chapter of the Westminster Confession, but only of a single article of the 31st chapter, which it limits; and that, consequently, when we adopt the Confession, the 23d chapter is to be taken as it is, in the plain and obvious sense of the words. After some discussion, a motion was unanimously agreed to, which had been proposed by Mr. Dick, and seconded by Mr. Fullerton—That a committee be appointed to revise the phraseology of our Formulas, proposed to ministers and elders at ordination; and the understanding of Synod was declared by the Moderator to be the Acts confirming and approving of the Reformation. The committee was afterwards named to consist of Messrs. Stavely, Ewing, Hawthorne, and Dr. Paul—Mr. Stavely, Convener. We regard the course adopted by the Synod, in this case, as proper and judicious, since experience justifies the remark, that changes, however slight, in ecclesiastical documents, which have been

long in established use, should be made after due deliberation. To act precipitately in a matter of this kind, affords occasion for suspicion, and may lead to dissatisfaction and schism. Every needful improvement should be adopted; but when it is known that, in other sections of the church, organic changes have been effected by means of changes in testimonies and formulas, we think it wise to act with much caution. In the present instance, while we freely admit that the change in the question of the formula is of little consequence, if the terms are rightly understood, we think good may be accomplished by the labors of the committee.

On Wednesday, the second day, the Synod was opened at 10 o'clock, several additional members, ministers, and elders, having come forward since the preceding day. The next item of unfinished business which occupied the attention of the court, referred to a decision of the Synod last year, upon a memorial from the congregation of Knockbracken. From the minutes of Synod of 1836, the object of the Memorial, and the Synod's procedure thereon, may be fully seen. The memorialists had expressed deep concern to witness, in some quarters, principles avowed, which appear to be opposed to the great doctrine of a *national establishment* of the true religion, and which have a tendency to draw the members of the church into an *approval of the men and measures of the present civil administration in these lands*. They had, also, "greatly lamented the prevalence of a report, that ministers of the Reformed Presbyterian Church should of late have joined hands with those who impugn the doctrine of a National establishment of christianity—and, moreover, ministers of the church have been publicly declared to be engaged in conducting publications, in which portions of our Westminster standards are directly denied or turned into ridicule—in which sanction is given to gross libels on the standards and practice of the Reformed Church, and the article of a National establishment of true religion is opposed. For these reasons, "Memorialists earnestly request Synod to make a Public Declaration to the church, and to the world, of the doctrine of the church respecting the duty of nations and civil rulers, to whom the light of divine revelation comes, authoritatively, to establish the true religion, and to protect and support the church of Christ." In relation to this Memorial, the Synod, on the motion of Mr. Dick, seconded by Mr. Smyth, had agreed—"that our religious profession and ordination vows imperatively demand of us, in the present circumstances of the church, a distinct and solemn declaration, that while we decidedly disapprove of existing civil and ecclesiastical establishments in these lands, we cannot make common cause with any of the political parties of the day, or with such as deny and oppose the principle of a National establishment of the religion of Jesus Christ. That we refer this petition to a committee of Synod, with an express injunction to endeavor to have in readiness a matured report upon the subjects to which it relates; and that we affectionately beseech and warn all members of this church to abstain from all acts contrary to the spirit of the foregoing Declaration." This motion had been agreed to with much cordiality by the Synod, and a committee appointed in terms of it, Drs. Paul and Henry, and Messrs. Alexander and C. Houston, with their elders, alone having dissented and assigned reasons.

Mr. Dick, the convener of the committee, now presented a Declaration in accordance with the motion which was read by the clerk. As this Declaration, with the Synod's corrections, is given in another part

of the periodical for this month, we are saved the necessity of inserting here any outline of the matters contained in it.\* After it was read, it was moved by Mr. Ewing, and seconded by Mr. Gibson, that the Declaration be now received for consideration. A discussion took place on this proposal, which was continued during the whole of the forenoon session of the Synod, this day. Drs. Henry and Paul, with Messrs. Alexander and C. Houston, offered various objections against the Synod entering upon the consideration of the Declaration; such as that time was requisite to deliberate on a subject of such grave importance; that several aged members of Synod were not present, and, after the matter was under discussion for some hours, it was alleged, that other papers, which had passed the Committee of Bills at the late meeting in Moneymore, should have been taken up before the Declaration. Dr. Henry proposed,—“That the Declaration should be sent to the sessions of the different congregations in connexion with the church, for their consideration.” This was the view which those who joined with him in opposing the consideration of the document by the Synod, wished adopted, and in support of which they resorted to a variety of modes of reasoning. In opposition to these views, and in favor of the Synod considering the Declaration at present, it was shown by several members, that the Synod must generally have expected a document of this kind, since, in 1836, a committee had been appointed, with an express injunction to have a Declaration, on the subjects to which the petition referred, in readiness at the last Synod in Moneymore; and, moreover, that owing to the discussions that had recently been going on in the church, the members of Synod generally must be familiar with these subjects; that as the expectation had been excited throughout the church, that, at the present meeting, there would be full discussion on the topics embodied in the Declaration; and as members had collected from various quarters to be present at such a discussion, this would be a most favorable opportunity;—that obviously, it would be better to discuss the subject in dispute on a paper which exhibited general principles, that personalities might be avoided—and that memorials which were on the Synod’s table could be easily disposed of, if the members had come to an agreement on the Declaration. An elder (W. Gibson,) justly remarked, that it would be unreasonable to defer the consideration of the document, because some members of court were not present, since it could not be expected that the business of Synod would be delayed because some few members absented themselves. It was likewise shown, that the Declaration properly took the precedence of all the other unfinished business, since the matter on which it was founded had not only been before the Synod at Moneymore, this year, but that it had also been noticed in the Synod’s proceedings of 1836—and that it was contrary to all order, after the court had agreed to take up a subject, and had actually taken it up, as in this instance, then to stop short on the pretence that it was disorderly to enter upon the matter at all. And in favor of then considering the Declaration, it was argued, from a reference to the procedure of ecclesiastical courts, that the only proper course, after receiving such a paper, was to take it under consideration; and that it was contrary to all precedent, and tending to manifest confusion, to send it down at once to sessions and congregations without any consideration.

\* This Declaration may be given in a future number of the Monitor.—*Ed. Rel. Mon.*

It was moved by William Gibson, elder, and seconded by James Oliver, elder, that the court now enter upon the discussion of the paper. Within a few minutes of the hour of adjournment, the question was put, and the motion was carried by a large majority. Drs. Henry and Paul, and Messrs. C. Houston and Alexander, dissented from this decision. At 2 o'clock, the Synod adjourned for three quarters of an hour.

It was gratifying to witness the interest taken by the members of court, and by the numerous assembly present, in this preliminary discussion, and the cordiality manifested by the Synod, with the exception of the dissentients. As the Declaration was not of the nature of a new law, but simply an Act declaratory of the principles of the church's testimony on a particular subject, the Synod might have at once enacted it, without sending it to the inferior courts as an overture. The plan adopted, was, however, pacific and judicious; and, besides nullifying various specious objections which might have been urged against the Declaration, had it been at once proposed as a law to the church, it will afford a good opportunity for the sessions of the various congregations to give a public expression of sentiment in favor of the church's testimony. The consideration of it by the eldership will, we doubt not, be productive of much advantage, as there is no body of men in the church whom it is more important to have fully informed on the article of principle, and whose efforts have generally contributed more to the purity of the church, and to the vindication of her testimony.

On resuming business after the recess, Dr. Henry stated, that he and those who had joined him in the dissent, designed to take no part in the consideration of the Declaration, as they disapproved of the course that had been adopted by Synod, and he wished it to be understood, that their silence should not be construed into either approbation or disapprobation of any thing in the document. Mr. Ewing, and some other members of Synod, endeavored to bring the dissentients to take part in the discussion, but without effect. The clerk then read the Declaration again, and afterwards it was submitted, paragraph by paragraph, the members of court offering remarks and proposing alterations.

In answer to the remarks by Messrs. Toland and Ewing, respecting the "law of nature" as the foundation of magistracy, and the proposal by the latter to substitute the "law of creation" for the "law of nature," Mr. Dick said, the phrase employed in the Declaration is one that is in general use. It had been adopted by us in the "Resolutions regarding the American question." By the expression, the committee meant that law which was impressed on the heart of man at his creation. The expression in the first paragraph was preparatory to that in the second. He considered it necessary to state this point clearly, inasmuch as covenanters had been considered as holding that magistracy is *founded in grace*. Against this supposition the Scottish brethren had lifted their voice. It is laid down explicitly in the new testimony of the Reformed Church in Scotland, that magistracy is founded in the very nature of man. Let the friends of correct principle say what they liked, enemies would misrepresent—but the truth was not to be surrendered, nor the received modes of stating and defending it given up on this account.

Mr. Gibson would distinguish between the *law of nature*, on which

he regarded magistracy as founded, and the *light of nature*. The law of nature he regarded as the moral law imprinted on man's heart at his creation; the light of nature he considered merely as the knowledge of that law possessed by mankind.

Mr. Hawthorne said, the foundation on which civil authority rests is the will of the Creator. This will, he added, was made known to man in two ways—1st. By its impression on man's mind, as was done at his creation. 2d. By means of Revelation. This will, when known to man without revelation, is called the law of nature. He (Mr. H.) regarded civil government as founded on the will of God, impressed on the human mind at creation, and still more fully developed by means of revelation.

Mr. Ewing said he thought there was in the Declaration too much descending to details, with respect to the exercise of the magistrate's authority. There is difficulty in pointing out the different parts of the magistrate's duty. It was going into details on this subject, he thought, that had given rise to all difficulties contained in the papers which were at present on the table of the court. He was of opinion, that when we would have such a magistrate as was pointed out in the scripture, and when the nation would acknowledge his authority, it would be easy to determine his duty in particular cases. It was the duty of the church, at present, to avow the principle, that magistrates should use their influence in advancing the interests of christianity; but they (the church,) should refrain from stating the particular exercise of authority of the christian ruler. It was with respect to these details that there was the greatest diversity of sentiment. For example, there were different opinions with respect to the nature of that support which the magistrate is to afford to the church, and also with regard to the manner of that provision. He thought the magistrate must receive from his subjects whatever he gives to the church, in his character of magistrate. Here there might be a difference of opinion with regard to the amount of taxation levied for the church's support. We also come to the question which has been so much agitated—how is the magistrate to treat those who do not belong to the church? Are they to be compelled to pay for its support? At present, he thought there was difficulty connected with the answer of this question. The difficulty he regarded as arising, not from the principle itself, but from an evil heart of unbelief. He believed that when Christ would be acknowledged as universal Head and Lord, then this difficulty would vanish,—then would all people willingly come forth to support the religion of Jesus, and the kings would lay their crowns at the feet of the Redeemer.

Mr. Hawthorne said that, in a preceding paragraph, they had declared for Messiah's Headship over the nations. They now asserted the necessity of scriptural qualifications in magistrates—that they should take the word of God for their rule in governing nations—that they (magistrates) should embrace, profess, and support the true religion. He could not agree with Mr. Ewing, that we should not enter into details. We have the same rule to guide us now in stating the magistrate's duty, which nations will have when Christ is received as universal Head and Lord. This rule, he stated, is the law and the testimony. He regarded all details as depending on the grand principle stated in the Declaration.

Mr. Dick felt under obligation to Mr. Ewing for his remarks. In drawing up documents of this kind, there is one rule which ought to be

observed. We should not depart from a testimony which is definite, and adopt one that is indefinite. It was not advisable to make statements of principle too general. He admitted there might be circumstances in which a nation could not avail itself of the advantages that flow from a scripturally qualified magistracy. He did not wish to go into minute and intricate questions, nor to make the testimony of the church more particular than it was formerly. He referred to the Larger Catechism, Quest. 191, where it is stated, that the church should be "countenanced and maintained by the civil magistrate." He said, the paragraph under consideration was also supported by the New Scotch Testimony. He had endeavored to guard against what Mr. Ewing disapproved of. The expression in the paper was that the representatives of the nation should support the Church of Scotland. He did not, nor would he specify the particular support which they ought to afford, nor the manner in which it was to be extended to the church. He did not wish to go farther than the church had already gone, nor did he wish to stop short of former attainments.

Mr. Ewing felt satisfied when support was taken in this general sense. He had referred to pecuniary support. He was aware that magistrates could support the true religion by their moral influence, and various other means, as well as by pecuniary aid.

On *Thursday*, the Synod was occupied, during the whole of the forenoon Session, with the Declaration. In reply to remarks made by Mr. Smyth and Mr. T. Houston, respecting the magistrate's giving "civil sanctions" to the church's standards, and concerning the civil ruler giving his "official power and strength to the Prince of the kings of the earth," Mr. Dick, on the part of the committee, referred to the "*Explanation and Defence of the Terms of Communion*," p. 22, and p. 31; to the Testimony of the Original Seceders, prepared by Dr. M'Crie; and to the New Testimony of the Covenanting Church in Scotland, p. 99. In these days of *voluntary* agitation, he said, some individuals assert that certain passages of scripture, which point out the magistrate's duty, refer to him in his private, and personal, and not in his official character. The committee were decidedly opposed to this view. He (Mr. D.) referred to a statement of Dr. M'Crie on this subject. He says, that as magistrates, in their official capacity, opposed the Messiah, so when the nations become evangelized, and their rulers embrace christianity, they shall not only personally, but also officially, seek to promote Christ's kingdom. On this subject reference was also made to the "*Resolutions of the Scottish Synod on Popish Emancipation*," to those on the "*American Question*" adopted by our Synod, and to the "*Act and Testimony*."

On the paragraph in which it is declared to be the magistrate's duty to reform the church when corrupt, by removing impediments, &c., Mr. Smyth wished to know what is the line of conduct which the christian civil ruler should pursue, for this end? Mr. Gibson, in reply, referred to the example of the godly princes of Judah, and said that magistrates were limited in the exercise of their authority with respect to the church of Christ by the word of God.

Mr. Ewing, suggested a change of phraseology, as, in his opinion, it was difficult to say how barriers could be removed, and not easy to state what means were to be employed for promoting the true religion, even after impediments had been taken away. He suggested that the paragraph should be worded—"It is the duty of the magistrate to

employ his influence in the extension and promotion of reformation, and of the religion of Jesus Christ." This phraseology, he said, would, in his opinion, prevent the very supposition that the weapons to be used by the magistrate are carnal and not spiritual.

Mr. Dick remarked, that the proper exercise of civil authority is not a carnal weapon; for this reason, that magistracy is an ordinance of God, and no ordinance of God can be a carnal weapon, provided the word *carnal* be taken in its obnoxious sense. The language employed had been that of the New Scottish Testimony, p. 99, where it is stated that the magistrate ought to remove external impediments to christianity. He did not regard the whole conduct of the godly princes of Judah as imitable. Some of them had the spirit of inspiration and prophecy. The language employed in this part of the Declaration is that used by the renowned Guthrie, who, rather than yield to Erastian supremacy, laid down his life: the godly Livingstone had also used similar language before his judges. Guthrie speaks of this power of the magistrate, as the ordinary power of the godly princes of Judah. The same sentiment occurs in the Larger Catechism, and in the New Testimony. *Persecution* might be instanced as an external impediment to the spread of christianity, which magistrates should remove. It was also a part of the magistrates duty to awaken holy zeal in the ministers, and, in some cases, to call Synods. He must not, however, interfere in their deliberations. On these topics, reference was made to the Second Book of Discipline—to the Explanation and Defence of the Terms of Communion—p. 22,—to the Acts of Assembly of 1642—p. 127,—and to the Assembly's approval of the King's Letter, in which he had declared his intention to carry forward the work of reformation. In 1647, also, the Assembly in Scotland speak of the necessary service which should be rendered by the Parliament in promoting the same glorious cause. Reference was likewise made to the works of Thornburn and Stevens, to show that magistrates should officially render assistance in promoting true religion: these might be regarded as inferior authorities.

Inquiry was made by Mr. Toland, whether in any case an appeal was to be allowed from the church courts to the civil magistrate; and, afterwards, whether if the case were one of heresy and not of flagrant immorality, there could be an appeal? To this, Mr. Dick, on the part of the committee, replied. Independent jurisdiction is in the Declaration allowed to the church. The power of the church and of the State is co-ordinate, not collateral or dependent on one another. The church has no power over the State in State affairs, nor has the State any power over the Church, in Church affairs. The State, in this point of view, is not superior to the Church, nor is the church superior to the State. No appeal with respect to worship, doctrine, &c., can be made from the Church to the State. He (Mr. D.) furthermore admitted, that there are difficulties connected with this part of the subject, inasmuch as persons who are church members may also be civil rulers. The same cases may also come under the cognizance of ecclesiastical and civil courts in different conditions. He referred to a minister's character, and to disputes respecting houses of worship, and showed that they might come before an ecclesiastical court, as cases of scandal or complaint, and before a civil court, as matters in which civil rights were affected. The government contemplated in the Declaration, is a scriptural government. When the law of God would be embodied in the

constitution of the State, he thought there could be no appeal from the church courts. The church would then be acting on its own laws, and on the laws of the State at the same time.

On the subject of Penal Laws, it was shown that the committee had explicitly declared that these should not be enacted or executed against any class of religionists, except as a necessary part of self-defence in particular cases. It was only when in their profession and practice there was something opposed to the best interests of the kingdom, that the magistrate should take cognizance of them. These laws were never to be employed but in the way of self-defence, and here they were evidently justifiable. Objections, he admitted, had been urged against them in any case, but the church had always maintained the necessity of allowing them in cases referred to. There is a manifest difference between protecting religion against its enemies, and propagating christianity by civil pains and penalties. In corroboration of this part of the Declaration, reference was made to the *New Scottish Testimony*, p. 162,—to the *Testimony of the Original Seceders*, p. 65,—and to *Resolutions of the Scottish Reformed Synod on Popish Emancipation*. Roman Catholics are morally and scripturally disqualified for places of power in the nation.

In reply to a question from Mr. Toland, respecting the *Judicial Laws*, as mentioned in the Declaration, Mr. Dick referred to the proofs quoted by the Westminster Divines, in the 19th chapter, 4th section of the *Confession of Faith*, and said the reference is obviously not to the Ceremonial Law. Judicial Laws may be distinguished—1. Into those that are properly ceremonial; 2. Such as are moral; and 3. Those made up of both. What was ceremonial in the Judicial Laws has passed away; but the grand principle remains the same. He here referred to the distinction made in the Jewish law between manslaughter and murder, which is recognised at the present day. Some of the Judicial Laws are regarded as of common right; others as of particular right. General equity relates to the first table of the law, as well as to the second. Some evil actions are, moreover, punishable on the ground of common right; while the mode or degree of punishment may be regarded as of particular right, varying in different circumstances. In the New Testament it is stated that evil-doers should be punished; and it is to be observed, that there is just as good authority in the New Testament to punish the violation of the first four precepts of the decalogue, as the last six. No penalties are particularly specified in the one case or the other. The law of retaliation is recognised in the New Testament, when it is said, “an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth.” This law he regarded as a part of general equity. He considered the spirit of the Judicial Law still binding, while whatever is ceremonial in, or peculiar to the Jewish people, has passed away. In Deut. xiii. 10, there is a reference to the reason why evil-doers should be punished—the good of society requires it.

Mr. T. Houston observed, that there is an ambiguity sometimes in speaking of the Judicial Law. None contend that, as a whole, it is now binding. The committee has made a proper distinction; those parts of the Judicial Law alone that are moral in their nature, are of perpetual obligation. Dr. Owen, in his sermon on Daniel vii., has well observed—“Subduct those parts of the Judicial code which are peculiar to the Jewish church and nation, and those which remain under the general notion of a church and nation, are everlastingly binding.” It might

be easily shown that the Judicial Law had peculiarities in the penalties annexed to violations of the second table, as well as of the first;—he instanced the case of the person who cursed his father or mother. We are not called to maintain that the same penalties are still to be employed. He referred to various writers on the law of nations, to show that the principle could be maintained, while modes of application might vary.

On the same topic, Mr. Dick read a passage from Dwight's *Theology*, showing that the christian civil ruler is to regard the law in the Old Testament as still, in some measure, a directory of his conduct—and observed, that he did not refer to Dr. Dwight as an authority in the church, but as an eminent divine, and a man of great genius.

The paragraph being read, in which the duty of the christian civil ruler to restrain and punish open violations of the precepts of the first, as well as of the second table of the law, is declared—

Mr. Ewing wished it to be understood, that it is to promote the glory of God that the magistrate is thus to exercise his authority, and that he must only employ means that accord with the spirit of the religion of Christ. This excludes all persecuting principles.

Mr. Toland further inquired, Whether there is not a distinction between profane swearing and blasphemy—and whether heresy and blasphemy may coincide? Mr. Dick—As to persecution, the church utterly disclaims it: but we have the authority of the New Testament that the magistrate shall not only be a "praise to them that do well," but, also, "a terror to evil doers." In the New Testimony, and also in the "Explanation and Defence," the magistrate is allowed the power of punishing outward violations, both of the first and second table of the law. The language of the Declaration here, is the language of the New Testimony. A statement of the general principle that gross immorality, whatever commandment may be broken, is liable to be punished by the magistrate, is all that is intended. Gross heresy may coincide with blasphemy in some cases.

Mr. T. Houston—While he agreed in the main with Mr. Ewing, on the propriety of not entering into minute details, he thought, with our Scottish brethren in their New Testimony, that we should never recede from a particular testimony to one more vague and general. In all our old standards, open and obstinate heresy was mentioned as punishable by the magistrate, as well as blasphemy and idolatry. He quoted the Westminster Confession, 23d chapter, and the Act and Testimony, p. 164, and said, he did not see cause to omit, in the Declaration, "open and gross heresies." An enumeration of other cases was given, and why should this be left out? He granted it was fully implied in what was elsewhere stated, but he thought the words should be used. Elders and members of the church might think that there was a departure from a more particular to a more general testimony. In a document such as this, the Synod should not omit a specific enumeration, because certain individuals might deal in misrepresentation and reproach.

Mr. Dick said, he did not wish in the least to depart from our standards, but he did not see the use of introducing the term heresy.—The word is not so easily understood as some other terms in the paper. The committee had stated the general principle, but had said nothing at all about modes of punishment. It is with heresy openly avowed

and propagated, not as entertained in the mind, that the magistrate has to do it.

Mr. T. Houston said, as in the Declaration, not only the principle is stated, but very satisfactory reasons are given in proof of it, he considered it unnecessary to contend about a word.

In reply to a remark of Mr. Ewing, that some of the statements in the Declaration might appear contradictory—Mr. Dick, on behalf of the committee, said—Certain general principles on this subject balance and limit each other. Carrying any of them to an extreme was wrong. The committee, in preparing the Declaration, had, 1st. Shown the power which the magistrate is to employ about the church. 2d. What he ought to do in restraining those that are enemies to the church and the commonwealth; and 3d. What he is to do, as the guardian of both tables of the law. We do not say, the magistrate may and may not do the same thing. If individuals put wrong constructions on our language, we are not to blame. The scriptures themselves have been perverted. There have been vague and injurious allegations made, with respect to our standards. Individuals, and even public bodies, have spoken of embracing the Confession of Faith, as far as it does not inculcate persecuting principles. This mode of speaking evidences any thing but sincerity in adopting it. He regarded it as a base aspersion on the Confession of Faith. He considered it better first to ascertain what persecution is: it would then be easy to show whether the Westminster Confession inculcates intolerance or not.

Various other remarks were made, and explanations given, both on the former and on the remaining parts of the Declaration, which need not be particularly specified. At the suggestion of Mr. T. Houston, a sentence was introduced at the close, from the New Testament, respecting the right of christians who, on conscientious grounds, refuse to incorporate with the national society, to enjoy protection.

After the Declaration was fully considered,

Mr. Hawthorne said, he rose to express his entire satisfaction with the document. He thought it contained the grand principles of the Covenanting Church, on the important subject to which it relates. He was well pleased, moreover, with the details which it contains. They shew us satisfactorily how a great principle may be brought into practice. He thought it a useful document to send to our sessions, as an Overture. The Synod would gladly receive from them observations before giving it their final approbation. He regretted that, in considering the document, some of our fathers in the ministry had withheld their counsel and co-operation. He would have rejoiced, could the Synod have presented themselves to the public as of one mind. Before sitting down, he would move that the Declaration be now adopted, and sent down as an Overture to Sessions and Presbyteries.

Mr. Stavelly rose to second the motion. He had listened attentively to the paper, and to the remarks which had been made on it. He regretted that each member of Synod had not a copy of it in his hand. He did not feel at liberty to make any observations on the paper while the court was considering it, as he had not seen it previously. He knew he would have an opportunity of examining it again, as it was only to be sent from Synod as an Overture. He would wish, at present, to make a few remarks, with respect to the impressions made upon his mind by the reading of the paper. He would observe, 1. That the paper, or rather the statements which it contains, seemed to be un-

wieldly and unmanageable. 2. The first part of the paper pointed out what the magistrate should do; and the second, what he should not do. With regard to the first, it seemed to contain something like *Erastianism*; while in the second, there appeared to be a sprinkling of what is now called *Liberalism*. These impressions, he thought, might, on due consideration, be removed. The unwieldiness and unmanageableness of the paper had arisen from the nature of the subject itself. In the compass of human investigation there are few subjects more difficult. When we approve of the grand principle of the magistrates province and duty, in matters of religion, we are not thereby required to go down, and mark out minutely the line to which the magistrate should go. Circumstances alter cases. A thing may be proper in certain cases, that may not be so in others. With respect to the seeming *Erastianism* and *Liberalism* contained in the paper, he did not think, on first hearing it read, that certain statements in it did not accord; and if any person felt the same impression, he would recommend him not to take any of its statements separately. The paper should be taken as a whole, and no statement should be considered apart from its connexion. Improper use had been made of the most valuable writings in this way: even the scriptures themselves had been perverted, by taking them in detached portions. He remembers that, when a young man, he was introduced to a celebrated Deist. He (the Deist) flattered him, and said it was a pity that his talents should be perverted by his engaging in the work of the ministry, which was likely to do harm to the world. He had written a book styled, "The God of the Jews characterized from his own writings." He handed him two copies of this work, requesting him to examine it carefully. He (Mr. S.) did read it with particular attention, and found in it certain portions of the scriptures of the God of truth treated in the most abominable manner. The author had selected statements, without paying any attention to their connexion, and had drawn exceedingly startling conclusions, even from the Oracles of God. If the several parts of this document were treated in a similar manner, it might be productive of evil consequences. He (Mr. S.) would recommend to every person to view it in the same manner as he had done, and it would be found valuable and important. He would also suggest, that it should be sent to the ministers of the church, in Scotland and America. He also hoped, that our respected brethren who had remained silent, on this occasion, would lend us their aid, in bringing the Declaration to such an issue, that it might be called the law of the Covenanted Church, respecting the magistrate's power *circa sacra*.

After some further conversation, in which several members took part, it was agreed that the Declaration should be handed to the committee, for the purpose of making the alterations that had been suggested, and of printing it as speedily as possible, and circulating it widely as an Overture.

---

#### ART. VII. *General Assembly of the Church of Scotland.*

[From the Presbyterian.]

A friend has furnished us with the following sketch of the proceedings of this venerable judicatory. The last item is peculiarly interest-

ing at the present time, and our readers will unite with us in applauding the noble stand taken by the Assembly, in adopting Mr. Buchanan's motion.

The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland met at Edinburgh, at the usual time, in May. The papers announce the arrival of Lord Belhaven, the Queen's Lord High Commissioner to the Assembly, at Holyrood palace; there he was waited upon by the magistrates, who presented the keys of the city, and received them back from his Lordship. It is added: "His Grace holds his first levee at 11 o'clock to-day, and afterwards proceeds, in state, to open the Assembly."

On the 21st of May, a committee was appointed to petition Parliament for more efficient measures for the suppression of the sale of liquors on the Lord's day.

On the 22d, Dr. Chalmers presented the report of the committee on the extension of the church, by providing for the erection of additional places of worship. The report was followed by an address from the Doctor, in which he stated, that offers had been received from the licentiates of the Presbyteries to minister in the districts now destitute of churches, which he hoped would be accepted. "Only," said he, "let it be well understood by the young gentlemen themselves, that, however important the labors of a parochial missionary are, they should not encroach on the labors of the closet, in the prosecution of their professional literature, and in their preparation for the Sabbath."

"The committee would confess their alarm lest a loose and extemporaneous preaching should take the place of careful and well-digested sermons. It must be obvious that the present circumstances of the church called for the utmost wisdom as well as the utmost firmness. It were well that under a sense of difficulty there was more amongst all of them of the exercise of prayer for grace and wisdom from on high. They ought to acquit themselves like men—be strong. It was a remarkable juxta-position to these words, and which tended to evince that the union spoken of, wisdom and firmness, though difficult, was not impossible, when in immediate succession to the clause quoted, they read 'let all good things be done with charity.'"

The report of the committee was received with great enthusiasm; and, according to a vote of the Assembly, a prayer was offered, giving thanks to God for the great success that had attended the efforts of Dr. Chalmers in providing for the extension of the church; and then the Moderator, in a suitable address, presented the acknowledgments of the House to the Doctor.

It appears, that 187 new churches are already built, or are in progress, at an expense of nearly a million of dollars.

On the 23d, a very animated discussion took place on the "independence of the church," which arose from the following circumstances:—In 1834, the Assembly enacted, that no man should be ordained to a vacant living if the majority of the male heads of families objected to his appointment. The parish of Auchterarder, some time after that becoming vacant, the patron presented it to the Rev. Mr. Young; who was not accepted by the parish, and the Presbytery accordingly refused to ordain him. Mr. Young, and his patron, (Lord Kinnoull,) brought a civil action; and the court decided, that the act of the Assembly was in opposition to the law of the realm, giving the right of presentation to the patron; and that, consequently, Mr. Young was entitled to the living. Two resolutions were offered to the Assembly; the first by Mr.

Buchanan, of Glasgow, and the other by Dr. Cook. The final vote was, for Mr. Buchanan's motion, 183 : Dr. Cook's, 141 ; so the former was adopted. We subjoin them, as having some interest for our own church at present.

MR. BUCHANAN'S MOTION.—“That the General Assembly of this Church, while they unqualifiedly acknowledge the exclusive jurisdiction of the civil courts in regard to the civil rights and emoluments secured by law to the Church and the ministers thereof, and will ever give and inculcate implicit obedience to the decisions thereanent ; do resolve that as it is declared in the Confession of Faith of this National Established Church, that ‘The Lord Jesus Christ is King and Head of the Church, and hath therein appointed a government in the hand of church-officers distinct from the civil magistrate ;’ and that in all matters of teaching, doctrine, government, and discipline of the Church, her judicatories possess an exclusive jurisdiction founded on the Word of God, which ‘power ecclesiastically flows from God and our Mediator, the Lord Jesus Christ, who is spiritual, not having a temporal head on earth but only Christ, the only spiritual King and Governor of his Kirk :’— And they do further resolve, that this spiritual jurisdiction and the sole Headship of the Lord Jesus Christ, on which it depends, they will assert, and at all hazards defend, by the help of the blessing of that great God, who, in the days of old, enabled their fathers, amidst manifold persecutions, to maintain their testimony even unto death, for Christ's kingdom and crown : And finally, that they will firmly enforce submission to the same upon all office-bearers, &c., members of the Church, by the exercise of the laws and of the ecclesiastical authority wherewith they are invested.”

DR. COOK'S MOTION.—“That the General Assembly, while they hold sacred the spiritual powers confided to the Church by the Lord Jesus Christ, its great head, and consider it to be their indispensable duty to maintain entire and inviolate those powers, they are nevertheless persuaded that it is incumbent on all classes of men, and particularly the members and office-bearers of a Church which is sanctioned, established, and endowed by the State, to yield obedience to the existing laws, as declared by the supreme legal tribunals of the country, whose duty it is to regulate all civil and temporal rights, privileges, and possessions of whatever kind ; and as the recent decision of the Court in the case of Auchterarder has given rise in the inferior judicatories of the Church to apprehensions respecting their spiritual independence, that it is most desirable that that decision should be brought under the review and consideration of the House of Lords, as the court of last resort, in order that the doubts that some entertain of the import of the statute on which it proceeded may be removed, and that, with this declaration and finding, the General Assembly dismiss *in hoc statu* the Overtures now on their table.”

On the day after this decision, Mr. Young was cited to the bar of the Assembly, “to make such defence as may seem to him right.” The majority on this resolution was twenty-eight.

An Edinburgh paper speaks as follows of the late General Assembly of the Church of Scotland :

“Those who have read the full reports which we have given, and impartially considered them, will agree with us in thinking that a more noble Assembly has seldom been convened. Apart from the many excellent judgments and deliverances which have been pronounced upon

a great variety of questions affecting the moral and religious interests of our fellow-men, both at home and abroad, the stand which has been made upon the spiritual independence of the Church is sufficient to confer the highest honor upon the spirit, and courage, and zeal, of the General Assembly. No better proof, perhaps, can be given of the soundness of the steps which have been taken, than the bitterness and wrath which they have provoked among the Voluntaries, and Radicals, and haters of the Church. These men see that the decisions of the General Assembly, instead, as some ill-informed and timid friends of the Church imagine, of endangering her existence, establish her upon a firmer basis than ever—give the lie to three-fourths of the Voluntary argument against the Church, and create new claims to the respect and affection of the people of Scotland. We shall have many opportunities of returning to the subject. In the mean time, to neutralize the misrepresentation of a part of the press which professes to be friendly to the Church, we take leave to say that in the matter of the Auchterarder case throughout, the General Assembly was completely successful. The Church gained every vote upon the question; and Mr. Young, or rather the Dean of Faculty as his counsel, was constrained to give the answer which the Church desired, and which completely vindicates her proceedings in the case. He has substantially declared that the steps taken against the Pysbetry of Auchterarder were not meant as any insult to the Church, or attempt to frighten the members in the discharge of their duty, but were essential, as a matter of form, to the conduct of the civil case before the House of Lords. This is an important confession. Had it been otherwise, the General Assembly could not have consistently allowed Mr. Young to retain his license for another hour. No one who knows any thing of the case can believe that the learned dean would have stood so much upon technicalities, had he not felt that the cause of his client was to gain nothing by an argument upon the merits. In the meantime, an admirable lesson has been read to the probationers and presentees of the Church which they will not soon forget."

*Original Burgher Synod-Union with the Church of Scotland*—At the meeting of the Synod last week, the subject of re-union with the Church of Scotland was again brought under consideration, and discussed at great length and with the most intense interest. There were two motions before the Synod—the one by the Rev. Mr. Moscrip, Grenock, that the proposed union should be immediately effected; and the other by the Rev. Professor Willis, Glasgow, that it should still be delayed for at least another year—some ministers, who spoke strongly and pointedly in favor of immediate union, at last yielding to the wishes of those who pleaded for delay. Accordingly, on the vote being put, it was found that twenty-one had voted for the first, and thirty for the second motion, making a majority of nine in favor of the motion for delay. Against this decision thirteen ministers, along with a number of elders, protested, took instruments, and craved extracts, reserving to themselves full liberty to proceed in the matter as they shall see cause. We understand the protesters have since met, and unanimously agreed to follow out their protest by an immediate application for themselves to the Committee of the Assembly's Committee on Union.

**ART. VIII. *The Abolition of Slavery in the West Indies.***

If we rightly understand the matter, slavery may be considered as at an end in the British West Indies. All parties there seem to be satisfied that the complete abolition of slavery is an advantage even to slaveholders themselves. The apprenticeship system, which was continued in most of the Islands, was found not to work so well as the total emancipation system. A part of the apprentices, the house servants, were, according to Act of Parliament, to become free on the first of the present month, and the remainder, the field servants, on the first of August, 1840. But the latter have also doubtless obtained their freedom in the Island of Jamaica, and either have or soon will have, in all the other Islands. The following, which we copy from the New-York Observer, relates to the legislative action which has taken place on this interesting subject in Jamaica :

The House of Assembly met yesterday afternoon, at 3 o'clock, on which there was a very full attendance of members.

The House having been summoned over to the Council Chamber, his Excellency was pleased to open the sessions by the following speech :

*“ Gentlemen of the Council,*

*Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Assembly :*

I have called you together at an unusual season, to take into your consideration the state of the Island, under the laws of apprenticeship for the laboring population.

I need not refer you to the agitation of this subject throughout the British empire, or to the discussions upon it in Parliament, where the honorable efforts of the ministry were barely found sufficient to preserve the original duration of the law, as an obligation of natural faith.

I shall lay before you some despatches on the subject.

Gentlemen—General agitation and Parliamentary interference have not, I am afraid, yet terminated.

A corresponding excitement has been long going on among the apprentices themselves, but still they have rested in sober and quiet hopes, relying on your generosity that you will extend to them that boon which has been granted to their class in other colonies.

*Gentlemen of the Council,*

*Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Assembly :*

In this posture of affairs it is my duty to declare my sentiments, and distinctly to recommend to you the early and equal abolition of apprenticeship for both classes.

I do so in confidence that the apprentices will be found worthy of freedom, and that it will operate as a double blessing by securing also the future interests of the planters.

I am commanded, however, to inform you, that her Majesty's ministers will not entertain any question of further compensation.

But should your views be opposed to the policy I recommend, I would entreat you to consider well how impracticable it will become to carry on coercive labor always difficult, it would in future be in pe-

ril of constant comparison with other colonies made free, and with those estates in this Island made free by individual proprietors.

As Governor, under these circumstances, and I never shrink from any of my responsibilities, I pronounce it physically impossible to maintain the apprenticeship with any hope of successful agriculture.

*Gentlemen of the Council,*

*Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Assembly:*

Jamaica is in your hands—she requires repose, by the removal of a law which has equally tormented the laborer and disappointed the planter; a law by which man still constrains man in unnatural servitude. This is her first exigency. For her future welfare she appeals to your wisdom to legislate in the spirit of the times, with liberality and benevolence towards all classes.”

On the return of the House, the speech was referred to a special committee.

Mr. Guy gave notice that he would to-morrow introduce a bill for the entire abolition of the apprenticeship system.”

The following is an extract from the Reply of the Legislature to the Governor's speech :

“We feel confident that the hopes of the apprentices will not be disappointed, and that the wisdom and generosity of the Legislature of Jamaica will not hesitate to extend to them that boon, which has been granted to their class in other colonies.

“We cordially concur in your Excellency's wise and humane recommendation of an early and equal abolition of the apprenticeship of all classes, and feel pleasure in recording our perfect conviction, that the apprentices will be found worthy of freedom in every respect—and will so conduct themselves in their altered condition, as to ensure the future interests of the planters.

“Coercive labor has, at all times, been obtained with difficulty, but under the present peculiar circumstances of this Island, we fear it might be impossible to maintain the apprenticeship with any hope of successful agriculture.

“Jamaica does indeed require repose—and we are sanguine in the expectation that, under Divine Providence, such laws will be passed by her Legislature, as will evince their desire to act with liberality and benevolence towards all classes.”

In view of the unanimous adoption of the resolution that the apprenticeship should be abolished, the Jamaica Royal Gazette remarks :

“It is with sincere pleasure that we congratulate the island on the successful issue of the deliberations of the Hon. House of Assembly. Freedom will ere long be proclaimed—full, complete, and unrestricted freedom will be conferred on those who, according to law, would have had to continue in servitude for two years more. No dissentient voice was heard within the walls of the Assembly, all joined in the wish so often expressed, that the remaining term of apprenticeship should be cancelled, that the excitement produced by a law which has done inconceivable harm in Jamaica, in alienating the affections of her people, and creating discord and disaffection, should at once cease. Thank God! it is now nearly at an end, and we trust that Jamaica will enjoy that repose so eagerly and anxiously sought after, by all who wish the island well.”

There is little doubt, therefore, that Mr. Guy's Bill for the entire abolition of the apprenticeship system, has become a law. Slavery may be considered as at an end in the British West Indies. We hope that this noble example will be speedily followed by our Southern neighbors—that they will see, that to emancipate their slaves is not only an act of justice to them and a duty to God, but also a deed which will redound to their own worldly interests.

---

ART. IX. *A Schism attempted in the Associate Church.*

It is with deep regret that we find ourselves called upon to announce to our readers, that an attempt is now making to produce a *Schism* in the Associate Church. Perhaps we might say in truth, that a Schism has been already made. Our readers, before this time, have learned from the published Minutes of the late Synod, that that court was necessitated to suspend the Rev. Messrs. H. H. Blair, A. Stark and P. Bullions from the exercise of the ministry and from the fellowship of the church, on account of their disorderly and contemptuous proceedings. It now appears, that these *suspended* brethren, contrary to every just and reasonable expectation, are determined to persist in their sinful and insubordinate course, and to decoy, inveigle and "carry away from their steadfastness" as many others with them as possible. They have accordingly undertaken to exercise *Presbyterial jurisdiction*. In the assumed character of a Presbytery, self-constituted, and in open violation of all scriptural order, they have ordained an individual to the office of the holy ministry; they have undertaken to establish a congregation in this city; they have commenced the publication of a *religious* periodical, styled THE ASSOCIATE PRESBYTERIAN MAGAZINE, "REV. P. BULLIONS, D. D. EDITOR;" and, moreover, "to take away their reproach" they call themselves *The Associate Presbytery of Albany*. This information we have obtained from No. 1 of the Magazine just named, at the end of which there is the following "Ecclesiastical" notice :

"ORDINATION—The Rev. James Williamson was ordained by the Associate Presbytery of Albany, at Newark, N. J. on the 7th July. The Rev. P. Bullions, D. D. preached on the occasion from 2 Cor. i. 24, and presided. The Rev. H. H. Blair, of New-York, delivered the charge to the minister; and the Rev. A. Stark, of New-York, addressed the congregation.—The application for a continued supply of sermon from the congregation of Fall River, and also of a number of individuals living in the city of Albany, was attended to, as far as it is in the power of Presbytery in present circumstances."

The designs of these suspended brethren in all this, especially in the establishment of their Magazine, on the very first page of which there is an attack on the character of THE RELIGIOUS MONITOR, and in their attempt to get up an *opposition* congregation in this city, are quite too palpable to require from us any remark whatever. An All-wise Providence, however, may kindly interpose and frustrate their designs.

With respect to the *contents* of the No. of their Magazine which has made its appearance, and which relate almost exclusively to the proceedings of the late meeting of Synod in the case of these brethren, it is enough to say, that they harmonize most completely with the contents of Mr. Stark's anonymous Pamphlets, which the Associate Synod have

*unanimously* declared to be of "a mendacious, calumnious and ribaldish character," and "of an infidel tendency." But as some of our readers may never have seen those Pamphlets, truth and duty compel us to declare, and we do it most deliberately and solemnly, that the contents of the Magazine referred to contain an uninterrupted tissue of falsehood, misrepresentation, slander, Jesuitical sophistry and pitiful quibbling, which probably has not been far surpassed by any infidel or popish writer since the era of the Reformation.

Now, it is truly lamentable that these brethren should be so blind as not to see the awful sin and danger of the *schismatical* course which they are pursuing. Dreadful, indeed, are the denunciations of God's word against such conduct. *SEDITIONS*, or "causeless separations" in the church, are by the apostle Paul classed with "heresies," "witchcraft," "adultery," and other "works of the flesh:" and he declares that "they who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God," (Gal. v. 19-21.) And surely there never was a more "causeless separation" made in the church of Christ than that attempted by the suspended brethren. This is evident:

1. Because, according to their own showing, they are "fugitives from discipline:"
2. Because, they vaunt that there is no difference between them and the Synod on the score of *principle* or *public profession*.
3. Because, their complaint is only against an act of administration—the Synod, in *their* opinion, gave a wrong judgment in a "personal cause:" and
4. Because, they claim a *majority* of the Synod as being on their side. "It is in fact known to us," say they, "that those very decisions, of which we complain, are by no means in accordance with the judgment of a great majority of the ministers and elders belonging to the church. They are not so much the decisions of the Associate Synod as the decisions of a party."

Now, we ask, was there ever, according to the brethren's own story, a more "causeless separation," a more groundless *schism*? But what is most deplorable of all, and is calculated to give rise to very painful reflections, is the fact, that this schism is attempted by the brethren, in the very face of vows and oaths deliberately, solemnly and repeatedly made to the contrary. They have given and have repeated, in the presence of God, angels and men, affirmative answers to the following questions:

"Do you engage to submit yourself willingly and humbly, in the spirit of meekness, to the admonitions of this Presbytery, remembering that while they act uprightly, they judge not for men but for the Lord, who is also with them in the judgment: and do you promise that you will endeavor to MAINTAIN the spiritual UNITY and PEACE of this church, CAREFULLY AVOIDING EVERY DIVISIVE COURSE—and this you promise through grace, notwithstanding any trouble or persecution you may be called to suffer, in studying a faithful discharge of your duty in these matters?"—(See Ordination Vows of the Associate Synod of North America.)

These brethren have also *sworn*, with uplifted hands to God, or expressed their willingness to swear, the following OATH:

"We engage in the strength of the Lord, to follow that PEACE which is founded upon an agreement in the truth, that we may stand *fast in one spirit, with one mind, striving together for the faith of the gospel*; and to BEWARE of every thing that has a TENDENCY to BREAK this desirable HARMONY and profitable communion among the members of Christ's mystical body; and for this end we shall endeavor to *mark them who cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which we have received, and avoid them*." (See The Solemn Covenant Engagement unto Duties.)

Now in view of these vows and oaths, than which nothing on this side of eternity can be more solemn and awful, we leave it to Him, "by whom actions are weighed," and "who searcheth the hearts and trieth the reins of the children of men," to judge, whether, to act, as these brethren are now acting, be *moral perjury*, or not. We know what would be the judgment of every man on the subject, whose conscience has been enlightened by the word of God and the spirit of truth. But it is "a very small thing to be judged of man's judgment," in a matter of such awful moment.

How far this schism may extend, we cannot at present tell; but we are well aware that all that can be effected by artful appeals to prejudice and passion, by *pious frauds*, by perversion of facts, by sophistry and chicanery, will be attempted, in order to extend it as far as possible. But, "O my soul, come not thou into their secret; unto their assembly, mine honor, be not thou united."—We have just been informed, to our great surprise, that the newly organized Presbytery of Vermont have undertaken to remove the sentence of deposition from Dr. A. Bullions. But whether they intended this as an act of separation from the Associate Synod, or whether they performed it under a mistaken notion of the extent of their powers, thinking that they could exercise Presbyterianial jurisdiction in the heart of another Presbytery, we are not fully prepared to say. But this we will say, that all Seceders, who have any correct knowledge of Presbyterianial order and respect for the authority of the Synod, will regard this act of the Vermont Presbytery as null and void—as a mere *farce*.

In regard to the abuse so lavishly heaped on the Synod in the brethren's Magazine, we have only to say, that it will ultimately hurt its authors more than the Synod; though it is humiliating to find these men uniting with the *Christian Magazine* in caricaturing and defaming a Court which they were bound to love and respect, and to which they had sworn subjection in the Lord. Forty members of Synod voted for the suspension of the separating brethren, and for this act of discipline, honestly and deliberately performed, in the name and presence of the great Master and Judge, the whole forty are persecuted with "bitter words,"—are represented as *designing knaves* or *willing dupes*. But, however exasperating such treatment may be, we hope those members of Synod will bear it meekly, and endeavor to cherish and cultivate the spirit of the Apostle and his injured companions—"Being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we suffer it; being defamed, we entreat." This unjust and cruel treatment, if properly improved, will lead us to a more lively perception of the *moral sufferings* of our innocent Saviour. Listen to His complaints—"They laid things to my charge, which I knew not." "He that did eat of my bread, hath lifted up his heel against me." Being placed, therefore, in somewhat similar circumstances, let us follow his example—"Who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously." Let us "avenge not ourselves, but rather give place unto wrath; for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord."

Whether it be necessary, with the view of preventing some honest, but uninformed, Seceders, from being led away from their profession, to expose the glaring falsehoods and misrepresentations which abound in the aforesaid Magazine, is a question which we are not at present prepared to solve. On this question we wait the advice of our brethren.

**ART. X. Notices.**

A. R. is received and will appear in our next.

We would direct the attention of our readers to the notice on the cover respecting **THE DISCOURSES AND BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES**, proposed to be published by Rev. J. P. Miller. This will be a work of vast interest to Seceders. Every family in our Communion, that is able to meet the expense, should be in possession of a copy of this work. It will be put to press as soon as a sufficient number of subscribers is obtained to warrant the publication. It is hoped that ministers and elders especially, will see to it, that this important work be not hindered from seeing the light from a want of due encouragement.

The exertions of our friends and patrons were perhaps never more needed in behalf of the Monitor than in the present crisis. We have a large surplus of copies from the commencement of the present vol. still on hand; together with several copies of the last (the XIV.) volume.

---

**ART. XI. Ecclesiastical Record.**

At a Meeting of the Associate Presbytery of Philadelphia, held at Baltimore on the 4th July, Mr. Joseph T. Cooper was licensed to preach the everlasting gospel; since which time he has been supplying the 2d Associate Congregation of New-York, which became vacant by the defection of their former pastor.

Mr. James Law was licensed in like manner, by the Associate Presbytery of Cambridge, on the 17th of July.

---

**Advertisement.**

**WILLIAM S. YOUNG**, No. 173 Race Street, Philadelphia, has just issued an edition of **THE WESTMINSTER CONFSSION OF FAITH**—Printed, *without alteration*, from a late and correct Edinburgh edition. The work has also been carefully read and compared with older and correct copies of the book, and every effort used to render the work as free from errors as possible.

Single copies of the Confession, neatly and substantially bound in sheep, will be sold at the reduced price of \$1 12 1-2, or \$12 per dozen.—Copies of the work on superior paper \$1 25 singly, or \$13 50 per dozen.—Fine copies, handsomely bound in calf, gilt, \$1 88—a proportionable discount made where purchased by the quantity.

As the above prices, with the view of increasing the demand, and accelerating the sale of the work, are put lower than it is believed the work was ever formerly sold at,—should any part of the edition remain on hand twelve months from the publication of the work, it is the publisher's intention to advance the price, to defray the additional expenses of keeping.

Orders for the above, or other books, will be thankfully received, and met with prompt attention.

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,  
AND  
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

SEPTEMBER, 1838.

ART. I. *Charges Delivered at the Installation of the Rev. John G. Smart, to the pastoral inspection of the Associate Presbyterian Congregation in the City of Baltimore, Md. May 2, 1838.*

DEAR BROTHER—On this occasion, so interesting to yourself and to this congregation, so solemn and important as it must be to all the parties concerned, I scarcely need declare what cannot fail to be obvious—my unfeigned embarrassment. It may well appear incongruous, that one so young in the ministry should address you, who have for so many years borne the heat and burden of the day in the Master's vineyard, on the momentous obligations devolving upon an ambassador of the Lord Jesus Christ. Gladly would I have avoided this high office. It was my desire that it should have been delivered to other more experienced and skilful hands. But in obedience to the requisition of Presbytery, which I was not at liberty to disregard, and in reliance on promised aid, I will endeavor to proceed in the work to which I have been assigned. And I do this the more cheerfully, because I have the gratifying assurance, that the word spoken derives neither authority nor efficacy from instruments, but is made powerful by the omnipotent energy of the Spirit of God—that where it is spoken according to divine appointment, though babes and sucklings, and weak, and base, and despised men be the instruments, there we have a divine warrant to look for the Holy Spirit's presence, and to expect the blessing. *For neither is he that planteth any thing, neither he that watereth, but God that giveth the increase.*

Therefore I trust you will bear with me, while I endeavor to stir up your pure mind by way of remembrance, not merely of your ordination vows, but also of those *new* duties which are now incumbent on you, in consequence of the new relation which has this day been formed between you and this people. *For thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.*

A few topics connected with the CHARACTER of the ministerial office, and the MANNER of its execution, must necessarily form the subject of address on this occasion.

I. Respecting the CHARACTER of the ministerial office. It partakes largely of that of an ambassador. "Now then," says the apostle, "we are ambassadors for Christ." A wise prince will commit this high office to none but the most prudent and trusty of his subjects, much less to an alien; and surely we are not to look to the King of Zion for a less elevated rule of procedure. Consequently this office can be rightly filled by no other than a man of prudence, one in whom confidence can be safely reposed. "O Timothy," says the apostle, "keep that which is committed to thy trust."

An ambassador represents the will, the interest, and the honor of his king in a foreign land. So with the minister of the Lord Jesus. He is under the most powerful bonds known among men to represent truly the interests of his divine Master, in the world, which, in respect to his spiritual kingdom, is also a foreign land. As an ambassador he cannot depart in any degree from his instructions. The extent of the powers conferred in his commission is clearly defined. And both the honor of his Master and the vital interests of those with whom he treats, require a rigid adherence to his instructions, and an unbending resolution in their application. Any departure from this rule will produce erroneous impressions, injurious to the Master's interests, and create hopes which can never be realized.

In a time of profound peace, the duties of an ambassador are comparatively light and unimportant. But in a time of war, involving the lives, the property, and the temporal happiness of men, those duties assume an importance and possess a thrilling interest, which ought to rouse the slumbering energies of the mind and enlist all its faculties. But, as in the case of a gospel minister, when the embassy involves a state of peace and war, affecting not the temporal but spiritual happiness of men; not the life of the body but of the immortal soul, the magnitude of these duties becomes overwhelming, and we are compelled to exclaim with the apostle, "Who is sufficient for these things?"

And such, dear brother, is the importance of the station you now occupy. You are this day commanded by the King of Zion to go into a revolted province of the empire with instructions from the court of heaven. You are the bearer of a treaty of peace from heaven. You are commissioned to treat with a people already in arms against their lawful Sovereign. Unallured by their smiles, undaunted by their frowns, cease not then to proclaim the unreasonable and horrible nature of their rebellion, together with its dreadful consequences; while you hold forth to their view, the way, the duty, and advantages of peace. *For God hath committed to us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ; as though God did beseech you by us, we pray you in Christ's stead be ye reconciled to God.*

But the ministerial office also partakes largely of the character of a steward. "Let a man so account of us as ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God." In a great house (and such is the house of God,) a steward is appointed, whose duty it is to make provision for the daily wants of all the members of the household. He must, with judgment and discretion, deal out of his master's treasures those things which are needed, which are most conducive to the health, sustenance and comfort of the family, and which it is the Master's will they should receive. And that every obstacle may be removed out of the way of his discharge of duty, the master commits to his custody the

keys of his store-house. Thus he is supposed to possess a personal and experimental knowledge both of the supplies and wants of the family, and of every individual member thereof, and to be invested with all the powers necessary for a suitable supply of those wants.

So with the minister of the gospel. Officially, the keys of the kingdom of heaven have been put into his hands, that he may unlock the store-house of divine mysteries, "mysteries of God," which are "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction and instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished for every good work." And whatever the minister binds on earth in the name and by the authority of the Master which is according to his divine will, "shall be bound in heaven." Accordingly, it is supposed that a minister is personally and experimentally acquainted with those divine mysteries which he handles; that he knows by happy experience the food which he deals out to others, to be both wholesome and nutritious; and that he dispenses to others those things only which he has himself seen and heard, and handled, and tasted of the good word of life. And not only so, the minister of the gospel, like a faithful steward, must also be acquainted with the moral constitution and habits of all the members of his charge; what degree of spiritual health and strength may be enjoyed respectively by each, that he may judge correctly as to the kind of aliment their present condition seems most to require. And for this purpose, it is incumbent on him to visit his people often; not indeed for the purpose of indulging in gossip, or pleasure, or amusement; but for religious conference and catechetical instruction. For in this way only can he show himself *a man approved of God, a workman that needs not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth, giving to each a portion in season.*

II. Respecting the MANNER in which you are to execute the duties of your high office, in the name and by the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, the judge of quick and dead, I CHARGE you,

*Take heed to yourself.* For while the sentiment that divine ordinances derive their efficacy either from the character or intention of those who dispense them, is to be rejected with abhorrence, yet in the present imperfect state of man, the moral character of a minister of the gospel exerts a powerful influence over the minds of the young and those who are only partially instructed, either for good or for evil. Such persons generally neglect or attend upon the means of grace, according to the estimate they form of their minister's character. Though this is a false standard, it has been found impossible fully to eradicate it from the minds of a large majority of gospel hearers. Neither is it desirable that a people should become indifferent on this point; their jealousy exerts a salutary influence over the ministerial character. All that is intended to be condemned is the disposition to neglect the positive commands of God, on the ground of any real or supposed defects of ministers. The vices of ministers are also injurious to the honor of the gospel, destructive to unstable souls, and grieving to the people of God. "A wicked messenger falleth into mischief; but a faithful ambassador is health." Be not then a mere candlestick, containing that light which illumines and cheers the pathway of others to glory, merely to become a cast-away when your work shall have been accomplished.

*Take heed that you give yourself wholly to the work of the ministry.* This work, totally and for ever, excludes all secular avocations, not

only as inconsistent, but incompatible with a faithful discharge of its high functions. The Master whom you serve has left nothing that pertains to your high office to be regulated either by the prudential maxims of the world or your own convenience or pleasure. He that hath called you, has also said give thyself wholly to the work. And accordingly we find that the apostles gave themselves "continually to prayer and the ministry of the word;" neither would they be diverted from their work to "serve tables." But how can a man be said to give himself wholly to this work, who gives three-fourths of his time to listless indolence, or one-half his time to those branches of science which are little more than ornamental; or to the more criminal pursuit of a light and ephemeral literature; or to the grammar school? how can that man be said to give himself wholly to this work, who devotes five or six days of the week to his farm or his merchandize; who fairly outstrips the common worldling by his side, in his eager pursuit of this world's goods? Surely it is little less than presumption to look for the spiritual growth and prosperity of the church any further than she is delivered from a secular ministry. It is futile to plead the parsimony of the people. If a man has not sufficient moral courage to throw himself upon the promise of his Master and the liberality of the christian people, it ought to be regarded as an evidence that he has not the call of God to this work. An ambitious, scheming, worldly, and temporising ministry ever has been, and ever will be a curse to the church. The parsimony of the people may be traced chiefly to the delinquency of the ministry. What inducement have the people to support a man who neglects their salvation to support himself? If the laborer be worthy of his hire, so are those who pay him worthy of that labor for which they pay. Throw yourself entirely upon the liberality of your people for a supply of your temporal wants; and if these supplies be withheld, flee to another city, shaking off the dust of your feet as a testimony against them. But let no consideration divert your attention from the constantly recurring and momentous duties of your office. The end of all things is at hand, the night approaches, the Master stands ready to receive the account of your stewardship, and reward you according to your work. *I charge thee, therefore, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and kingdom: Preach the word: be instant in season and out of season, reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine.*

*Take heed that you neither faint nor faulter in your work.*—Aim to carry a steady hand, and let nothing move you. Bonds and imprisonment awaited the great apostle of the Gentiles in every city. Innumerable perils attended his ministry; in weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst; in fastings often, in cold and nakedness; in perils both by sea and land; both by his kindred and professed brethren. You also may lay your account to meet with difficulties of no mean magnitude; such as the grace of God only can enable you to surmount. You may suffer more from the hands of false brethren than from all the combined hosts of open and avowed enemies. You may receive bitter hate from such as have avowed the most ardent love; and persecution from those who are under the strong-

---

\* Should any of your readers regard these remarks as too severe, it is to be hoped they will settle the point not with you or your correspondent, but with the Lord and his apostles.

est possible obligations to succour and support you. Such things have been, and may again take place.

But *apparent want of success* may prove even more distressing than even the malice of the wicked. You may find your most solemn warnings regarded as empty puffs of wind—your most persuasive exhortations may fall upon the ear of the “adder deaf.” And if grace prevent not, this will tempt you to speak no more in the name of Christ. In general, other men are permitted to behold something at least of the fruit of their labors; but the minister’s work is hid with his Master. The husbandman sows in hope and reaps with joy; but the minister’s reward lies concealed in the invisible world beyond the boundaries of time. Therefore, you may be compelled, to all human appearance, to plow and sow amid rocks and thorns, and in the high-ways. You may be compelled to exhibit divine mysteries only that they may excite the ridicule of fools. The awful counsels of Jehovah’s will may be listened to as they fall from your lips, as though you only repeated nursery tales “and old wives’ fables.” You may fill your mouth with arguments and your heart with hope, and secretly flatter yourself that surely sinners will now hear and believe, and return to the Lord; and yet you may find their hearts firmer than a stone, yea, harder than the nether millstone. Nay, more, they may even laugh at the tremendous threatenings of divine wrath, as Leviathan doth at the shaking of the spear. And yet you must not cease to *proclaim the whole counsel of God*; yea, *woe unto you if you preach not the gospel.*

Finally:—*Take heed that you watch for the souls of this people.*—They have this day committed to your over-sight, under Christ, the chief Shepherd, their spiritual interests. So that you may now become the happy instrument of their growth in grace, and a co-worker with God in their everlasting felicity; or, on the other hand, you may become a vile pander to their lusts and the base instrument of their eternal ruin. Not that the immutable purposes of God are dependent upon the feeble instrumentality of man; but he has connected their accomplishment with such instrumentality. Consequently, your responsibility is not in the least abated by the efficacious grace of God. Therefore, the position which you now occupy, whether it be considered in relation to your own soul, or the souls of this people, is one of commanding importance and unrivalled grandeur; and ought to rouse the best energies both of body and mind to active and unwearied exertion.

The contemplation of a wise and powerful prince whose administration elevates the character of his country, and diffuses general prosperity among all classes of the community, delights the imagination of men and calls forth rapturous applause, not only from his own subjects, but from surrounding nations. But were you entrusted with the temporal welfare of your native land—nay, more, were you entrusted with the temporal destiny of all the nations of the earth, the trust would sink into insignificance, in comparison with the immortal interests of the few precious souls in this little flock over which the Holy Ghost hath this day made you an overseer. *O son of man; I have set you a watchman unto the house of Israel; therefore thou shalt hear the word at my mouth and warn them from me. When I say unto the wicked man thou shalt surely die: If thou dost not speak to warn the wicked of his way, that wicked man shall die in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at thy hand.*

The mere man of the world reads with admiration, and perhaps with

enthusiasm, the story of the hardy chivalry, the conquests and triumphs of Roman generals, and of the great captains of modern times. The laurel crown fills the fleshy mind of the unregenerate man with supreme delight. He feels stirring within secret aspirations after similar conquests and similar triumphs. His soul pants for the grateful incense of popular applause. And if the anticipated quantum of flattery be withheld, his self-complacency is converted into malignity. And he would immolate one half of the human race upon the altar of his unholy ambition, could he but win the empty adulation of the other half. For men are not only naturally ambitious, but blood-thirsty ferocity is the most prominent trait in their character. What are those conquests and triumphs to which allusion has been made? Are they not almost uniformly conquests of the guilty over the innocent—of the strong over the weak? triumphs of the savage over the saint—and demoniac barbarism over the untold miseries of our fellow-men? How often this spirit has rent the church need not be declared to you. How much of this spirit has desolated our own section of the church in the day in which we live, or who have been, and are still, most under its influence, it becomes neither the speaker, nor the time and place to declare. The day is at hand that shall declare these things; and to that tribunal from which there is no appeal let them be referred. But by all that is holy in our profession; by all that is sacred in your office; by your hopes of glory, suffer me to warn you against the first approach of the spirit which has now been described. It will bite like a serpent and sting like an adder. Let your ambition be of a far more lofty and holy character. Cast to the winds both the censure and applause of mortal man, so far as these may be designed to influence your official conduct. Seize hold of a prize more durable than crowns of olive and gold. Aspire to that honor which cometh from God only, that you may be encompassed with a crown of glory when the mighty men of the earth are filled with unutterable anguish. So shall you be enabled to say at the close of your ministry, with the intrepid apostle of the Gentiles—*I have fought the good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but to all those also that love his coming.*

If such, then, dear brother, be your high and responsible station; if such be your reward, enter upon the work before you with lofty aims and unbending resolution. Take for your pattern in this arduous work the example of the apostle, to whom reference has been so frequently made in this address. Like him, be a man of prayer. Pray for yourself. Pray much and fervently for the salvation of this people. Like him, be a man of unwearied labor. Proclaim the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ not only publicly in this worshipping assembly, but also from house to house, "by night and by day." With meekness and lowliness of mind cease not to warn every man with tears. And above all, take for your security the covenanted faithfulness of your Lord and Master, who has said, "So I am with you always, unto the end of the world." Therefore, "make full proof of your ministry, that you may be pure from the blood of all men." And may God in his abundant mercy give you, in this place, many seals of your ministry. The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with you. Amen.

[The Charge to the People in our next.]

**ART. II. *Reflections on the Treatment of our Colored Population.***

**MR. EDITOR**—After some delay, I take pen in hand to pursue my reflections on the treatment of our colored population. It is not necessary to state what has been the cause of this delay, farther than to observe that my remarks have been the subject of some animadversions by yourself and others, and that it well became the importance of the subject and the deference which is due to the opinions of brethren, to bestow upon it the most calm and deliberate consideration. Of such criticisms and rebukes I do not complain. Such smiting will not break my head, and I shall try to convert it into a precious oil, that I may speak as becometh the oracles of the living God. Where a perfect coincidence of thought exists, there is little encouragement to attempt carrying on a traffic in ideas. It is true that in mental productions, as well as in the productions of our hands, there may be such an utter incongruity in the nature of our wares as to forbid the thought of a profitable exchange; but is not that man an object of compassion who cannot read an article in a periodical which is adverse to his sentiments, without becoming enraged, dashing the paper out of his hand, and anon directing the editor to erase his name from his subscription list? This intolerance is one of the worst features of the times, both in a political and religious point of view. In theory, we are all loud and vehement in vindicating freedom of thought, freedom of discussion, &c., but in practice too many of us appropriate this privilege to ourselves, and virtually deny it to others. This is truly an unfortunate state of the public mind, but it is not necessary at this time to make any farther reflections upon it.

That a cloud of thick darkness, darkness that may be felt, envelopes this nation as to the evils of slavery, and the proper mode of removing those evils is demonstratively plain. Public opinion is unsettled and vascillating; our public men appear to be undetermined and temporising; even men holding judicial and executive stations, have not the nerve and firmness of resolution requisite to discharge their duties with the fear of God and not the fear of man before their eyes. Church judicatures, too, shrink from the odium of standing up in defence of their own members, whose sacred rights have been violated and trampled under foot. We find the people divided into three great factions, one professing to be satisfied with the institution itself; another acknowledging it to be a great evil, but determined to let the slave-holders manage it in their own way, and at their own time; a third appear to be zealous to break the fetters of the slave, but for aught that is seen are little concerned to have him restored to the enjoyment of substantial freedom. Among this latter class there is much of uproar and confusion; many indulging in this chimeral delusive scheme, and many in that. It is doubtless true, that in this Babel of opinions and schemes, there is a remnant who are willing in this, as in all things else, to follow the heavenly mandate, do to others as you would wish others to do to you, but in the clashing of arms, and amid the shouts of contending millions, how is their feeble voice to be heard if the press is closed against them?

I find myself in a strange, though not in an altogether unexpected predicament. While I am pleading the cause of the oppressed, and urging to redoubled efforts to secure to them their long lost rights, there are those who regard me as attempting to uphold the system itself. It is not by publishing furious tirades against slave-holders that any good

is to be effected.. Such efforts will only exasperate and harden the cruel oppressor ; they may call forth a tear of pity, and a prayer for pardon from the *pious slave-holder*. Will it answer any valuable purpose in effect to tell our southern fellow-citizens that we regard them as no better than murderers, thieves, adulterers ? Is it so that every slave-holder is as guilty as though he were living in the habitual commission of such crimes ? If it were so, it might be injudicious to tell him so ; but without evidence clear as the noon day sun, it is cruel to pronounce such a sentence, a sentence which the records of the eternal world will doubtless show to be absolutely untrue. Do we expect to obtain their ear that we may calmly and deliberately reason together, while we treat them thus ? Such an expectation would be quite irrational. Why is such a charge brought against the slave-holders universally ? It is answered that every man, while he owns a slave, supports and countenances the cruel and unjust laws which uphold the system. The inference is utterly illogical and unjust. I have previously shown, if I have succeeded in establishing any thing, that it is this very class who have it in their power to exert the most efficient influence in overthrowing the whole superstructure ; and to take it as a matter not to be questioned, that because a man owns a slave, therefore he is opposed to emancipation, argues about as much goodness of heart and soundness of head, as to condemn a man to be hung without knowing the law or hearing the evidence. "Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge—ye shall be judged." Thousands there are in the free States, who are bellowing with stentorian lungs against the slave-holders, who are themselves upholding slavery tenfold more efficiently than are thousands who own slaves ; and in this very matter it is to be feared that many of us, in judging others, condemn ourselves. But more of this hereafter.

In this paper I propose addressing a few suggestions to those who regard the evil of slavery as resting entirely on the slave-holding portion of the community, and that it is out of place and dangerous to our peace and the stability of the Union, for the non-slave-holding States to meddle with it in any manner. But before entering on that part of the argument, it would be well to make a few preliminary observations explanatory of former remarks, as it is pretty evident I have been so unfortunate as not to make myself well understood. I have already intimated to you, in a private note, that I desire not controversy, nor will I engage in it, but it might seem indecorous to pass over in silence all that has been said.

No one, I assure you, would regret more than myself, to see the Religious Monitor converted into a vehicle for spreading mere party opinions on the subject of slavery, and could I for a moment believe that these essays partake of that character, they should for ever rest in oblivion. With the various societies which now agitate the country the author stands in no way connected ; their lawfulness is not denied, but so far as their action affects the subject on hand, he is ready to exclaim with the prophet of old, "I, even I only, am left." And here let me correct a misapprehension into which you appear to have fallen respecting my sentiments. It is not so that I regard slavery in this country, as so *national* in its character as to exclude individual guilt. Neither you nor your readers require to be informed that there cannot be national guilt without implicating individuals ; but there may be national guilt where all the individuals of the nation are not personally implicated ;

and all that I have contended for is, that because a person sustains the relationship of master, he is not therefore *necessarily* thus implicated. How persons become individually chargeable with national sin, is, I presume, well understood by all, and any illustration to point it out in this place might be deemed superfluous. It may not, however, be amiss to notice, that national sins are contracted by the controlling power of the commonwealth, be that controlling power in the hands of few or in the hands of many; and individuals become responsible as such, when they lend their aid to sustain the State in its iniquitous course, or when they fail to put in requisition all the talents committed to them to arrest it in its mad career.

As to the Bible contending slavery, I freely adopt the sentiment of your correspondent, Ego, who gives evidence that he is disposed to make no unnecessary concession in favor of slave-holders. The Bible, indeed, only *tolerates* it: and is there not the same valid reasons for tolerating it now, that there was when the gospel was promulgated? Is not the government of this country, so far as this matter is involved, as completely heathen as were ever that of Rome? Is not the gospel to be preached in every pagan country under the sun—and will there not still exist as valid and sound reasons why slavery should be *tolerated*, as ever existed while the vilest brute that ever disgraced a throne, swayed an imperial sceptre over the Roman world? I have said the Bible is the great charter of our civil as well as religious liberty, and that if its doctrines were faithfully preached, and its precepts punctually practiced, it would prostrate every species of tyranny in the dust, and erect freedom and virtue in its stead. It is the duty of the christian to love his neighbor as himself, and so far as this grace is manifested actively, it displays itself particularly in two ways, that of rejoicing with those that rejoice, and weeping with those that weep. If a christian be a master, his duty will be that of alleviation; his endeavors will be directed to making the condition of his servants more tolerable than the State has made it—to make it as *tolerable* as the circumstance over which he has no control will permit.

It is true indeed, that if slavery be essentially in its nature immoral, then the relationship of master cannot be lawfully sustained, any more than theft can be committed with impunity. Here, I doubt not, is the radical point where we differ, and since you have requested me to give my sentiments in reference to what the non-slave-holding States ought to do in the present emergency, a few remarks would not be out of place on that topic. Indeed, we cannot satisfactorily, or with hope of success, point out what is duty in this case, without first ascertaining with precision the ground on which we stand, how far we are chargeable with guilt, how far our rightful authority extends—what we have done to free ourselves from guilt contracted, and what we can yet do to accomplish that desirable end. Is not this a purpose which coincides precisely with the high aims and holy designs of your publication? But as it seems to be interdicted ground to agree that slavery is not essentially in its nature immoral, I shall, for the present, wave that part of the argument, and only say a few words by way of correcting one or two errors which appear to prevail to some extent, trusting, however, that should occasion so require, you will not refuse me the privilege of giving my views more fully on some future occasion.

That the giving of directions for properly discharging the duties of

any relationship is equivalent to an acknowledgment of the lawfulness of that relationship, is a maxim which I thought was universally admitted to be founded upon a basis of unquestionable solidity. Immoralities may be considered as consisting of two classes:—The first are such as are opposed to the nature and perfections of the Divine Being; the other, such as are opposed to his positive precepts. With respect to the first, God can no more give his sanction to them than he can deny himself. Amongst men, would we not be disposed to regard that legislator as worse than crazy, if he were to declare the unprovoked taking of human life a heinous crime, and at the same time direct that whoever killed a man should not use a club, or a butcher knife, but should shoot him *honorably* and decently in the head with a pocket pistol? Shall we charge upon Infinite Wisdom what would be regarded as folly and wickedness among men? The proof brought from the liberty granted to divorce wives, and to marry more wives than one, in support of the position that the Divine Lawgiver may give directions for properly discharging the duties of a relation which is not lawful in itself, will not avail, until it is shown that these are immoralities of the first class, which it is presumed will not be attempted. That they are immoralities of the second class is admitted, but this can prove nothing in reference to slavery, until it is shown that the particular directions given concerning it have been revoked.

An Abolitionist answers the enquiry, how did it happen that we have no account of slavery in the scripture catalogues of sins, by saying that though slavery is not named, the fruits of it are condemned, which he considers equivalent to condemning it. To this it may be proper to reply, that the condemning of results is not the scripture method of reproving sin, and at any rate, he begs the question—takes for granted the very matter in dispute, attributes to slavery as *necessary* consequents, tyranny, oppression, adultery, &c. &c. That it does bring forth such fruits to a lamentable extent in our country, has been fully admitted, but does it do so in all cases? This would doubtless be saying too much. Perhaps the most bitter cup which man is called upon to drink is mingled by the marriage relation, yet who will say that this relation is an unlawful one? Far, however, be it from me to put the two on the same footing. It would be an easy task to answer all opposing arguments that I have seen, but I promised not to wield the sword of a controversialist. I must, however, bespeak the patience of the reader while I notice one or two other points in order to be faintly understood.

The same writer thinks it strange that I should speak of a lordly peer as wearing a badge that marks him a slave. This perhaps requires a word of explanation. If the reader will attend to the drift of the remarks made, he will not fail to discover that the intention of the writer was to show, that man, in his natural condition, is at the same time a wicked tyrant and an abject slave, and not to insist that the lordly peer is precisely in the same condition of an African slave. It might be well here to attempt the correction of a destructive and prevailing delusion. We often hear even divines speaking of natural rights, natural liberty, &c., as if *nature* constituted mankind *freemen*. This *naturalism*, if you will grant me the liberty of making a word, they are careful to confine to things temporal; of things spiritual they tell us the ruin is universal and complete. Why the distinction is made is more than I can tell. If strict inquiry be made, it will probably be found that man's claims to

rights and privileges have been forfeited about as much in one case as in the other. The truth is, there are no freemen but those who are made free in Christ Jesus, and to speak of *natural liberty*, *natural freedom*, savors more of vain philosophy than of gospel truth. It is in fact a scion which has been transplanted from infidel schools into gospel seminaries. Even grave divines of eminent attainments, hesitate not to tell us that virtue, that morality, that a change of our nature, is not necessary to the maintenance of our civil and religious liberty; that *intelligence* alone will instruct every man to understand what belongs to himself, and of course he will not suffer others to despoil him. To see that this is sophistical reasoning requires but a glance of the eye, it is however the legitimate offspring of that natural liberty which we so often hear spoken of.

What is the difference betwixt natural liberty and the liberty wherewith we are made free in Christ Jesus? Simply this, which is indeed an essential difference, natural liberty as clearly indicated by the sentiment cited above, teaches men to defend themselves on selfish principles, but does not restrain them from invading the rights of others; on the contrary, that liberty which flows from the renewal of the heart, teaches us to preserve the rights of others as we preserve our own. Not only so, but it is the christians daily prayer, his daily effort to extend and enlarge this empire of liberty, to bring more and more to a knowledge and enjoyment of it. He fears no competitor, he dreads no rival. Emulation there may be—but it is that emulation which rejoices in the success of an antagonist, if I may be allowed so to express myself. Here there is no room for narrow selfishness. If there be selfishness in it, it is that holy selfishness which reaches beyond the grave, but finds no resting place amidst things terrestrial. Such a principle, universally adopted and maintained, would secure our civil and religious freedom throughout all coming generations. Not so with natural liberty. This is entirely selfish, and of course must lead to endless combinations, strifes, and contentions. Our demagogues are perpetually sounding in our ears as a sage maxim, that the price of our liberty is eternal watchfulness, in other words, that it is a source of perpetual distrust and jealousy which sufficiently indicates its nature and origin.

How often do we hear infidels (and saints too, often join with them,) rapturously eulogising Greece and Rome, as samples worthy of imitation. There, it would seem, natural liberty was enjoyed at least for a season in the utmost perfection. Greece and Rome free! If ever there existed on earth an associate band of cruel and unrelenting despotic tyrants, these are the places where we will find them. The meed of praise which is due these people for their excellencies in various walks of life, is not denied them; but to hold them up as models of freemen to the youth of our country, is a piece of wickedness and folly which demands a stern rebuke. They had indeed a systematic organization in their tyranny—so have a band of robbers, and for the very same reason—that they may plunder those around them the more effectually. Look at their insatiable ambition in conquering and subjecting to their iron rule all neighboring nations; look at their horrid treatment of captives; look at their ingratitude to their best benefactors; look at the fiend-like treatment of their slaves. In short, what were they but polished savages? What then is the native inference? It is that there is no source of real substantial liberty except in connection with cove-

nant mercies; nor is there any security for the permanency of our civil and religious institutions or the extension of genuine freedom, except in the prevalence of christian principles. To suffer the invasion of our own rights rather than to invade the rights of others, is a principle unknown to nature and is peculiar to the gospel.

The error of those who oppose the view here taken of the subject of slavery, is, that they do not discriminate accurately betwixt the case of the man who conscientiously endeavors to discharge the relative duties of master according to the divine law, and the man who tyrannizes over and oppresses those who are subject to his will. It surely is not necessary that more should be said to manifest my loathing and abhorrence of slavery, as generally practised in our country—but are there not noble exceptions? Indiscriminate condemnation of whole communities is never generous, indeed, it may with propriety be affirmed, *it is never just*. Only establish the position that a person cannot sustain the relationship of master without being an oppressor, and the controversy must for ever cease. Perhaps it may be insisted that the man who gives to another that which is just and equal, cannot in any proper sense be regarded as his master, notwithstanding the law of the land may declare him to be such. To such a position no exception need be taken, only that it is an inaccurate use of language.

Hitherto I have forbore to speak directly of the action of the Associate Synod on the subject of slavery. I hope no apology need be offered for suggesting a few scruples as to the lawfulness and propriety of what they have done. If a person were asked to point out the most appalling circumstances attending the traffic which is carried on in slaves in our country, would he not naturally advert to the rending asunder the tenderest ties known to us as social beings? It may sound strange in the ears of many, but it is nevertheless a fact that there are some, perhaps not a few, who cannot see but what this very charge may with truth be brought against the action of our church on the subject of slave-holding.

Let us, for a practical test of the matter, refer to a case, not an extraordinary case, but one which may frequently occur in the ordinary exercise of church discipline. A— B—, of Va., owns a slave who is married to a girl the property of C— D—, a neighboring farmer, by whom he has several children—both master and slave are members of our communion. A— B— applies for sealing ordinances, but the church officers, as they deem themselves in duty bound, propound the question, "Are you a slave-holder?" The applicant answers in the affirmative, with an accompanying assurance that he endeavors to discharge the duties of master according to gospel rules and directions; he permits him to cultivate a portion of his land, for which he charges him no higher rent than is customary; for extra labor he gives him usual wages, and for articles sold him he exacts no exorbitant prices. As to his spiritual concerns, he treats him as a brother, gives him what instruction he is capable of imparting, forbears threatening, and allows him to worship God without constraint. His plea is not regarded as valid, and is informed that as a subordinate court, they possess no discretion—that their duty is imperative, and that until he ceases to sustain the relationship of *master*, he must not expect to obtain the privileges which he is seeking.

A— B—, with a heavy heart and troubled spirit, seeks his slave and informs him of the difficulties which surround him; no alternative being left but to cease to be his master, or cease to avouch to the world that he himself is a servant of the Most High. With a flood of tears and a bursting heart, the slave implores him not to forsake him, and reminds him that if he lets him free, he can find no resting place for the sole of his foot within the bounds of the slave-holding States, and that he would be in danger of being kidnapped or mobbed, and fettered in cruel bondage, where he would never again hear his Saviour's name but in curses and imprecations; and that if he ever should reach a free State, he would be required to give security for his maintenance, good behaviour, &c. or comply with some other requisitions equally unjust and oppressive. He tells him, too, that he cannot, he must not leave him; that his wife is united to him by as tender ties as that of the white man; that the Lord of heaven hath said; that which God hath joined together let not man put asunder. In language which a fond husband will understand, he exclaims, How can I, how dare I voluntarily take an everlasting farewell of that being who is my solace in this world of tears, and who is dearer to me than liberty or life itself? Must I be a willing instrument in breaking that heart which I have sworn before God and man I would love, cherish and protect? My children, too! though I am denied a parent's rights, I feel all the yearnings of a father's heart.

The pleadings of humanity, the pleadings of nature, the pleadings of religion, are all to no purpose; the slave must be emancipated. His wife and children are the property of those over whom the church has no control, and who care for none of these things, and of course they must be deserted. Need I attempt to describe that which is indescribable, the writhing agony of a widowed heart, not widowed by the fiat of Him who gave the husband, and who has an unquestionable right to take him, but widowed by cruel man, and done too under the sanctity of that religion which proclaims peace from heaven and good will to men?

Shall we follow the poor banished, ignorant, friendless African, in his wanderings? Unused to the ways of men, he is the sport of fortune, the dupe of knaves, and a nuisance to all. It would not be strange if he should finally become a slave to his own lusts, and end his days in the grog shop or the brothel. At whose hands will his soul be required? But let the curtain drop. Sure, if angels weep they shed bitter tears, when they behold saints at such a work as this!

My brethren, is this a dream, is it a fancy sketch, have I been on imagination's wing, soaring through chaotic regions, contemplating unsubstantial fantastic beings whom God neither made nor governs? Ah, no! we have been contemplating the sad realities which "flesh and blood is heir to," and gravely justified as founded on the word of God. Yes, we are told, solemnly told, that we must do our duty and leave consequences with Him who seeth the end from the beginning. We are told that, sustaining the relationship of master, is no better than stealing or killing, or living in adultery, and, of course, we have no choice, but must abandon the God dishonoring sin, be the result what it may. We are told that to free the slave is *our* duty, and that if the consequences depicted follow, sin lies at the door of the State, and not at our door. Poor consolation, truly, to the unhappy sufferer!

It is true, that rather than break God's law, we ought to be ready to

suffer such persecution, to cut off right hands and cast out right eyes, but in this case we are called upon to make no sacrifice, and yet by our act innocent persons are involved in crime, in suffering, in woe intolerable. Has any advocate of such doctrines ever made the case his own, and seriously pondered whether such a plea would avail at the bar of final accounts? Who seriously believes that Nero, scape goat-like, will bear the sins of a similar case if any such took place in his day, to the acquittal of the parties immediately concerned?—But why pursue the melancholy subject farther? I am sick at heart, and must close by asking the editor's and the reader's pardon for so far extending preliminary observations to the exclusion of the matter intended. God willing, I may be heard from again.

A. R.

---

ART. III. *A Memorial to the Committee of the Edinburgh Bible Society, concerning the use of the Scriptures in teaching children to read*—By the Rev. GEO. PAXTON.

Our native country has been long distinguished among Christian nations, by considerable attainments in religious knowledge, and by a steady sobriety and firm adherence to the truth. These attainments have not been confined to the higher and better educated classes; they are to be found in the lower ranks of the community, enlightening the mind, elevating the sentiments and adorning the conduct of the laboring poor; and I am not sensible of yielding to a natural, and, I trust, pardonable partiality, when I venture to assert, that a more generally intelligent, sober and industrious people, is no where to be found. These enviable distinctions your memorialist is disposed to ascribe in part to a custom very ancient in this country, and perhaps universally practised till within the last twenty or thirty years, of teaching the children to read the scriptures from their tenderest age. The scriptures, or a part of the scriptures, as introductory to a more extensive perusal of them, was in all, or in almost all our public schools, put into the hands of children very soon after they had acquired their letters. In fact, the Bible was almost the only school-book in use. The minds of children were, by this method of teaching, stored with biblical knowledge from their earliest years. The facts upon which our holy religion is founded, the precepts which it inculcates, the doctrines which it reveals, the life and immortality which it brings to light, were presented to the mind in its most susceptible and ductile state; were imperceptibly, gradually and indelibly stamped upon the memory, wrought into the understanding and judgment, and mingled with the best feelings of the heart. An internal and valuable treasure of divine truths, and moral precepts, was thus provided for the time when reflection begins to fix and conscience to overawe the mind, and the stripling approaches to the active scenes of life. For many years past, however, this wise and beneficial plan of education has been too generally discountenanced, especially by persons of better circumstances and superior education: and the natural consequence has followed; the time allotted to the reading of the scriptures in public schools, both parochial and others, has been unduly abridged; while in the more fashionable seminaries, it has been almost

entirely appropriated to books of a different character and tendency. The Old and New Testaments have been supplanted by collections of different kinds, in which the truth and morality of Revelation occupy a very disproportionate place; in which false views of life and manners are not uncommonly given; and dangerous principles of action, to say the least, indirectly recommended.

Our children are often taught from Cato, to regard suicide as a lawful remedy for the severer calamities of life, and, in common conversation, to be every now and then irreverently addressing the Heavens for mercy or favor:—from Shakespeare and other writers of the same class, to adopt the dashing language, and the ambiguous or impure sentiments of the corrupt and vicious; to embellish their sentences with oaths and curses; to admire and cherish the precious and manly virtues of pride, wrath, revenge, and others of the kind:—from Pope's universal prayer, to consider the worship of a benighted savage, or idolatrous heathen, as of equal purity and value with the homage of a genuine christian, as equally acceptable to God and beneficial to man; and to address the majesty of heaven without any respect to the only Mediator between God and our fallen race:—from Douglass, to covet renown as the highest and noblest end of human existence, and to insult the living God by a mock address to his throne. The greater part of the stories and anecdotes with which collections for the use of schools are filled, are evidently meant to operate chiefly upon the affections, to rouse and agitate the feelings of the susceptible and inexperienced mind, while the understanding is neither enlightened, nor the heart sustained and regulated by solid principles. The consequence is, that minds of a more delicate texture, are exposed to the ravages of a morbid sensibility, one of the most grievous affections to which the human bosom is liable; meanwhile, those of a firmer character are filled with romantic ideas which are even dangerous to the peace of the individual, and the comfort of the circle in which he moves; or they are inclined to the study and practice of virtue, but without respect to christian principles, the only foundation on which the sublime and beautiful structure of genuine virtue can be raised; or to christian motives, by which only the christian disposition of the heart can be excited with greatest glory to God and advantage to man. With the Holy Scriptures as a mere school-book, such collections are not worthy to be compared. All the benefits which the latter are supposed to contain, the former supply in greater perfection, and with safety.

The Bible can agitate the bosom and awaken the finest sensibilities of our nature, without perverting the understanding or misleading the heart. The Bible can raise the tone of feeling, purify and elevate the sentiments, and impart energy to the character, without producing by its own proper influence one extravagant or romantic idea, or generating pride, fierceness, revenge, or any other of the vicious dispositions which enter into the composition of what the world approvingly calls a high and lofty spirit. No book contains so great a mass of important historical information, in so small a space, as the Bible; information in which we are so deeply interested, and details so richly fraught with lessons of genuine wisdom and prudence. The specimens which the word of God contains in every species of fine writing, are equally numerous and beautiful. Is it desirable to present the tyro with a model of historical description, where shall a more perfect one be found than the history of Joseph, (which is only one out of many in the scrip-

tures,) from the pen of Moses? simple without meanness, minute without prolixity, it possesses a charm which we shall look for in vain in the narrative of the greatest uninspired masters, ancient or modern.

If the rules of art are little regarded, the rules of nature are so closely followed, that the unbiassed reader immediately forgets the difference of time and place; he becomes one of the party, and hears, and sees, and participates in all that passes, with a liveliness and interest little inferior to that which is felt in real life. Is it wished to display the innocent simplicity of rural life? Can a more beautiful and affecting story be chosen for this purpose than the story, where amiable simplicity of manners, endearing sentiments of conjugal affection, singular filial attachments, maternal tenderness and care, dignified generosity, chastened and refined by the habitual fear and love of God, and an accurate and lively statement of local customs and manners are equally conspicuous? Is the opening mind to be entertained, warmed and elevated with the effusion of poetic genius? What lyric composition may be compared with the song of Moses at the Red sea? and the odes of David, Asaph and Heman?—What elegiac strains, with the lamentations of David, on the death of Saul and Jonathan, or of Jeremiah, over the ruins of his country? What strains so lofty or so beautiful, as those of Isaiah, or so sublime as the prayer of Habakkuk? Or if dramatic writing be necessary to awaken the finer sensibilities of our nature; to exercise and invigorate the understanding, and to engage or agitate the heart, the christian teacher need not go to the astonishing productions of Shakespeare, or any other writer for the stage, where every flower conceals a thorn. The book of Job contains a drama, which mere human genius in its happiest mood will attempt to imitate in vain. Into the long agitated question, whether the book is a real history, or partly real and partly parabolic, I need not enter; which ever way it is decided, the effect on my argument is the same. The book is still in the form of a drama, and stands unrivalled among compositions of this kind, for characteristic and spirited dialogue, animated sentiment, beautiful description, and genuine sublimity, closed with a scene to which we have nothing comparable in the writings of dramatic poets; where, clothed in what may be called terrible sublimity, Jehovah himself descends to become the speaker, and to challenge his own afflicted creature to answer. Is it necessary to exercise the youthful mind on pieces distinguished for close and logical argument? The writings of Paul, and in particular his Epistle to the Romans, are well adapted for that end. Or, is it necessary to give him a specimen of the highest order of reasoning, and argument and intercession? I would venture to affirm without the fear of being contradicted by any competent judge, that the patriarch Judah, in his address to Joseph in behalf of Benjamin, for the sagacious choice of the most powerful and affecting arguments of which the subject would admit, and the artful management of them never has been surpassed by any pleader in ancient or modern times. Were it the object of a teacher to give his pupils profound views of human nature in its present state, and of the workings of the human heart in almost every situation, accompanied with the best maxims of wisdom and prudence, for the conduct of life, these he will find displayed in the most easy and perspicuous language in the writings of Solomon. It was justly asserted by Sir William Jones, one of the most accomplished men and greatest scholars of his age, that the Bible contains a greater quantity of elegant writing, of beautiful and

sublime composition than any other book of the same size. I am happy to support my sentiments by the testimony of another eminent writer, Dr. Olinthus Gregory, who, in his evidences of the christian religion, replies to an objection of the infidel, that the Bible is a tasteless, insipid, inelegant, uninteresting book, composed always in a dull heavy style, by asking "Where else can be found such wonderful and varied specimens of sublimity, as in the fifth chapter of Judges, the fourth, twenty-sixth, and thirty-seventh chapters of Job, the twenty-ninth, hundred and fourth, hundred and seventh, and hundred and thirty-ninth Psalms, several portions of Isaiah and Ezekiel, and the first chapter of the Apocalypse? Taking them even as they appear, under the disadvantage of a translation, I will venture to affirm, that nothing can be found in Homer, Virgil, Shakspeare or Milton, that will bear comparison with most of them in point of splendor, majesty or grandeur.

"Where again will you find such interesting stories, so artlessly yet often so pathetically told as those of Jacob and Rachel, of Joseph and his brethren, of the Death of Jacob, of the widow of Zarephath's and of the Shunamite's sons, and of Naomi and Ruth? Where will you find more genuine touches of nature, more delightful pictures of the effects of friendship and sympathy, than those in the eleventh and fourteenth chapters of John's Gospel and the twentieth of the Acts? Be assured that those who lay by the Bible under the notion of its being dull, dry, and uninteresting, deceive themselves most miserably, and thereby deprive themselves of the highest intellectual delight.

"This most excellent of all books, besides being of the highest authority in its historical portions, and of invaluable utility as furnishing the only consistent and practicable scheme of morality, contains very much that is superlatively adapted to gratify the finest mental taste. It enters more sagaciously and more deeply into human nature; it develops character, delineates manners, charms the imagination, and warms the heart more effectually than any book extant; and if once a person would take it into his hand, without the strange unreasonable idea of its flatness, and be only not unwilling to be pleased, I doubt not that he would find all his favorite authors dwindle in the comparison, and soon perceive that he was not merely reading the most religious but the most entertaining book in the world." Such is the spontaneous testimony of Olinthus, a layman, and one of the ablest philosophers of the present day.

No book, therefore, considered merely as a school-book, is better adapted (perhaps none so well) to enlighten the understanding, to invigorate the mind, to elevate and refine the sentiments, to form the taste for every elegance of composition than the Bible. And if a teacher wish to initiate his pupils in pure and correct English, our authorised translation, in this respect, far excels any other book of the same size. Our translation of the scriptures is in fact a standard book, and the best standard we have of the English language. In its fitness to produce all the effects on which the more genteel part of community sets so high a value, the Bible as a mere school-book surpasses all others. But if to these we add the salutary, and above all, the saving impressions which it may produce even on the mind of a child, it is infinitely preferable. It may be difficult to determine how early such impressions may be made on the tender mind by means of the scriptures, but the heart of a child seems to be capable of receiving them, as soon as reason begins to act, and the judgment to open. I willingly avail myself once more

of the authority of Dr. Gregory :—Through the blessing of God upon early instruction, the seeds of grace have been sown in the hearts of many during infancy. God ordains strength out of the mouths of babes and sucklings, and enables them to give evidence, at six or seven years of age, that their hearts are principally fixed on Christ and divine things.”

The benefit even of common impressions is incalculable. They have been known to stamp a character of decency and sobriety, if not of religion, on the whole life, or to pursue the apostate and transgressor through the intricate paths of wickedness for many years, and when other means of reformation failed, to seize him on the very brink of perdition and compel him to the right for peace. If a collection be necessary in the art of teaching, as modern practice seems to say, one might be formed for the most part of extracts from the scriptures equally interesting as those which are in high repute, with the pre-eminent advantage of teaching no doctrine and inculcating no moral precept which can pervert the understanding or mislead the conduct. The same idea has occurred to others, and I am happy to quote in its support the deliberate opinion of the Board of Education in Ireland, consisting of prelates, clergymen, and eminent laymen, couched in the following clear and pointed terms : “In the selection of books for the new schools, we doubt not but it will be found practicable to introduce not only a number of books, in which moral principles will be inculcated in such a manner as is likely to make deep and lasting impressions on the youthful mind ; but also to employ extracts from the sacred scriptures themselves, *an early acquaintance with which we deem of the utmost importance and indeed indispensable in forming the mind to just notions of duty and sound principles of conduct.*”

“It appears to us,” continues the Board, “that a selection may be made in which the most important parts of sacred history shall be included, together with all the precepts of morality, and all the instructive examples by which its precepts are illustrated and confirmed, and which shall not be liable to any of the objections which have been made to the use of the scriptures in the course of education. The study of such a volume of extracts of the sacred writings, would, in our opinion, form the best preparation for that more particular religious instruction, which it would be the duty, and we doubt not, the inclination also, of the several ministers of religion to give, at proper times and in other places, to the children of their respective congregations.”

My ideas on this subject are farther confirmed by the practice of the Lancasterian schools, in which, if I am rightly informed, the Bible is the principal school-book. In these schools indeed, only the children of the poorest class are taught ; but I should think the school-book which so many wise and good men, as the directors of these schools can boast of, judge to be so necessary, yea, indispensably necessary, in forming the mind to just notions of duty and sound principles of conduct, would be not less beneficial to the children of the rich, and not less requisite in forming their minds. If any thing more were necessary to give weight to these opinions, I might quote the example of the society for the support of Gaelic schools, whose rule is to teach a collection chiefly of scripture extracts, the Psalm Book, the Testament and the Bible. The happy effects of this mode of teaching are stated by one of their school-masters in the Isle of Sky, in these words :—“I am convinced that the teaching of the Holy Scriptures has done a great deal

of good in this place, both to old and young, especially to boys, who used to play on the Lord's day and trifle away the precious time in wicked practices. I see plainly that they are now of a different disposition, and they constantly read their book on the Lord's day." The advantage of such a plan of education is evident, too, from the pointed condemnation of infidels, who know well the consequences to their system, from an early and intimate acquaintance with the scriptures. No man was more aware of them than David Hume, who in some part of his writings loudly condemns the practice (which had not fallen into such disuse in his time) of initiating children in the principles of the christian religion, because it makes early impressions on their minds, and prejudices them against the doctrines of his school. Should it be objected that it is a tedious way of instructing children to read, I answer—The very reverse is the case. In the Gaelic school to which I have just referred, many children and adults who knew not one letter when they entered the school, commonly read the Old and New Testament distinctly in four or five months; a degree of progress which I suspect is seldom witnessed in those schools where the pupils are dragged through a whole library of Readings made Easy, Introductions and Collections.

Or should it be objected that by confining children to the scriptures, they will leave school unacquainted with many words which will afterwards occur—the answer is easy. He who can read the Bible fluently, will find little or no difficulty in reading any other book in the language. But it is not proposed to confine children entirely to the scriptures, though it perhaps might contribute not a little to their real advantage if they were, but only to claim for the sacred writings, that portion of time and degree of attention in the education of youth to which, from considerations both of true religion and sound policy, they are fairly entitled. One lesson every day in some good historical abridgment or judicious collection, will, it is presumed, soon render a pupil familiar with any common English term, while it will secure to him any other advantage which can reasonably be expected from books of that description.

It is the object of the Bible Society, if I do not greatly mistake, with the circulation of the scriptures, to encourage the reading of them. To use our collective and individual interest to restore the scriptures to the rank they are entitled to hold in the number of school-books, in all schools to which we have access, or where we have influence, seems to me perfectly consistent with the design of our institution, and would, if successful, prove, by the blessing of God, of great benefit to the community through all its gradations, and I submit it to the meeting whether it would not be proper to enter a formal resolution to that purpose on our minutes; whether it might not also be recommended to other Bible Societies in Scotland, both auxiliary and independent, to adopt the same resolution; and whether the attention of the parent society might not also be called to it, that they may exert their powerful influence both at home and abroad, to have the Bible introduced as a principal school-book in every seminary for the instruction of children and youth.

Now that the paramount value of the scriptures begins once more to be generally acknowledged; that fashion herself begins to look with complacency on the Bible, and to venture a word or two in its praise; and that it is no longer counted a shame for persons even of the high-

est rank to appear openly in its favor, the intended change, it is presumed, may be introduced where it is needed with greater ease and success. Those parents and guardians of youth that subscribe to the Bible Societies, it is to be expected, will come readily into the measure, and have their children or pupils taught by their own express desire in the manner proposed. Others may be induced to follow their example, and thus, in a short time, the sacred scriptures will be daily read in every school throughout the empire. The rising generation will, by this means, be early imbued with the doctrines and precepts of inspiration, by whose influence they may be defended from the lighter but not uncriminal follies of youth; and may merge into active life well stored with sound principles of moral and religious conduct, may prove an ornament to their christian profession, a comfort to their relations, a blessing to their country, and may more than supply our place in circulating the word of God and diffusing the knowledge of the true religion, when our labors shall be closed and we shall sleep with our fathers.

*Remarks by the Transcriber.*

He now sleeps with his fathers, and his labors are closed, but this happy anticipated result has not followed. The age had not a relish for the sound sentiments of this memorial; and they would therefore have extended their influence a very short distance in community, had there been no other opposition; but since it was written, the world has been inundated with novels of all descriptions, and especially from the pen of Sir Walter Scott, and the community has opened its mouth and drank them in. This, in my solemn conviction, has removed the reading taste as far off from the Bible as hell is from Heaven. It seems vain to speak on this subject to any. For *Seceders*, who profess to be standing alone for the attainments of the reformation, have been known to declare, "*That religious instruction has nothing to do in the day school.*"

"How is the gold become dim." One of the General Assemblies of the second reforming period, ordained in substance the very resolution proposed by Mr. Paxton, and gave it in charge to the Presbyteries to see it executed. You cry persecution when the Roman Catholic Bishop prohibits the reading of the Bible, and argument of every weight and variety is poured forth upon him to prove that God gave it to be read—that the reading of it is indispensable to the well-being of the common people—and that he is Anti-christ for hindering it—but you, of your own accord, train up your children to do *almost* without it! Six days out of seven *altogether*, and the seventh *almost*! While you continue this [training, your forming of Protestant Associations, erecting of presses, and holding public debates to save the country from Popery, is of little use, and of less consistency. You foster a Popery of your own within the citidel of liberty, fence it round by science and civilization, and varnish it over with Protestant forms, less visible indeed, but not less deadly to experimental religion. The Waldenses were not more remarkable for their stern and successful opposition to Popery, than for their constant diligence in reading the scriptures from their very childhood. Even during their meals one of the family read the scriptures. An Inquisitor gives testimony to this effect, "That a boy of ten years of age possessed a knowledge of the scriptures which would have put some of their own doctors to the blush." The most deadly thrust that Wickliff gave to Popery in England, was by translating the scriptures

into their mother tongue. The astonishing success of the reformers is to be imputed to this as a means more than any thing else, that they enabled the people to read in their own tongue the wonderful works of God, which they did with great avidity. And until the same spirit returns for "searching the scriptures daily," we shall look in vain for any effectual bar to the encroachments of Popery. You say there are a multitude of difficulties in the way. You would be singular—You cannot raise a school or get a teacher to teach the scriptures at that rate—Your children *must* be taught other branches, &c. Did you truly realize in your heart that importance of the scriptures which you *profess to believe*, you would at once say, "though there be a lion in the streets," my children *must* be taught the scriptures.

---

#### ART. IV. Ministerial Flattery.

"If people knew how discouraging it is to ministers to preach to vacant pews, the pernicious and sinful practice here referred to [absence from public worship] would soon be banished from our churches."—*Charge to the people by the Rev. H. A. Boardman, at the installation of the Rev. J. H. Jones. (See Presbyterian of July 7, 1698.)*

It appears to me this sentiment requires a passing notice, because it is incorrect, as to matter of fact; because it places moral obligation on a false basis; because it comes from a source to which the public mind is at present directed for orthodox sentiments, especially since the late division of the General Assembly; for Mr. Boardman belongs to the old school party; and because there is abundant reason to believe that a great proportion of professing christians, and those too, who call themselves Protestants, are building their supposed obedience to God on a foundation no higher than that which is expressed in this extract.

It is no pleasant task to notice any thing of this kind, especially as the Rev. gentleman is wholly unknown to me, any further than the testimony of *common fame* may be credited, which is altogether in his favor; neither have I the least doubt, but that Mr. B.'s *real* views correspond nearly with my own on the subject in question. For the sentiment conveyed in his words has been uniformly condemned by all sound Protestant writers. But this only imposes an additional necessity for the application of a corrective. For error must be in the nature of things most dangerous when propagated by those who are reputed sound. And there can be but little doubt that most of the heresies which have afflicted the church have crept in through the loose manner in which many who are in the main orthodox express themselves, and their still more reprehensible manner of *holding* or maintaining those truths which they believe and profess. But I have said

1. That the sentiment is incorrect, as to matter of fact. No doubt many people are influenced by common courtesy towards their minister, among other equally frivolous reasons, to attend the preaching of the gospel occasionally, all other things being in their estimation convenient. But many people know and talk of the ministers discouragement on account of being compelled "to preach to empty pews," who manifest no disposition to remove the evil by their personal presence;

and by far the greater proportion rejoice that it is so. They have as little regard for the minister's feelings as for the authority of God.

2. It places moral obligation on a false basis, viz: regard to men. The scriptures are full of directions, admonitions and warnings on this point. The apostle Paul labors in all his epistles to drive men away from this natural but fatal disposition. He would have the faith of christians stand not in the "wisdom of men;" but in the "power of God." Let the reader peruse attentively the second chapter of his first epistle to the Corinthians throughout. And it was also a heavy charge brought against Israel of old, that their fear of God was taught by the precept of men. (Isaiah xxix. 13.) And it is a principle lying at the foundation of christianity, that the will of God authoritatively expressed in the scriptures, is the only formal binding and efficient rule of all religious worship and all acceptable obedience. (Deut. xxviii. 58.) "If thou wilt not observe to do all the words of this law, that are written in this book, that thou mayest fear this glorious and fearful name **THE LORD THY GOD**; then the Lord shall make thy plagues wonderful," &c. (See also Matt. xv. 9.) Therefore attendance on divine ordinances merely from a regard to a minister, or any thing about him, except the gospel message, is itself an act of rebellion.

3. It has a striking resemblance to Popery. It does not indeed formally set up priestly authority as the rule of faith; but goes very far in the way of substituting a minister's feelings in the place of divine authority.

4. It is a specimen of that flattery of the people which has become so prevalent that it is looked for as a matter of course; and unless a sermon be well spiced with it, the preacher is uninteresting; but which has caused incalculable mischief to religion. Under such preaching the young acquire a vitiated taste and a false standard of duty; the old are not edified; and sensible men retire with disgust. Or it is a kind of *billing and cooing*, for we know not what else to call it, with the dear people, who are treated like spoiled children who will not bear to be told their duty; but who are nevertheless simple enough to be inveigled into the path of duty, so far at least, as to yield an outward respect to religion, by holding a pew and attending occasionally on the forenoon of the sabbath (the afternoon being devoted to pleasure or amusement) lest their dear minister should be discouraged by preaching "to vacant pews." And thus they are cajoled into just religion enough to keep up a splendid show to the world, and aggravate their own condemnation. But infidelity looks through the flimsy veil and is abundantly gratified; the intelligent and truly pious are grieved; and no body is affected except children and the weaker sort of females.

5. It may be regarded as a slight specimen of one of those little but almost innumerable ways in which men preach themselves instead of Christ Jesus the Lord. When a minister makes loud professions of attachment to the people, or speaks of himself even in an indirect way, from the sacred desk, or delivers himself in such a manner as is calculated to send the people away admiring the man instead of the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, I think it might have been a blessing to the church had he chosen some other occupation. And when a people are found praising their minister more than the wonders of redeeming love, I cannot but wish that they possessed more enlightened views of the gospel, and more exalted motives to evangelical obedience. For it is

in vain to look for any very extensive revival of religion till ministers become in earnest to exalt the authority of God as the only rule obligatory upon the conscience, and people bow to the force of divine truth; love the truth for the truth's sake; and yield obedience because the Lord hath spoken.

But after all, the above sentiment, on which we have thus animadverted, sinks into insignificance and is left far in the back ground, in comparison with a celebrated letter which was published in the city of New-York in 1836. It purports to be a letter from a pastor to his people, *professing* to be Associate Presbyterians, in which the author expresses his "*inexpressible* satisfaction" for "the cordial support of his people." He then adds—"I cannot express to you the high value I set upon it." And finally concludes by saying that "he would be willing to be annoyed" for five years by his co-presbyters, and be suspended by the supreme judicature of his church, "for such another proof of their confidence!" And yet this man had, at least *impliedly*, by his being in the church, solemnly sworn to "submit himself willingly and humbly, in the spirit of meekness, to the admonitions" of that very Presbytery of which he speaks as subordinate to that Supreme Court, "as he would be answerable at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints; and as he would desire to be found among that happy company at his glorious appearing." We say he *impliedly* made this profession, for the writer has no evidence that he did it in any other way. Can all be right when a minister has such *inexpressible satisfaction* in the dear people as leads him to such a pointed renunciation of his profession? Is there not evident consciousness of guilt on the face of such a confession? A consciousness of having shocked the moral sense of the community from whose just indignation he thus seeks refuge in men! Nay, more, have we not here a consciousness of having offended God? Or, why not seek refuge in him? It was not till Israel had offended God, that they looked to Egypt for help; and were admonished of God by the prophet that the Egyptians were men; and their horses flesh and not spirit. Every child of God knows how hard it is to wean his affections from instruments. He has often been visited with the rod for his confidence in men. And his confidence in God is always in proportion to his renunciation of all other helps. Let this mark be applied to the case before us, and the people of God will be in no danger of forming an erroneous judgment. For they know that a curse is denounced against that man who makes flesh his arm. And says the Saviour. "How can ye believe who receive honor one of another?"

SIMPI EX.

---

#### ART. V. *Abiding in Christ.*

JOHN xv. 4.—"Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me."

Abiding in Christ may be viewed, first of all, as a gracious *privilege*, and then as an important *duty*, the diligent performance of which leads to the enjoyment of many distinguishing benefits. Considered as a privilege, *abiding in Christ* intends simply a state of vital union to the Sa-

viour, with the gracious fruits which result from it. They who are rescued from the guilt and misery of a natural state, were once aliens, in a wandering degraded condition—the bond-slaves of sin and Satan, having, as the sum of all their future expectations, only a “certain fearful looking for of judgment.” Through sovereign mercy, in the time of love, they are rescued from this deplorable condition, and brought nigh by the blood of the cross. Being justified freely by grace, they are taken into the family of God, become the subjects of his gracious kingdom—are built on Christ as a sure foundation—are married to the Lord, and become members of his flesh, and body, and bones. No longer under the power of darkness, they are translated into the kingdom of God’s dear Son; no longer left in an alien condition, they are brought nigh by the blood of the cross; guilt is cancelled; Christ is formed in their hearts as the hope of glory; they are united to the Lord the second Adam, who is a quickening spirit, and by the most tender and indissoluble ties they are joined to Him who is light, life, and, in short, all substantial and everlasting good.

No comparison could more fitly express the nature of this union to Christ, than that which is employed in the commencement of this chapter. As the principle of vegetable life is communicated from the root or trunk to the branches—as the branch lives while its connexion with the trunk is maintained, and speedily dies when the connection is broken—as the branch depends for its verdure, vigor and fertility on the sap which it derives from the trunk, and as the process is invisible, but real—so it is in the union between Christ and believers. They are quickened by him, and He lives in them by his Spirit, as the vital all-informing principle. None can pluck them out of his hands: they are bound up in the bundle of life with them; and so much is Christ the life of their duties, comforts, joys and hopes, that when he hides himself, though he is never really withdrawn, they languish, and are full of dismal apprehensions, as if their life was about to be taken away. There are many, it is true, in the visible church, who are united to Christ by mere external profession, by attendance on ordinances, or by office in the Church; these having no life in them, like the decayed or luxuriant branches of the vine, must be pruned away, or they will crowd the others, and prevent their fruit from coming to perfection. In a time of trial they shift the cross: having no root in themselves, they endure only for a time; they go out from us, because they were not of us. But the declension and fall of apostates affects not the stability and growth of real believers. They who are in Christ, being new creatures, have their continuance in grace guaranteed by the most powerful judges that Heaven can give. He that hath begun a good work in them, will perform it till the day of Christ Jesus. “Because I live,” says the Saviour, “ye shall live also.” “They shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hands.” What is the conclusion that irresistibly follows from these reiterated gracious assurances? Is it not, that the saints’ abiding in Christ, their state of vital union to him, with all the inestimable benefits that flow from it, is secured beyond the possibility of failure, and that is the source of all the gracious privileges which they afterwards come to possess?

To abide in Christ, is, therefore, to be vitally united to him:—it is more—it implies continuance in this blessed connexion even till the end, and this not only as a gracious privilege, but as a greatly important duty; in some sort, the sum and substance of all other evangelical adu-

ties. In forming the spiritual union, the sinner is wholly passive:—“When I passed by thee, and saw thee polluted in thine own blood, I said unto thee, when thou wast in thy blood, Live; yea, I said unto thee, when thou wast in thy blood, Live.” (Ezek. xvi. 6.) In the progress of sanctification, however, the matter is otherwise; the renewed sinner becomes a co-worker with God. He is required to wash his robes and make them white in the blood of the Lamb. The branches of the true Vine are to bring forth fruit, as the evidence of their union, and as the proper return for the cultivation which they have received: “He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit.” “Herein is my father glorified, that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be my disciples.” Gracious privilege always obliges to duty.

The *duties* involved in abiding in Christ may be viewed in two lights—they are all those which are connected with compliance with the first call of the gospel—and they are those which are implied in the faithful, diligent, and constant use of all the *means* which are provided for insuring the saints’ perseverance in a gracious state.

We abide in Christ by fleeing to him daily as a shelter from the wrath to come, and by resting on him as the immovable foundation of safety and real satisfaction. *Faith*, “the substance of things unseen,” is the medium of connexion, at first, between Christ and the soul, and it is the principal means afterwards whereby it is maintained. It is “fleeing for refuge” to the name of the Lord as a strong hold, when a sense of guilt and the terrors of the Lord take hold on the conscience; and, ever afterwards, faith leads its subject to trust in the shadow of God’s wings, and, amid every storm from hell or earth, to have recourse to Him who is the Ark of safety, an hiding place from the tempest, and the shadow of a great rock in a weary land. In short, by faith in Christ we receive him as the grand provision of the Covenant; put on Christ; feed, as hungry and thirsty, on his flesh and blood; and by faith we afterwards walk in him, clothed with his costly righteousness as the raiment of salvation, and adorned with the graces of his Spirit. Under a sense of ever pressing wants and necessities, we repair to his fulness, and receive out of it grace for grace. The *direct* and renewed acts of faith, similar to the first vital act, are indeed the grand means of prolonging union to Christ, or, in other words, of abiding in him. Thus the branches maintain their connexion with the tree, and at the same time derive from it sap and nourishment, growth, vigor, and fertility. Resting on the person of Immanuel as the foundation of hope, dependence on his merits, and confidence in his character, promises, and gracious relations, are indispensable to a saving relation in Christ; and these, in fact, form the chief parts of the hidden, but real and blessed walk which believers maintain with the Beloved of their souls.

Nor is *Repentance* less requisite towards abiding in Christ than faith. The connexion between these two leading graces is intimate and inseparable. We never look to Christ, whom we have pierced, without being led to mourn for Him as an only Son and a first born. The great New Testament Passover is never eaten but with the “bitter herb” of godly sorrow for sin. And as repentance at first is a return, with much self-abhorrence, to the Lord, so every subsequent act implies abiding in him, under a deep sense of abasement for sin. Formerly, the genuine penitent heard of him only by the hearing of the ear—only in the way of a distant report, that failed to fix attention or command belief—now,

abiding in him, his eyes see him, and the discovery penetrates the soul—he abhors himself, and repents in dust and ashes. The beholding of Christ's glory produces deep and permanent sorrow for sin. Like the inspired seer, the contrite sinner lies prostrate in the dust, before the overpowering manifestations of Immanuel's glory—crying out—"Wo is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips; for mine eyes have seen the King the Lord of hosts." (Is. vi. 5.) We abide in Christ, then, by entertaining the lowest views of ourselves—by a cordial fixed and increasing hatred of sin, and by having recourse daily to the Fountain opened for sin, that our robes may be washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb.

Love to the unseen Saviour, is another hallowed bond of abiding union and intercourse. Believers are united to Christ by a holy, spiritual, supreme affection, arising from a sense of his love and loveliness. They are drawn with the cords of love and bands of a man. His name, his person, atonement and offices, are like fragrant ointment poured forth, and when the Spirit implants a new spiritual sense in regeneration, the hearts of believers are filled with the odour of the perfume—"therefore do the virgins love him." They become "rooted and grounded in love." They are set as a seal on the Beloved's arm; they delight themselves in him, lean on his bosom, put in claims of interest, and dwell with rapture in the commendation of his matchless excellencies. The morning of conversion is a "time of love;" and the proper expressions of spiritual affection ever after are such as these—"My Beloved is mine, and I am his—he feedeth among the lilies." "Thou art fairer than the children of men." "As the apple-tree among the trees of the wood, so is my Beloved among the sons. I sat down under his shadow with great delight, and his fruit was sweet to my taste." "He brought me into the banquetting house, and his banner over me was love." He is "the chiefest among ten thousand; yea, he is altogether lovely." Nothing can separate the saints from the love of Christ. Thus they abide in Christ, for it is declared—"He that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him." This is the principle that attracts them to Christ, the centre of all that is excellent and amiable; this it is that draws them with ardent desire to delight in him, to desire communion prolonged, and to do or suffer any thing for his name's sake." "The love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead. And that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again." (2 Cor. v. 14, 15.) Love to Christ is, in fine, a main element of heavenly blessedness itself. The redeemed, who dwell in God's high and holy place, have this greatest of holy graces in perpetual vigorous exercise. They taste, admire, and abundantly enjoy the Saviour's love; and with fervent gratitude and heartfelt complacency, they repose on his bosom, while they sing—"Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing." (Rev. v. 12.)

The grand agent in producing and continuing this happy union, and in creating in the soul these gracious dispositions, is the *Holy Spirit of God*. The Spirit is the bond of connexion, on heaven's part, between the believer and Christ; he is the vital principle uniting the members and the Head. Coming into the soul, as sent by the Father and the

Son, he makes it the temple of the living God. Believers, in consequence, enjoy the seal, the unction, and the earnest of the Spirit of promise. His office is continually to lead them to Christ—enable them to live near him in all privilege and duty, and to be at once the basis of blessed intercourse, and the unequivocal evidence of union and intimate fellowship. “He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit.” “Hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us.” (1 John iii. 24.) It is by “walking in the Spirit,” that abiding in Christ is realized: under his gracious and powerful influences, believers become spiritually minded—they see Christ all glorious and excellent; their souls are filled with marrow and fatness, and they drink abundantly of the rivers of God’s pleasures.

So much may suffice for a view of the internal principles in the exercise of which the believer abides in Christ. There are, besides, *outward means*, through which these principles are called into exercise. These are all the divinely appointed means by which perseverance in a state of grace is secured, and by which communion with Christ is promoted. They are the prescribed ways in which Christ and his people walk together in happy agreement, and without which there can be no abiding fellowship. Some of the principal of these means we briefly notice.

I. We abide in Christ by *abiding in his word*. This is a term of discipleship which distinguishes genuine followers from all pretenders. “If ye continue in my word then are ye my disciples, indeed.” (John viii. 31.) In the context, the indwelling of the word is represented as the grand means whereby union is maintained:—v. 7, “If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you.” In the word, Christ is proposed and offered to sinners; all his unsearchable riches are in its exceedingly great and precious promises; his law is in its precepts; and every part of the word, as a polished mirror, reflects his unparalleled glory. By receiving the word, and hiding it in our hearts, we receive and embrace Christ; wherever his word dwells richly, there he dwells; by digesting the word in meditation, we feed on Christ; and when we use it as our constant monitor, guide and treasure, we abide in Christ, and he in us.

II. We abide in Christ by *walking in his ordinances*. These form meeting places between Christ and his people. He has assured them of his presence in them: “In all places where I record my name, I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee.” (Exod. xx. 24.) “Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.” (Matt. xviii. 20.) He chooses Mount Zion to be his dwelling place and rest, and all that love his blessed name dwell there, and have it in sure possession. They desire ordinances intensely, because of the presence of Christ in them; they see in the tabernacles of his grace transcendent loveliness; enjoy in them the testimony of the Spirit to their union to the living Head; and participate in endeared and intimate fellowship with himself. He takes them into the banquetting house, and spreads over them his banner of love. Like the spouse, they find the Beloved without, and embrace him; but their enjoyment is felt to be incomplete, till they bring him to the assemblies of the saints—till they lead him “into their mother’s house, and into the chamber of her that conceived her.” (Song iii. 4.) Oppressed with darkness and doubts, they flee from enemies, and hide safety in the fragrant chambers of the Sanctuary—“Until the day break, and the shadows flee away, I will

get me to the mountain of myrrh, and to the hill of frankincense." (Song iv. 6.) There they abide with Christ; and during all the night of their trials, and indeed of their pilgrimage on earth, the Well-Beloved, as a bundle of myrrh, lies between their breasts.

III. Especially in *prayer and meditation* we abide in Christ.

When the hearts of the disciples who journeyed to Emmaus began to burn with them, as the Saviour opened to them the scriptures, "they constrained him, saying, Abide with us, for it is toward evening, and the day is far spent. And he went in to tarry with them." (Luke xxiv. 29.) Thus the hearts of true disciples are still enkindled in love by spiritual meditation on the Saviour's wondrous person, his unspeakable love and condescension, his unfathomable fulness, and his precious relations: and then, in prayer, they wrestle, as Jacob, with the Angel of the Covenant, they constrain him to abide with them when he seems ready to withdraw; and they experience how very good it is to draw near to God. They "have power with God and with man, and prevail." As prayer is in some measure their element, and they "pray without ceasing," so, in this delightful exercise, they abide with Christ continually, regarding it as their high and distinguishing privilege to pour out their hearts before him, and to lean on his bosom for all the support that they need.

IV. *Intercourse with the people of God* is another hallowed means of abiding in Christ. The communion of saints is inseparable from communion with God, and is, indeed, a chief means of realizing that more exalted fellowship. When the conversation of fellow-saints is in heaven, the great Master comes and joins himself to them, and their hearts burn within them. In the assemblies of the saints, he is present to preside over their services, share their joys and sorrows, and impart to them his abundant blessing. Withdrawment from the society of God's people is departure from Christ, and oftentimes the commencement of dreadful and incurable apostacy, as was instanced in the case of Cain and Judas Iscariot. The place of perpetual abode with Christ in glory, whither the steps of all the saints on earth are tending, is the highest state of the endeared fellowship of saints with each other. "They shall come from the East and West, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven." (Matt. viii. 11.)

Lastly, we abide in Christ by *keeping his commandments*.

Holy, humble, persevering obedience, is the fruit of spiritual union, and an eminent means of enjoying fellowship with the Father, and his Son Jesus Christ. The branches are in the living Vine, deriving vigor from the root, and enjoying the incessant care of the husbandman, that they "may bring forth much fruit." New obedience is, indeed, the grand evidence of discipleship, and the principal means of abiding with Christ here: "he that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me, shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him." (John xiv. 21.) And thus shall the ransomed of the Lord hereafter enter the portals of the New Jerusalem, to be ever with the Lord: "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." (Rev. xxii. 14.)

The *advantages* of abiding in Christ are manifold, and most valuable. They, in fact, include all the benefits of the Covenant enjoyed by

gracious subjects. Freedom from the law's curse : protection from the avenging justice of God ; the in-dwelling of the Spirit ; safety, strength, and vigor, in the way of duty ; and final victory over all enemies, are among the glorious privileges which are enjoyed by all, without exception, who have been admitted to the Gospel refuge, who have come to trust in the shadow of Immanuel's wings. We select *three* advantages, which in the Divine Word are explicitly connected with abiding in Christ.

First. *The connexion is mutual.* "Abide in me, and I in you." They who abide in Christ, are temples of the living God. Christ is formed in their hearts the hope of glory ;—according to his own gracious promises, he dwells in them and walks in them ; he is their God, and they are his people. What a spring of holy principles—what a source of strong consolation is this ! How unspeakable the privilege to have Christ thus dwelling in the heart, as in a consecrated habitation !

Secondly. *The fullest answers of believing prayer are guaranteed.* "If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you."—ver. 7. How wondrous the privilege, to have what we will for the asking ! Yet it is secured by the immutable word of Jehovah to all who abide in Christ, and have his word abiding in them. The promise is express, and without limitation : "Delight thyself also in the Lord : and he shall give thee the desires of thine heart." (Ps. xxxvii. 4.) All the renewed desires of the heart, every wish, every petition dictated by the Spirit of grace and supplication, will be fully granted. The intercession of Christ secures this for all his members :—even to a crown and a kingdom of glory, their believing desires shall be fulfilled.

Thirdly. *The assurance of acceptance in the judgment to come* is guaranteed to all who abide in Christ. "And now, little children, abide in him ; that when he shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before him at his coming." (1 John ii. 28.) How unspeakably precious and encouraging is such an assurance ! Guilt may stare in the face—Satan may accuse—conscience may condemn, and a wicked world may brand us as hypocritical ; but, under the covert of blood and in the city of refuge, the believer may bid defiance to them all, and may triumph over every accuser. The Saviour shall appear the second time, without sin unto salvation : all who are now united to him, all who live by faith upon him, shall have lofty confidence, and be filled with enraptured joy at his coming : shame, as a garment, shall cover their enemies, but the Judge himself, amid the unparalleled glories of his appearance, shall welcome them to his presence.

So excellent being the privilege, and so important the duty of abiding in Christ, should we not labor perpetually after this high attainment ? It cannot be too often remembered, that abiding in Christ is indispensable to our doing any good : "As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine ; no more can ye, except ye abide in me." It is equally necessary to *our doing much good.* He alone who flees frequent to the covert of the atonement, habitually exercises faith in Christ, and love to him, lives upon his promises, and is led by his Spirit, bringing forth much fruit. Union to Christ is the root of all real usefulness ; connexion with him is an inexhaustible source of happiness, and of holy, vigorous action. One practical reflection we should carry with us, as the sum of the whole matter—**HE THAT SAITH HE ABIDETH IN HIM, OUGHT HIMSELF ALSO SO TO WALK, EVEN AS HE WALKED.** (1 John ii. 6.) All who make a profession of religion, say

they abide "in Christ." Dreadful, indeed, is the condition of those who have not found the city of refuge, and who have never been united to the Living Head. If we profess to be members of Christ, then are we under the weightiest and most solemn responsibility daily to copy the example of Christ. We ought to walk as He walked, in a habitual course of humility, meekness, zeal for the glory of God, and universal active benevolence towards men. If we fail in these things, in vain may we expect our profession to be credited by any who know the transforming efficacy of the saving knowledge of Christ.—*The Covenant.*

---

ART. VI. *Peculiar Fastidiousness of the Age in respect to Ministers.*

[From the Literary and Theological Review.]

The time shall come, says Paul to Timothy, when the people shall have itching ears. The time has come. A prurient sensation pervades the community, an itching, teasing desire to hear something *new*. It desires novelty for its own sake. It seeks originality rather than permanent utility.

Why is it that the bosom of the Church is torn by intestine faction; that the gentle dews of heaven are withheld; that spiritual death pervades the land? Why, but because the people, to a great extent, will not endure sound doctrine; but, "after their own lusts heap to themselves teachers; having itching ears." Other diseases spend themselves, or are thrown off; this cleaves like leprosy. The more it is gratified, the more it burns. Other maladies kill the body, this the soul. How often does it embitter the Christian's sweet hopes, and weigh down the aspirations of his bright faith? How can his soul be lifted to the throne of God in prayer, while weighing the force of the speaker's petitions? How can it be filled with active, fervent, and delightful love, when carping and caviling at the preacher's words?

So delicate are the sensibilities of *some*, that the least repetition in a discourse is past endurance; the use of what they term "cant phrases," insupportable; the bare mention of the word hell, barbarous, insufferable. Now are any so grounded in the faith, as no longer to need "line upon line, and precept upon precept?" Nay, are not those very persons who complain of repetition, among the most forgetful hearers of God's word? When we consider how large a portion of every evangelical discourse is Bible truth, truth from the lips of Jehovah, truth which will constitute the delightful theme of the Christian's contemplation through eternity, how heinous appear such complaints? What, are these sacred truths so hacknied, that we cannot think upon them, for one short hour, unless arrayed in the meretricious garb of *earthly* beauty? How, then, can we bear the thought of dwelling upon them forever in heaven? And what though they are sometimes found couched in what are termed "cant phrases?" Are they not the same hallowed, precious truths still? And the said word hell and the like—do these convey aught of terror to the mind that does not "hang around the second death?" Besides, if we do not call things by their *right* names, by what terms *shall* we designate them?

But how large a part of the encomiums and strictures, passed upon al-

most every discourse, have reference merely to the *costume*. How much attention is given to the *manner*, how little to the *spirit* with which they are uttered!

How often do a whole assembly watch the frail creature who, with trembling hand, is lifting the veil that shrouds the mercy seat! They mark his gestures, his diction, his intonation, *any* thing but the glories of that God he is struggling to reveal.

It is this fastidious spirit moreover, that steels the heart of the impenitent against the influence of truth. Instead of taking the posture of trembling penitents to hear God's message, from the lips of His minister, they assume the attitude of critics. While the man of God portrays the terrors and glories of Jehovah, they criticise. While he pours out his soul in prayer on their behalf—they criticise. Thus are the very arrows of the Almighty rendered powerless.

It is this also, that pours poison into the life-blood of the new-born soul. He learns to cavil almost as soon as he draws his breath in the spiritual world; and thus but too often converts the "sincere milk of the word" into wormwood and gall. It is this that blasts his growth. And shall we cherish it, until it have penetrated the very core of the heart, and poisoned every thought, and sensibility, and feeling? Shall God's holy day be spent in speaking or hearing some "*new thing*?" With what utter apathy do we but too often regard what we deem a common-place preacher?

"As in a *theatre*, the eyes of men,  
After a well graced *actor* leaves the stage,  
Are idly bent on him that enters next,  
Thinking his prattle to be tedious;  
Even so, or with much more contempt,"

are men's eyes too often turned upon the humble, devoted, though less gifted servant of Jesus. It is not the *gem* they seek, but the casket. What cause for fear that God will give them nothing else!

The time *was*, when the first enquiry in reference to a candidate for settlement, was—"Is he a man full of faith and the Holy Ghost?" *Now* the inquiry has come to be, whether he is a *smart* man. But the the *smartest* are not always the *best* men. Hence, it often happens that the Head of the Church *gives* people a smart man, and "sends leanness into their souls." *Now*, when they find themselves pining and starving, they turn against the man of their choice, and rest not day nor night until he is dismissed. And it may be that he is as ready to *go*, as they are urgent to *have* him go. For *smart* men can always get settlements at short notice. Nor are those, to whom the thing is referred, reluctant to grant dismissal; since it is often the case, that those who make the greatest noise abroad, are least respected at *home*.

But the evil, of which we speak, stops not here. The manner in which the minister discharges *pastoral* duties, subjects him to great illiberality of stricture. If he visit much, he acquires the character of a great visiter. And this poor family that complain bitterly that "notwithstanding the minister visits others so much, he has been inside of their house but ten times in a whole year." "If, on the other hand, he finds it necessary to study some, and cannot therefore visit every individual of his parish many times in the course of the year, they will say—"To be sure he does very well in the pulpit; but then he is no *pastor*."

If he dress well, he is extravagant. If ill, penurious. "But whereunto shall I liken this generation? It is like unto children sitting in the

market place, and calling unto their fellows, and saying, we have piped unto you, but ye have not danced; we have mourned unto you, but ye have not lamented." For one minister "comes neither eating nor drinking, and they say he hath a devil; another comes eating and drinking, and they say, behold a man gluttonous, and a wine bibber, and a friend of publicans and sinners."

But, the fastidiousness of the age is exhibited in nothing more strongly than in a craving desire for excitement. It has arisen to such a height that it can neither be gratified, nor allayed. It cannot be gratified; for like all other morbid appetites, it acquires strength by indulgence, and cries continually, "Give, give." It cannot be allayed at least, until all unnatural stimuli are withdrawn. A large number in almost every church in the land attend meeting, not so much to be enlightened as quickened; not so much to gain a clearer view of God and His law, as to be wrought into a spiritual frame. Hence, they do not come from their closets with hearts *prepared* to "receive with meekness the engrafted word;" but with a mass of ice encircling them, to be melted away by the power of the preacher. If, therefore, their *frozen* hearts are not melted, they must have *another minister* who *can* move them. This is the chief cause of the pastoral removals, so frequent at the present day. And they will doubtless increase, until this accusing spirit is checked. For God is not honored, his blessing is not sought, the truth is not sufficiently recognized, that man speaketh to the ear, but *God only* to the heart. Besides excitement, produced by external means merely, is but too often mere *animal* excitement, or the result of sympathetic imitation. And those who are the subjects of it, therefore, become more and more fastidious and querulous. Why? Because the human soul is so constituted that the oftener deep emotion is elicited, without terminating in *action*, self-directed, self-sustained *action*, the harder does it become to renew such emotion. For the soul is, for the most part, passive in such a process; and, therefore, becomes more and more callous and obtuse, until no human means *can* move it. For confirmation of this remark, look at those who have often been the subjects of religious impression. Has not every successive excitement of this kind left them worse than it found them, until, perhaps, they have become *past* feeling? Is it then at all strange, that those who frequent the house of God for the sake of mere excitement, should come away disappointed, when they do not find it, and dissatisfied with the preacher who has not furnished it?

But allowing that there may be much holy feeling mingled with this strange fire, that is but too often kindled from the altar of God, still, that state into which many would plunge themselves and the Church, is against nature. All her changes, mighty though they be, are the result of laws not fitful in their operation. It is also against the economy of grace. The spasms and contortions sometimes effected in the Church are much like those effected by stimulants upon the human body; powerful in their immediate effects, but invariably followed by collapse. Look at the *recent*, as well as the more ancient history of the Church, and see if she has ever long continued in a state of feverish excitement. Have not such seasons been uniformly followed by correspondent depression? I would not, however, depreciate healthful, equable, sustained excitement, nor undervalue revivals of God's work. They are most auspicious tokens of his presence; living fountains in the desert; an image of heaven. Oh, that God would multiply their number and their

power; oh, that those who minister at the altar, may so pray and labor "*with one accord*," that the days of Pentecost may revisit and bless the church. It is *morbid, diseased, enervating* excitement only that is to be deprecated. Yet so strong is the *desire* for this excitement, that a minister of moderate parts is often unable to meet the demands of a single parish, consisting of a few hundred souls. The aid of revival itinerants is sought. But this, instead of *meeting*, does but *increase* the demand. After one man has exhausted his magazine, *another* and *another* is called. And the oftener a place has been thus burnt over, the more difficult does it become to devise *any* means by which the dying embers may be again revived and fanned into a blaze. Where is this mania to end? Is the word of God so stale and weak, that none but a Boanerges can give it power upon the conscience and the heart? Blessed Spirit! desert not in grief our sanctuaries and our altars! Inspire with courage those who stand on the watch-tower of Zion, that they "cry aloud and spare not," until the people turn from their abominations, and the plague be stayed; "in wrath, remember mercy."

---

ART. VII. *Remarks before the Jefferson County Anti-Slavery Society, at Carmel Meeting-House, Aug. 1837.*—By JAMES MORROW.

A Pamphlet bearing the above title has been in our possession for sometime. We owe an apology to our friend Col. Morrow for not noticing it sooner: This we had intended to do, but our attention, owing to other matters, became diverted from it. We need only now say that we entirely agree with the author in his Remarks; and indeed we are happy to perceive our friend taking such a firm and zealous hold of this important subject; and O, that every religious professor had attained to the same correct views on a point of such great moral and political bearing. Below we will present to our readers an extract from the above Pamphlet, showing what Slavery is according to the definitions and opinions of its abettors. And if such definitions and opinions be correct, then our Abolitionists must be fully justified in their attempts to overthrow such an abominable system.

In this connection we may observe that our correspondent A. R., another of whose communications will be found in the present number of the Monitor, appears to us still to be in the dark relative to the true nature of Slavery. He still seems to think that Slavery is not *essentially* wrong—that master and slave is a relation of God's instituting. God has indeed instituted the relation of master and servant, but not of master and *slave*. There is a lawful and an unlawful servitude. Slavery holds the same relation to lawful servitude that concubinage does to lawful marriage. Slavery and concubinage are *perversions* of lawful relations. We are at a loss to understand how intelligent persons

can work themselves into the belief that *Slavery* identifies with it a lawful relation. Who upon due reflection can believe that a Just and Holy God has instituted a relation to obtain among mankind, one party to which may be "reputed and adjudged to be chattels personal" in the hands of the other! that the one party to said relation "can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire any thing" but which must belong to the other party; which other party "may sell him, dispose of his person, his industry, his labor!" Who, we repeat it, can, after due consideration of the whole matter, believe that our infinitely wise and benevolent Creator ever established such an absurd, unjust, cruel and oppressive *relation* as this among intelligent and accountable beings?

A. R. thinks that "tyranny" and "oppression" are not *essential* to Slavery. In this he is certainly mistaken. Is it not the very essence of "tyranny" and "oppression" to deprive an unoffending fellow creature of his right to himself, subject him wholly to *your will*, compel him to labor for *your* benefit without any just remuneration, and then sell him, if you think proper, as "chattels personal?" Take from slavery this "tyranny" and "oppression" and it at once ceases to be slavery.

In relation to the Synod's Act respecting Slavery, we would remark, that in our judgment, it will stand the test both of Reason and Revelation. A. R. misinterprets it. The slaveholder, in the case which he supposes, would indeed, according to the Act in question, be excluded from the fellowship of the church, notwithstanding of all his kindness to his slave, because he still holds him as a *slave*, as his *property*, claiming "a right to his labor, and compensating him only for that which may be *extra*. But the Act does not require him to turn his slave adrift upon society where "he would be in danger of being kidnapped, or mobbed, or fettered in cruel bondage," nor does it require him to send him away from his wife and children, as a condition of his emancipation, into one of the free States; (all this, indeed, would be contrary to the spirit of the Act;) it only requires him to cease being his *owner*, to give him a *writing* declaratory of his freedom, and then continue him in his service and pay him for *all* his labor. The Synod's Act does not require what may be technically called *emancipation in law*, but only a *virtual* annulment of the unjust, unnatural and unscriptural relation of *master* and *slave*. All the Act requires is summed up by the Apostle Paul in one short sentence, "Masters, give to your servants JUSTICE and EQUALITY."

But we are enlarging on this subject more than we intended, and shall now conclude by remarking that our slave-holding brethren at the South have no just reason for being offended with the *Northern Abolitionists*, because they are unquestionably indebted to them for their long

continued enjoyment of freedom from *slave insurrections*. The slaves there know what their friends at the North are doing in their behalf; they indulge the hope that through their exertions their fetters will ere long be burst asunder; and they hearken to the earnest entreaties of their friends, the Abolitionists, not to take the work of emancipation into their own hands. But were Abolitionists to cease their "labors of love," the poor slaves would sink down into a state of absolute despair of ever receiving justice through the instrumentality of white men, and God only knows what this despair might prompt them to do in the way of *self-emancipation*. Hence we sincerely believe that Abolitionists are the best friends not only of the slaves but also of their masters.—But we have detained the reader too long from the promised Extract from Col. Morrow's Remarks. It is as follows:

"Slavery is that system, which recognizes the right of man to hold property in man, independent of his Maker. Subjecting one free man to the arbitrary will of another. But that you may not depend upon my definition alone, I shall quote Southern law:

"A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. The master may sell him, dispose of his person, his industry, his labor; he can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire any thing but which must belong to his master.'—*Louisiana Code, Art. 3.*

"Slaves shall be deemed, taken, reputed and adjudged to be chattels personal in the hands of their masters and possessors, to all intents and purposes whatsoever.'—*Laws of South Carolina, Brevard's Digest, 229.*

"Such is slavery. A claim thus held, originating in fraud and violence, must continue unjust to the latest generations. Long continuance in sin may indeed aggravate the guilt, but cannot change its nature; it will continue the same while a holy and righteous law remains unchangeable.

"When such is the system of slavery, what are we to look for as the *condition* of slaves, but to see human beings, rational creatures from their Maker's hands, of one blood with all other human beings, reduced to the condition of beasts that perish? and all this because their Maker in his sovereignty was pleased to make the color of their skin different from those who, in his providence, have the power. Seeing all nations are made of one blood, by the same sovereign Almighty hand, but not of one color, let me ask on passing, if one color more than another is the favorite of heaven, which is it? If we dare venture to form an opinion from numbers, in America, indeed, it would be in favor of the white, but directly the reverse in Africa.

"Here, again, with your leave, I will read from Southern authority a mere specimen of cruelty both to bodies and souls of suffering slaves. The Maryville (Tenn.) Intelligencer says:

"To say nothing of the system of slavery, as such, with its Hydra-headed train of concomitant and inseparable evils, let me give you one case, which, though among the worst, is not very dissimilar to many others. A certain negro ran away, to avoid a whipping, perhaps for a trifle. His master pursued and overtook him within the precincts of his own farm—brought him back and extended him at length on a bench, binding him fast with his face upward. He then took his bullet-moulds and broke out his four front teeth,' &c.

"Here, sir, this single story is not half told; but to save delicate feelings, let it suffice.

"I do not mean to say, sir, that every slave-holder will act thus. Far from it. I am sure it would shock the feelings of the more humane; but I do mean to say that the *system* puts it in their power; and that the bodies of slaves are thus made subject to the will of a cruel master. Truly may they say as in the days of Nehemiah: "They have dominion over our bodies, and we are in great distress." Let us now see the condition of their souls. Mr. Jones, professor of Theology, Columbia, S. C. in his sermon before two associations of planters in Georgia, 1831, says:

"Generally speaking, they (the slaves) appear to us to be without God and without hope in the world, a nation of HEATHEN in our very midst. We cannot cry out against the Papists for withholding the scriptures from the common people, and keeping them in ignorance of the way of life, for we *withhold the Bible* from our servants, and *keep them* in ignorance of it, while we *will not* use the means to have it read and explained to them. The cry of our perishing servants comes up to us from the sultry plains as they bend at their toil; it comes up to us from their cottages when they return at evening, to rest their weary limbs; it comes up to us from the midst of their ignorance and superstition, and adultery and lewdness. We have manifested *no emotions* of horror at abandoning the souls of our servants to the adversary, the "roaring lion, that walketh about seeking whom he may devour."

A committee of the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, in their report, 1833, say:

"Who would credit it that in these years of revival and benevolent effort, in this Christian republic, there are over TWO MILLIONS of human beings in the condition of HEATHEN, and in some respects in a *worse* condition. From long continued and close observation, we believe that their moral and religious condition is such that they may be justly considered the HEATHEN of this christian country, and will bear comparison with heathens in *any country in the world*. The negroes are destitute of the gospel, and *ever will be*, under the present state of things.

"We may now enquire if they (the slaves) enjoy the privileges of the gospel in their own houses, and on their own plantations? Again we return a negative answer—They have no Bibles to read at their own fire-sides—they have no family altars; and when in affliction, sickness or death, they have no minister to address to them the consolations of the gospel, nor to bury them with solemn and appropriate services."

"In a number of the Charleston Observer (in 1834,) a correspondent remarked: 'Let us establish missionaries among our own negroes, who in view of religious knowledge, are as debasingly ignorant as any one on the coast of Africa; for I hazard the assertion that throughout the bounds of our Synod there are at least ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND SLAVES speaking the same language as ourselves, who never heard of the plan of salvation by a Redeemer.'

"The Editor, Rev. Benjamin Gildersleeve, who has resided at least ten years at the South, so far from contradicting this broad assertion, adds, 'We fully concur with what our correspondent has said, respecting the benighted heathen among ourselves.'

"In confirmation of the foregoing, see iniquity established by law

and the speech of Mr. Berry, in the House of Delegates of Virginia, in 1832. 'We have,' says he, 'as far as possible, closed every avenue by which light might enter their (the slaves') minds. If we could extinguish the capacity to see the light, our work would be completed; they would then be on a level with the beasts of the field, and we should be safe. I am not certain that we would not do it, if we could find out the necessary process, and that on the plea of necessity.'

"Add to all this, the well known fact that there is not in any one of the States of this Union, one section of law, recognizing a legal marriage, or affording the least protection in the conjugal relation. Among the more than two millions of colored, native inhabitants of this country, some are professors of religion, but all living, as Mr. Breckenridge admits, in a state of concubinage; I would seriously ask, who are the most guilty, the master or the slaves? Although there is no legal marriage, it is true that in some sort, there are husbands and wives, parents and children; but the duties required by the divine law in these several relations, human laws forbid, and these relations are often broken up and torn asunder at the will of a master under the most heart-rending circumstances.

"With this faint picture of slavery, with the condition of slaves, is it not as clear as the sunbeams at noon-day, that the awful judgments of heaven hang over us? and will we do nothing to avert the stroke, not even open our mouths in solemn warning to others? Let us see the slave-holders' own apprehension of danger. Mr. Moore, in his speech in the House of Delegates of Virginia in 1832, says:

"It is utterly impossible to avoid the consideration of the subject of slavery. As well might the Apostle have attempted to close his eyes against the light which shone upon him from heaven, or to turn a deaf ear to the name which reached him from on high, as for us to try to stifle the spirit of enquiry which is abroad in the land.—The MONSTROUS CONSEQUENCES which arise from the existence of slavery have been exposed to open day; the DANGERS arising from it stare us in the face, and it becomes us as men to meet and overcome them, rather than attempt to escape by evading them. Slavery, as it exists among us, may be regarded as the heaviest calamity which has ever befallen any portion of the human race. (If we look back at the long course of time which has elapsed from the creation to the present moment, we shall scarcely be able to point out a people whose situation was not in many respects preferable to our own, and that of the other States in which slavery exists. True, we shall see nations which have groaned under the yoke of despotism for hundreds and thousands of years, but the individuals composing those nations have enjoyed a degree of happiness, peace and freedom from apprehension which the holders of slaves in this country can never know.)'

"The female petitioners from Fluvanna County, Va., to the Assembly in the same year, say: 'We cannot conceal from ourselves that an evil (slavery) is amongst us, which threatens to outgrow the growth, and dim the brightness of our national blessings. A shadow deepens over the land and casts its thickest gloom upon the sacred shrine of domestic bliss, darkening over us as time advances.'

"Now when the sin is so obvious, and imminent danger apprehended by all, surely our duty is clear: *Let us break off our sins by righteousness and our iniquities by showing mercy to the poor—Break every yoke and let the oppressed go free; and then, and not till then shall our light break forth as the sun.*"

ART. VIII. *Hon. William Slade and Students of Bangor Theological Seminary.*

Being ourselves pleased with the Correspondence between the Hon. Wm. Slade, a Member of the present Congress, and the Students of the Theological Seminary at Bangor, (Me.) we have concluded to lay it before our readers :

Theological Seminary, Bangor, March 24, 1836.

Hon. WM. SLADE :

*Dear Sir*—The receipt yesterday, at the reading room of this Seminary, of your speech before the United States House of Representatives, on a motion “to instruct a select committee to report a bill abolishing slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia,” affords us an occasion, which we gladly embrace, of expressing by letter our joint approval and admiration of your prompt and fearless course in Congressional debate, on the 30th of December, 1837.

We rejoice, with all true friends of liberty and supporters of the right of petition, that although repeatedly interrupted and gnashed upon by slave-holding members of the House, and at last in the most extraordinary and unconstitutional manner, nearly deprived of the floor—and then, in common with other advocates of freedom there, tyrannously cut off from the privilege of further debate, by the “surreptitious introduction” of the infamous resolution of Mr. Patton—we rejoice that you were still not to be silenced. Prohibited the liberty of speech in the Representatives’ Hall of this American Republic, you have resorted to that mighty engine of freedom which the “resolution” cannot restrain; and have published to your constituents and this nation, the investigation of slavery, and the noble defence of a constitutional right which Southern slave-holders had thought to suppress.

From the “loop holes” of our sacred theological retreat we often look out upon the spectacle which our nation now exhibits; and though our destination be far otherwise than to mingle in her councils and sit in the halls of debate, yet as patriots, as christians, as friends of bleeding humanity, we cannot but feel an intense interest in the proceedings of our National Congress on the absorbing subject of slavery. We have mourned over the illiberal, unrepblican spirit evinced there; and we have been indignant at the base attempts to muzzle free discussion, and spurn the respectful petitions of a free people.

But we have devoutly thanked God that there have been found a few statesmen yet uncorrupt and undaunted, to stand nobly in defence of constitutional right and the principles of eternal justice. The efforts of your honorable colleague, Mr. Prentiss, in the Senate, and of yourself and the illustrious John Q. Adams in the House, have elicited our warmest regard and admiration; and we thank you for the occasion now afforded, by the reception at our Reading Room of a copy of your speech, to transmit to you an expression of that admiration and regard. Be assured, sir, that the principles you have advocated, and the cause you have plead on the floor of Congress, we also shall advocate and most earnestly plead from the sacred desk.

Praying that these principles and this glorious cause, may speedily be espoused, and become dear to numbers of the statesmen as well as clergy of this nation; and that your venerable co-worker in the House may not have long to “wait” till the institution of slavery shall be

freely discussed there, and measures taken for its speedy abolition, we remain respectfully,

Yours in behalf of the slave,  
Signed by thirty Students of the Seminary.

Washington, April 25, 1838.

*Dear Sirs* :—Your letter informing me of the reception at the Reading Room of your Seminary, of my speech on the subject of slavery, has been received. The pressure of official duties, with a state of health rendering the performance of almost any duty a burthen to me, has prevented that prompt attention to your letter which it deserves. Justice to my own feelings, as well as respect for you, requires this apology.

It would be but common place to tender to you my thanks for the kind expression of regard and confidence with which you have been pleased to honor me. I owe you more than thanks, and more than any expression of gratitude can pay. But my obligations to you personally, high as they are, fall far below the obligations imposed on me by the sacred cause of human freedom to which you are so much devoted, and your love of which has dictated a commendation which I should be most happy to deserve. For that cause, you cannot entertain too deep and strong a regard, nor for its triumph too fervently pray, or too faithfully labor in the sphere which Providence shall allot to you.—The triumph to which it is destined we must all remember, however, is not to be accomplished without long and patient and self-denying efforts. The foundations of slavery are deeply laid in the social and civil institutions of a large portion of our country; and the mighty edifice is not to be overturned but by efforts worthy of the greatest triumphs which truth and reason and philanthropy have ever achieved. Whence are to arise the mighty men who are to wield these engines of destruction against American slavery? Let the *young men* of this land answer. Let those, especially, answer, whose hearts have been redeemed from the slavery of selfishness, by the transforming power of the christian faith and who have begun to learn in the school of Christ the lessons of practical benevolence so impressively taught by his example. By you, I doubt not, has this question been often and anxiously asked, and that, not in the spirit of a poor ambition of personal distinction, but in the noble and sublime spirit of a full-hearted and self-denying philanthropy, which counts all earthly honors as nothing in comparison with the true glory of following in the footsteps of him who went about doing good.

You are looking to the sacred ministry as a profession. It is a noble office; and it gives me pleasure to believe, that, while you are giving to your minds the discipline, necessary to the discharge of its high duties, you are drinking deeply into the spirit of Him whose doctrines you are to teach. It is *that spirit* which is to make the sacred ministry so efficient an instrument in reclaiming and elevating the world. And in nothing is it destined to be more efficient; in no department of benevolent effort is its power to be more signalized, than in the deliverance, elevation and improvement of the enslaved. Alas! how large an amount of human energy has been wasted in contending about questions in theology of minor importance, while the claims of millions of enslaved men, trodden beneath the foot of irresponsible power, have been overlooked and forgotten! The Priest and Levite have passed by while the crushed slave has been abandoned to his cruel fate, as beyond the hope

of redemption. Thanks to a God of mercy, it is not always so to be. Deliverance is to come. The revolutions of time are not more certain. There are, indeed, great and appalling obstacles to be encountered, but they are not insurmountable. The quenchless ardor of christian love, tempered by christian prudence, sustained by the christian's faith and guided by the wisdom that Heaven gives to those who ask it, shall finally triumph. For that wisdom, and faith, and prudence and love, let us fervently pray, while with no less earnestness, we plead for those who are involved in the wrongs and calamities of slavery. What a power might be brought to bear upon that institution, if all the christians and christian ministers in this whole land would forthwith commence praying as earnestly for slave-holders and slaves, as they do for themselves and those who are dear to them, and would labor within their appropriate spheres, *in the true spirit of their prayers!*

That you will thus pray and thus labor, while you live, I am happy to believe; and it cheers me to hope that while you are bending before the throne of mercy in behalf of the slave and his master, you will not forget your friend and fellow servant,

WILLIAM SLADE.

Mr. Henry Cheever, and twenty-nine others, Students of the Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me.

#### ART. IX. *Precious Remedies against Satan's Devices.*

(Continued from page 121.)

CHAP. IV.—*The fourth Device that Satan hath to keep souls from holy exercises and religious services, is,* By leading them to make false inferences from those blessed and glorious things that Christ hath done. As that Jesus Christ hath done all for us, therefore there is nothing for us to, but to joy and rejoice; he hath perfectly justified us, and fulfilled the law, and satisfied divine justice, and pacified his Father's wrath, and is gone to heaven to prepare a place for us, and in the mean time to intercede for us, and therefore away with praying, and mourning, and hearing, &c. Ah! what a world of professors hath Satan drawn in these days from religious services, by leaving them to make such sad, wild and strange inferences, from the sweet and excellent things the Lord Jesus hath done for his people.—Now the remedies against this device, are these:

*Remedy 1.* Against this device of Satan, dwell as much on those scriptures that show you the duties and services that Christ requires of you, as upon those that declare to you the precious and glorious things that Christ hath done for you. It is a sad and dangerous thing to have two eyes to behold our dignity and privileges, and not one to see our duties and services. I should look with one eye upon the choice and excellent things that Christ hath done for me, to raise up my heart to love Christ with the purest love, and to joy in Christ with the strongest joy, and to exalt Christ above all, who hath made himself to be my all: and I should look with the other eye, upon those services and duties that the scriptures require of those for whom Christ hath done such blessed things: as upon that of the apostle, 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20. 'What, know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, which is in you,

which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price, therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's.' And that, 1 Cor. xv. 58, 'Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, knowing that your labor is not in vain in the Lord.' And that, 'And let us not be weary in well-doing, for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not.' And that of the apostle, 'Rejoice always, and pray without ceasing.' And that in the Philipians, 'Work out your salvation with fear and trembling.' And that, 'This do till I come.' And that, 'Let us consider one another, to provoke one another to love, and to good works; not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is, but exhorting one another, and so much the more, as you see the day approaching.' (Phil. ii. 12, 13. 1 Cor. xi. 26. Heb. x. 24, 25.) Now a soul that would not be drawn away by this device of Satan, he must not look obliquely upon these blessed scriptures, and abundance more of like import,\* but he must dwell upon them, and make them his chief and choicest companions; and this will be a happy means to keep him close to Christ and his service, in those times wherein many turn their backs upon him, under pretence of being highly interested in the great and glorious things that have been wrought by him, &c.

*Rem. 2.* Consider, that the great and glorious things that Jesus Christ hath done, and is doing for us, should be so far from taking us off from religious services, and pious performances, that they should be the greatest motives and encouragements to the performance of them, as the scriptures do abundantly evidence. I will produce only a few instances; as, 'That we being delivered out of the hands of our enemies, might serve him without fear; in holiness and righteousness all the days of our lives;' (Luke i. 74, 75.) Christ hath freed you from all your enemies, from the curse of the law, the predominant condemning power of sin, the wrath of God, the sting of death, and the torments of hell; but what is the end and design of Christ in doing these great and marvellous things for his people? It is not that they should throw off duties of righteousness and holiness, but that their hearts may be the more free and sweet in all holy duties and heavenly services:† so the apostle, 'I will be their God, and they shall be my people: and I will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.' (Mark what follows.) 'Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of the Lord.' (2 Cor. vi. 17, 18, chap. vii. 1 compared. And again, Tit. ii. 11-14.) 'The grace of God that bringeth salvation, hath appeared to all men, teaching us, that denying all ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world, looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.‡' Ah souls! I know of no arguments to influence you to a lively and constant performance of all heavenly services, like those

\* The Jews were much in turning over the leaves of the scripture, but they did not weigh the matter of them. John v. 39.

† This I am sure of, that all man's happiness here is holiness, and holiness shall hereafter be his happiness. Christ hath therefore broke the devil's yoke from off our necks, that his Father might have better service from our hearts.

‡ "Talk not of a good life, but let thy life speak." Your actions in passing pass not away; for every good work is a grain of seed for eternal life.

that are drawn from the consideration of the great and glorious things that Christ hath done for you; and if such arguments will not win upon you, I think preaching of hell fire to you will never do it.

*Rem. 3.* Seriously consider, that those precious souls which Jesus Christ hath done and suffered as much for, as he hath for you, have been exceedingly active and lively in all religious services and heavenly performances: \* he did and suffered as much for David as for you, and yet, who is found more in praying and praising God than David? 'Seven times a day will I praise the Lord.' Who more in studying and meditating on the word, than David? 'Thy law is my meditation day and night.' The same truth you may run and read in Jacob, Moses, Job, Daniel, and in the rest of the holy prophets and apostles, for whom Christ hath done as much for as for you. Ah! how have all those worthies abounded in works of righteousness and holiness, to the praise of free grace! † Certainly Christ hath done great and glorious things for us, therefore we need not make conscience of performing such religious services as men say the world calls for: if this logic be not from hell, whence is it? Ah! were the holy prophets and apostles alive to hear such reasoning come out of the mouths of such as profess themselves to be interested in the great things that Jesus Christ hath done for his chosen ones, how would they blush to look upon such souls? And how would their hearts grieve and break within them, to hear their language and observe their conduct!

*Rem. 4.* Consider this, that those who walk not in the ways of righteousness and holiness, (who wait not upon God in the several duties and services that are commanded by him) cannot have that evidence to their own souls of their righteousness before God, ‡ of their fellowship and communion with God, of their blessedness here, and their happiness hereafter, as those persons have, who love and delight in the ways and works of the Lord. 'Little children,' saith the apostle, 'let no man deceive you; he that doth righteousness, is righteous, even as he is righteous.' § 'In this, saith the same apostle, the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil; whosoever doth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother: if ye know that he is righteous, saith the same apostle, ye know that every one that doeth righteousness is born of him. He that saith I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him. But whosoever keepeth his word, in him verily is the love of God perfected. Hereby know we that we are in him. He that saith he abideth in him, ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked. If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth; but if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another; and the blood of Christ

\* The saint's motto in all ages hath been, "Let's be doing." "God loves the runner, not the questioner, or disputant," saith Luther.

† The day is at hand when God will require of men, "not what they have read, but what they have done; nor what they have spoken, but how much they have conquered or overcome."

‡ Certainly it is one thing to judge by our graces, another thing to rest, or put our trust in them. There is a great deal of difference between declaring and deserving.

§ As David's daughters were known by their garments of divers colors, so are God's children by their piety and sanctity. A Christian's emblem should be a house walking towards heaven. High words surely make a man neither holy nor just; but a virtuous life, a circumspect walk, make him dear to God. A tree that is not fruitful, is for the fire. Christianity is not talking, but walking with God, who will not be put off with words; if he miss of fruit, he will take up his axe, and then the soul is cut off for ever.

cleanseth us from all sin,' saith the same apostle. So James ii., 'What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works, can faith save him?' i. e. it cannot. 'For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also.' To look after holy and heavenly works, is the best way to preserve the soul from being deceived and deluded by Satan's delusions, and by sudden flashes of joy and comfort: holy work being a more sensible and constant pledge of the precious spirit, begetting and maintaining in the soul more solid, pure, and lasting joy. Ah souls! as you would have in yourselves a constant and blessed evidence of your fellowship with the Father and the Son, and of the truth of grace, and of your future happiness, look that you are diligent in holy services; and that you turn not your backs upon religious duties.

*Rem. 5.* Solemnly consider, that there are other choice and glorious ends for the saints' performance of religious duties, than the justifying of their persons before God, or the satisfying the law and justice of God, or the purchasing of the pardon of sin, &c.\* viz: To testify their justification: 'A good tree cannot but bring forth good fruits:' to testify their love to God, and their sincere obedience to the commands of God; to testify their deliverance from spiritual bondage, and evidence the in-dwellings of the Spirit; to stop the mouths of the worst of men, and to rejoice those righteous souls that God would not have made sorrowful. These, and abundance of other choice ends there are, why those who have an interest in the work of Christ, should, notwithstanding, keep close to the holy duties and religious services that are commanded by him.† And if these considerations will not prevail with you, to wait upon God in holy and heavenly duties, I am afraid, if one should rise from the dead, his arguments would not prevail upon you, but that you would hold on in your sins, and neglect his service, though you perish for ever, &c. .

(To be Continued.)

#### ART. X. *Insufficient Causes of Secession.*

The following extract is deserving of a careful perusal. It is taken from the "Testimony of the Original Seceders;" and though more full, it differs nothing in point of principle from our own Testimony on that subject. We commend it especially to the cool consideration of our *schismatical* brethren, who, contrary to their ordination vows and oaths, are foolishly, rashly and sinfully "pursuing a divisive course," obviously from "impatience of faithful admonitions and the due exercise of church censure:"—

"In opposition to many who wantonly, and without necessary causes, withdraw from the communion of the church, and form themselves into separate associations for the purpose of religious fellowship,

—WE DECLARE,

"That, as the holding of communion with the church, is not only a

\* It is a precious truth, never to be forgotten, "That duties are esteemed not by their acts, but by their ends."

† "The end moves to doing. Keep thyself within compass, and have an eye always to the end of thy life and actions," was Maximilian the emperor's motto.

high privilege, but also a great duty, tending to advance the glory of God, to preserve the visible unity of the body of Christ, and to promote the edification of its members,—so it must be sinful to break off this communion from a particular church on slight grounds, or such as do not affect the great ends of ecclesiastical fellowship.

“For illustration we observe, That it must be sinful to break off this communion, on account of personal offences given by the misconduct of individual church members—wrong decisions of church courts in personal causes, or particular acts of maladministration, when the public interests of religion are not immediately concerned, and permanently affected—differences of opinion about matters not clearly determined in the word of God, or which have not been publicly received in the church—diversity of practice in some points of mere external order, in prudential regulations as to the form of divine worship—irregularities or abuses of different kinds in a church which is aspiring after reformation—or the mere desire and expectation of doing more extensive good in a separate state: and still more culpable is the conduct of those who withdraw from a church from mere humor, pride, personal grudges, and envy; from aversion to any of the doctrines or institutions of Christ; or from impatience of faithful admonitions, and the due exercise of Church censure.”\*

To the foregoing there may be an *aptitude* in adding the following, on the same subject, from what is called the “Testimony of the United Associate Synod” Let the aforesaid brethren carefully and calmly peruse and consider the 6th and 7th specifications of “Schismatical courses,” here justly condemned by the United Seceders:—

“We condemn Schismatical Courses.—Division in any case is apt to be productive of so many unhappy effects, that it ought to be avoided as far, and deferred as long, as safety of conscience or a due regard to the interests of truth and holiness will permit.

“We regard as schismatical courses, 1st. The teaching of doctrines inconsistent with the acknowledged confession of the body, or suffering them to be taught without adequate censure; Gal. v. 9–12; Rev. ii. 2, 14, 15. 2d. The introduction and toleration of practices, subversive of the order of the church, or the special ends of the association; Rom. xvi. 17; 1 Cor. x. 11. 3d. Separation on slight and insufficient grounds, such as ought not to affect conscience, being left indifferent in the scriptures; or such as, by the agreement of the body, and the warranted exercise of forbearance, cannot interfere with personal liberty; Phil. iii. 15, 16. 4th. Precipitate separation, while liberty of dissent and exoneration is not refused, and before disappointment in a persevering use of the proper means for attaining reformation, seems to have proved the evil incurable; Hos. ii. 2; Heb. x. 23, 25. 5th. Separation in defence of doctrines which are really erroneous, or of practices which are sinful; or for the purpose of evading censure on account of these; 1 John ii. 18, 19. 6th. Separation on unhallowed principles, as in wrath, from the love of novelty, in the spirit of ambition; or in the spirit of party, and merely for party purposes; Phil. ii. 3; 1 Tim. i. 6, 7; 2 Tim. iv. 3, 4. 7th. The formation of new communions, without some obvious and important difference from those which already

\* Phil. iii. 15, 16; 1 Tim. i. 6, 7; John, vi. 60–66; 2 Tim. iv. 3, 4; Eph. iv. 2, 3; 1 John, ii. 18, 19.

exist, or when the legitimate objects of separation might be as well, if not better accomplished, by associating with one or other of the existing denominations, without multiplying divisions; Ephes. iv. 2, 3; Phil. i. 27."

---

ART. XI. *Psalmody.*

The following argument against the use of uninspired Hymns in the worship of God, we extract from an article in the *Covenanter* on that subject, as being worthy of special consideration:

*The circumstances of the introduction, in modern days of uninspired hymns and paraphrases, furnish a reason against their use in the praises of the Church.*

Already have we noticed the era of Watts as distinguished for scepticism, infidelity, and false liberality. At such a period, it is not strange that his "*Imitation*" should have attained a currency in the religious community, to which it had in vain aspired, at a time when a healthier tone of religious sentiment and feeling prevailed. Having once been introduced into the worship of the largest bodies of English Dissenters, these flimsy compositions held their ground, and other selections were formed after this perverted standard. Long before the days of Watts, the Dissenters in England had degenerated from the Scriptural simplicity that characterised the old Puritans and Nonconformists; and, since the days of Howe, and Charnock, and Henry, and Owen, many of them have made declension, in relation to many other parts of religious worship, to the article of the inspiration and authority of Sacred Scripture,\* to various doctrines of the Gospel, and to the proper grounds of civil and religious liberty. This may account for the tenacity with which they continue to adhere to the use of uninspired psalmody. The evil example set by Watts was carefully copied by Wesley and others, and the use of uninspired hymns was found to be a very convenient way of disseminating sectarian views, and heterodox sentiments throughout the religious community. Hymn-making, and the use of human compositions in public praise, have thus been, in fact, a fertile source of error in the Church. Of this we have a striking example in the history of psalmody, in modern days, in various sections of the *Presbyterian Church*. The inspired psalms, in our excellent Scottish version, were exclusively sung in the Church of Scotland, and by various classes of Presbyterian Dissenters, till Erastianism, and its numerous attendant evils, were introduced by the Revolution settlement. The persecuted Covenanters had sung these songs of Zion in their solemn assemblies, when their enemies hunted them like partridges upon the mountains; and on the scaffold, in the words of the sweet Psalmist of Israel, they triumphed in God's salvation, till their voices were drowned in the

---

\* During the recent controversy between the Edinburgh Committee, and the Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society, an article appeared in the *ECLERIC REVIEW*, in which the inspiration of not less than 150 chapters of the Old Testament was called in question! This periodical has long enjoyed the patronage and support of the largest bodies of English Dissenters. The loose views, also, of Dr. JOHN PYZ SMITH, and others, on inspiration, are well known.

sound of the drums by which the persecutors attempted to silence their testimony, or till their spirits took their flight to the upper sanctuary. It was not till a melancholy departure had been made from the principles of the Scottish martyrs, and till men of a far different spirit had obtained influence in the Church, that the attempt was made to lay aside inspired psalmody. The *paraphrases and hymns* appended to the psalms in metre, at the end of our Bibles, are the work of men who had very slender pretensions to soundness in the faith; and they were adopted by the Commission of the General Assembly, at a time when Arminian and other errors were extensively diffused throughout the pale of the National Church of Scotland. Even till our day, they continue to be chiefly used, to the partial exclusion of the inspired psalms, where *Moderatism* has exercised its baneful influence. We believe it will be found, that just in proportion as vital Christianity has declined in the Church of Scotland, and in other sections of the Presbyterian Church in this country and in America, so has the taste for human hymns prevailed; and on the contrary, wherever a return to the principles of the Westminster Standards has begun to manifest itself, there an increasing regard to the Psalms of David has likewise been discovered. In our own country, in the days of Livingston and Blair, at the time of the revivals about the *Six-Mile-Water*, and of the re-erection of Presbyterian order, which were truly the years of the right hand of the Most High, psalm-singing was much practiced; and it would then have been regarded as the most daring and presumptuous innovation, to have introduced human hymns into the worship of the sanctuary. It was not till, under the wing of an evil toleration, departure from Covenanted attainments to a great extent had taken place, and Arminian and Arian sentiments began to diffuse their malign influence throughout the Synod of Ulster, that the hymns and paraphrases were employed, instead of the Psalms of David. The day of this delusion, however, it is trusted, is now near a close. With a return to the Westminster Confession, a return to the inspired songs of Zion, which are the only songs of praise sanctioned in the Directory, has already begun to take place. In Presbyterian congregations, in some fashionable places, such as Dublin, Liverpool, &c., where Presbyterians are intermixed with Independents and other sectaries, the use of uninspired hymns has been quite common, as there were, in those places, various other striking instances of departure from Scriptural discipline and order. Even *Seceders*, in these places, in their anxiety to increase their numbers, and please religionists of different parties, have adopted the use of Watts' Imitations, and other hymns and paraphrases. In most of the cases, it were easy to show, that the disuse of inspired psalmody has gone hand in hand with departure from the principles and order of the Westminster standards. The love of novelty, and the desire to be fashionable, have led to the adoption of a practice, which, while it pours contempt upon a most valuable portion of the Divine Word, is fraught with manifold mischiefs to the Church. The revival of correct principles, and of a right spirit, will banish all innovations of this kind; and there are even now various symptoms of a growing regard to the inspired psalms, as the only proper vehicle of praise. In another paper we shall offer some specimens of the grievous errors and instances of perverted taste, which are to be met with in some of the most admired collections of modern hymns that are employed in public worship, instead of the Psalms of David.

**ART. XII. On the Causes of Irreligion in Children.**

The irreligious conduct of some of the children of pious parents, whether lay or clerical, may, I think, often be in a great measure ascribed to the following, among other causes :—

To the natural corruption of the human heart by reason of the Fall, which is as strong in the children of the most pious parents, as in others.

To early religious restraints, uncongenial to that corruption, and calculated to stir up the bad passions of the heart, when not enforced on the principle of love, affection and duty. Connected with this, I may notice the constant recurrence of religious duties, irksome to youthful minds, especially when rendered wearisome by the mode of conducting them, and not making them a pleasing privilege and delightful employment.

To needless severity in discipline ; an ill-advised manner of inculcating even religious truth ; a want of kindness in giving counsel ; and rebuking improper conduct and tempers in an unchristian spirit, which tends to repel rather than conciliate.

To visible infirmities in the parent, early noticed by children, and very soon considered as proofs of gross inconsistency, if not of hypocritical profession. I might mention for example, the loss of christian temper, as already noticed ; and the absence of humble patience and meek submission under worldly trials and disappointments, or too great eagerness after the things of the world ; or to the indulgence of some besetting sin.

To not early removing children from the improper conversation and bad example of irreligious servants.

To not carefully and anxiously watching over the first dawning of the youthful mind, and not giving it a proper direction, before wrong habits are formed.

To taking it too much for granted that our children will, as a matter of course, embrace our own views of religious truth, without care to acquaint them with its evidences, and the evidences of its power on the heart.

To the craft and malice of the great enemy of mankind, in the way of powerful and alluring temptation to the children of pious parents, by suggesting to their minds the failings of their parents ; by stirring up the corruption of the evil heart, in opposition to their will and authority ; by instilling false ideas respecting religion, the nature of sin, the pleasures of the world, and of happiness, in order to gain and confirm their early disrelish of godliness, and to incite disobedience to the wishes of their parents, and neglect of the commands of God.—*Christian Observer.*

---

**ART. XIII. Notices.**

**THE SUSPENSION PRESBYTERY.**—This disorderly and irresponsible body, the design of whose organization seems to be the overthrow of Christ's ordinance of Discipline, have issued the second No. of their Magazine, concerning which we are constrained to say, as we did of its predecessor, that its contents "harmonize most completely with the contents of Mr. Stark's anonymous Pamphlets, which the Associate Synod have *unanimously* declared to be of a 'mendacious, calumnious and ribaldish character,' and 'of an infidel tendency.' But as some of our readers may never have seen those Pamphlets, truth and duty compel us to declare, and we do it most deliberately and solemnly, that the

contents of the Magazine referred to contain an uninterrupted tissue of falsehood, misrepresentation, slander, Jesuitical sophistry and pitiful quibbling, which probably have not been far surpassed by any infidel or Popish writer since the era of the Reformation."

In our last we reminded the *Schismatical brethren* of their gross violation of solemn vows and oaths, and reproved them for the same. Reproofs, however, are not always, it would seem, attended with any good effect. There are some that will "harden their necks," though "often reprov'd." Nevertheless to tender reproof when occasion demands it, is an imperious duty. We would however, only at present, in the way of additional reproof, call upon the authors of this "mendacious" Magazine seriously to consider the few following texts, and to be admonished by the same to pay a greater regard to the Ninth Commandment:—"He that speaketh lies shall perish:" "He that telleth lies shall not tarry in my sight:" "Let the lying lips be put to silence:" "He that speaketh lies shall not escape:" "The Lord doth hate a lying tongue—a false witness that speaketh lies:" "Surely they are my people, children that will not lie; so he was their Saviour:" "The law is made for liars:" "All liars shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone:" "There shall in no wise enter into it [heaven] any thing that defileth, or maketh a lie."

**THE PREACHER, OR SKETCHES OF ORIGINAL SERMONS.** This is the title of a work lately republished from a London edition, by J. WHEHAM of Philadelphia. These Sketches (or Skeletons) of Sermons are comprised in two octavo volumes, and are said to be "chiefly selected from the Manuscripts of two eminent divines of the last century." The names of these divines are withheld, and we think unjustifiably, from the public. It is probable, however, that the celebrated Andrew Fuller was one of them.

It is a question with some, whether ministers should make use of helps of this kind in the preparation of their discourses for the pulpit. To copy after such Skeletons in a *servile* manner, would indeed be unjustifiable; it would be plagiarism: but to use them merely *as helps*, to borrow leading ideas and illustrations from them, is as justifiable, in our opinion, as the making use of Commentaries or critical works on the Holy Scriptures. The minister of the gospel has a right to borrow assistance from any quarter in relation to his arduous and important work of expounding and applying "the word of truth," "the gospel of our salvation."

The greatest objection we have to the publication of "Skeletons," is the tendency of such works to encourage and facilitate the unscriptural practice of *lay-preaching*. And hence we find in the Preface to the work before us, this very thing mentioned as a recommendation of it, especially to the "Baptists and Methodists who are more in the habit of engaging uneducated preachers than other denominations, who either disapprove of lay-preaching or take no steps to encourage it."

In regard to the *character* of the "Skeletons," we are noticing, from the cursory examination we have made of them they are believed to be strictly *evangelical* in point of doctrine, and the *divisions* of the subjects analyzed, both simple and judicious. As "Simeons Skeletons" are so voluminous and the price so high, we apprehend that the present work will meet with a speedy sale. The price is only three dollars per copy. It is to be had at the Bookstore of E. H. Pease, Theological Bookseller, No. 82 State-st., Albany.

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,  
AND  
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

OCTOBER, 1838.

---

**ART. I. *Historical Sketch of the United Brethren or Moravians.***

(Continued from page 55.)

After the total loss of religious liberty in Bohemia and Moravia, the members of the Brethren's Church, who had not emigrated into Protestant states, by degrees submitted to the reigning superstition. Even those who could not conscientiously embrace the unscriptural system of national faith, lost the vitality of religion, and for the most part satisfied themselves with a theoretical knowledge of evangelical truth, and rectitude of external deportment. But God, "who knoweth them that are his," was graciously pleased to awaken in the posterity of the ancient Brethren, a new and ardent desire to know, and love and worship him, not in the letter only, but in spirit and in truth, and entirely to disenthral themselves from the fetters of spiritual bondage. This awakening commenced about the year 1715, and its first powerful influence was felt in the family of George Jaeschke, mentioned in the former part of this history.

While new life was thus communicated to the faithful remnant in Moravia, the Holy Spirit breathed at the same time upon the dry bones in Bohemia. So that, while the descendants of the Moravian Brethren, in Fulnek and the adjacent villages, were stirred up to seek the Lord and his salvation, their fellow confessors in Leutmischel and Landscrone, were inflamed with the same desire, and this without any previous concert, or communication with each other. In the renewal of the Brethren's Church, both these branches were gradually united, the Moravian Brethren taking the lead in the emigration.

The instrument, employed by God for fanning the latent fire among the posterity of the Brethren in Moravia, was, in the first instance a discharged soldier from Silesia, who circulated several evangelical books among them, and introduced them to the Lutheran clergyman at Teschen on the Silesian frontiers. They frequently attended his sermons, though they had to go a distance of more than thirty English miles. His zealous testimony of the gospel, together with the perusal of evangelical

publications, led them to a clearer knowledge of divine truth ; but they were still defective in true love to Jesus, and thus wanted the main spring of true piety. To promote this God had prepared another instrument in one of their own countrymen—Christian David, who was a principal mover in their emigration.

Christian David was born in the village of Seuffleben in Moravia, on the last day of the year 1690. He was a zealous Roman Catholic, "and," to use his own expression, "in the performance of his devotions, crept on his knees round the images of the blessed virgin, till his whole body burnt like an oven." At the same time he strongly felt for the workings of sin, which plunged him into the deepest distress of soul, for he had no friend to shew him the right way, and, however frequent and earnest his penances and his invocations of saints, they yielded no comfort to his distracted mind.

While living in Holeschan he formed an acquaintance with some individuals who rejected image worship, pilgrimages, and the whole system of popery as human traditions. These opinions could not remain long concealed, especially as their abettors met together for religious edification, and read forbidden books. They were secured and confined in a cellar ; but here they employed themselves night and day in praying and singing. Christian David was astonished at these things but could not comprehend them. They, however, gave the first check to his superstition, which had been almost unbounded.

In Holeschan he had also frequent intercourse with the Jews, who had a synagogue in that town. Observing their zeal for the law of their fathers, new perplexities agitated his mind, and he was at a loss to determine, whether the Jews, or the Roman Catholics, or those cast into prison possessed the true religion. He was then twenty years old and had never seen a Bible ; but hearing now that it was the word of God, his desire to procure one was very great. This desire was at length gratified, and he read in it during every leisure moment ; the more diligently he read it, comparing the Old with the New Testament, the more was he convinced of its divine authority ; the painful conflict between the flesh and the spirit yielded to the power of the word of God, and his mind was filled with joy and peace in believing. Ever after the scriptures were the principal book he read. His mind which had received but little scientific culture, was hereby furnished with a rich fund of spiritual knowledge, which he well knew how to apply when addressing his fellow sinners on divine subjects, and which was signally blessed by God to the edification of many. This circumstance also gave a peculiarity to his style of speaking and writing, as his phraseology was almost purely biblical.

Being now fully convinced of the errors of popery, he resolved to join the Lutherans. To effect this he travelled into Hungary, where the Protestants had several congregations. But in one place his design was discovered by the priests, who threatened him with the stake ; and in another the Lutheran clergyman informed him, that he could not receive him without subjecting himself to a heavy punishment. This determined him to go to Saxony, from whence he proceeded to Berlin. Here the Rev. Mr. Schmid, after previous instruction, admitted him to the Lord's Supper in the Lutheran Church. Observing that the generality of Lutherans led very careless and even wicked lives, and that any individual, earnestly seeking the salvation of his soul, was exposed to taunts and reproach ; he resolved to enlist as a soldier, fancying he

would have more leisure in that state to attend to spiritual things. His hopes were, however, disappointed; his discharge was therefore not unwelcome.

In 1717 he paid his first visit to his native village, where he soon became acquainted with the family of the Neissers, who were grandsons of George Jaeschke. On one occasion he explained to them the words of the apostle: "Knowing this that the trial of your faith worketh patience; but let patience have her perfect work, that ye may be perfect and entire wanting nothing. If any of you lack wisdom let him ask of God," &c. They were astonished at his discourse, the more so as they knew him to be an illiterate man. His words penetrated their souls and disclosed to them the deceitfulness of their hearts. This made them desirous of obtaining more light; and as they beheld nothing but darkness around them, they entreated him to look out for a place where they might settle; for they fancied *all* Protestants were like him.

He repeated his visit in little more than a year, and explained to them the words of our Saviour; "Every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands for my name's sake, shall receive an hundred fold, and shall inherit everlasting life." This address increased their desire to emigrate, for where they then lived they saw nothing but misery before them, being forced to the observance of many superstitious rites, which were contrary to the word of God and against their consciences.

However, as they could not immediately effect their emigration, Christian David advised them to attend divine service in the Lutheran Church in Teschen. The incumbent at that time was the Rev. John Adam Stinmez. He and his two colleagues, Muthman and Sassadius, preached with great power. Their auditories were uncommonly large. No less than forty thousand Germans and thirty thousand Poles belonged to the congregation, and many Moravians, residing in the frontier towns, occasionally attended their ministry. To these clergymen the Neissers discovered their intention to emigrate; but they advised them against it, alledging, that they would every where find great corruption and many hindrances to conversion, true christians being always persecuted by the world. This threw them into great perplexity, not knowing what to do. But while they were laying their difficulties before the Lord in fervent prayer, and entreating his help, he was preparing the way for their complete emancipation from spiritual thraldom.

Christian David, after several fruitless attempts to find an asylum for his oppressed countrymen, was at length providentially directed to apply to Count Zinzendorf. After minute enquiry into the circumstances of these people, the Count promised that if they emigrated he would use his interest for them, and in the meantime receive them on his estate Berthelsdorf, not far from Goerlitz. Encouraged by this promise Christian David hastened to Moravia, no sooner had he informed the two brothers, Augustin and Jacob Neisser, of the Count's promise, than they resolved to forsake all and emigrate, "for," said they, "this is God's doing." The step they were going to take required not a little decision and fortitude. They were obliged to leave house and home, an extensive business and considerable property, and to separate themselves from a large circle of friends and relations, to whom they durst not say a word of their intention lest they should be betrayed.

At the appointed time they all assembled at Jacob Neisser's house. The company consisted of Augustin and Jacob Neisser, their wives and

four children, (viz. a boy of six years, a girl of three, and twins only twelve weeks old,) their cousin Michael Jaeschke, eighteen years of age, and a young woman, Martha Neisser. Soon after 12 o'clock at night on Wednesday the 25th of May, 1722, they commenced their pilgrimage conducted by Christian David, who led them through unfrequented paths across the mountains to the frontiers of Silesia, and arrived safely the next day at Nieder Wiese, the first Protestant town. Having left their families at Goerlitz, the two Neissers and Christian David proceeded to the estate of Count Zinzendorf. The Count being in Dresden, his grandmother, the lady Von Gersdorf, who resided at Hennesdorf, resolved that the emigrants should be provided for at Berthelsdorf, a village about two English miles from Hennesdorf, and of which Count Zinzendorf was proprietor. To this village the Moravians were sent, being recommended by Mr. Rothe, minister of Berthelsdorf, to Mr. Heitz, steward to Count Zinzendorf.

It was thought best to choose some spot where they might form a colony of their own—and not build in the village; the place chosen for building was on the declivity of the Hutberg, a hill on the high road from Loeban to Zittah. It was then a dreary wilderness, covered with forest trees and bushes, and the ground a complete swamp, with not a human habitation in the neighborhood. The objection of Augustin Neisser's wife, therefore, was well founded, who exclaimed: "Whence shall we get bread in this desert?" But she was silenced by another who in a tone of firm confidence replied: "If thou wouldst believe thou shouldst see the glory of God." Christian David full of faith and courage, striking his axe into a tree, repeated the words of the Psalmist: "Here the sparrow has found a house, and the swallow a nest for herself, where she may lay her young, even thine altars, O Lord of Hosts, my King and my God." Ps. lxxxiv. 3.

On the 17th of June, 1722, the first tree was felled\* for the building of the first house of the new settlement. Amidst great poverty and many difficulties, and exposed to the taunts of travellers, the Moravian emigrants continued their work in faith and hope, and by the end of October had so far finished their building that it could be inhabited. The name of Herrnhut was given to the new settlement by Mr. Heitz, before the first house was erected, in a communication to Count Zinzendorf, wherein he says: "We have called this place HERRNHUT, to remind us, on the one hand, that the Lord is our protector and keeper, and on the other that it is our duty to stand in the watch-tower and keep ward." This is in allusion to the meaning of the word Herrnhut, which has a double signification, and may be translated, either *the object of the Lord's protection*, or, *the watch of the Lord*.

The emigration of the Neissers exposed their relatives to heavy trials. They were required to discover the retreat of their brothers, and refusing to do this, were thrown into prison. The severity with which they were treated, induced them, when set at liberty, to forsake all, and with their families, consisting of eighteen persons, to follow their brethren to Herrnhut, where they arrived in the spring of 1723, and were affectionately received.

Towards the close of the same year, Christian David, who, regardless of every danger, was never more in his element than when he found an

---

\* On the spot where this tree stood, a stone monument has since been erected perpetuating the event.

opportunity of assisting the posterity of the ancient Brethren in obtaining liberty of conscience, undertook another journey to Moravia, and visited several villages. His powerful testimony of the gospel, and the account he gave of the grace prevailing at Herrnhut, excited great sensation throughout the neighborhood. By the searching discourses of the two brothers, David and Melchior Nitschmann, the number of persons who were sincerely seeking the salvation of their souls rapidly increased. They assembled in several places, in companies of more than a hundred, and spent the greater part of the night in religious conversation and prayer. The concern to seek the kingdom of God and his righteousness, became so general that this subject formed almost the exclusive topic of discourse, wherever two or three met together. Neither threatening nor reproach could damp their zeal, or repress their praises to God for these days of divine visitation, in which they were so mightily excited to follow the faith of their fathers.

It was not to be expected that these proceedings would be long beheld with indifference, by those who hated the light of evangelical truth. The district in which this awakening principally took place, belonged to the Jesuits of Olmutz. By their instigation the civil power was employed to crush the rising cause of Christ. Religious meetings were strictly forbidden, and those who promoted or attended them were cruelly persecuted.

Many were imprisoned; and as the gaols could not contain all, some were shut up in stables and offensive places, others were thrust into cellars and forced to stand in water till they were nearly frozen to death. Sometimes, however, their enemies were restrained by a higher hand, from proceeding to the lengths they intended. Thus it once happened in Kunnewalde, where the Brethren often assembled in large companies at each others' houses, for the purpose of edification, that a police officer, having entered the house of David Nitschmann, where more than one hundred and fifty were assembled, in his hurry seized all the books within his reach, but offered no other molestation, and then proceeded to another house for the same purpose. Fearing the people, he took a number of persons with him. When they entered the place of meeting the Brethren began to sing, with loud voices, the following stanza of one of Luther's hymns.

“If the whole world with devils swarm'd,  
That threaten'd us to swallow,  
We will not fear, for we are arm'd,  
And victory must follow :  
We dare the devil's might,  
His malice, craft and spite ;  
Tho' he may us assail,  
He never shall prevail ;  
The Word of God shall conquer.”

The officer commanded silence; but they repeated the verse, which so confounded him, that he threw down the books he had collected and ran out of the house. But on the following day twenty persons, all heads of respectable families were thrown into prison. This cruel treatment defeated its own object, as many were thereby induced to forsake their all, and emigrate, which they were obliged to do with the greatest secrecy.

On the arrival in Herrnhut of any emigrants, they were subjected to a strict examination concerning their reasons for leaving Moravia; and those only were permitted to stay who could satisfactorily prove, that they had taken this step purely for the gospel's sake. All others

were indeed hospitably entertained, but sent back as soon as possible, being provided with money needful for their journey. Count Zinzendorf in most cases gave them a letter to the magistrate of the district to which they belonged. This measure was rendered necessary for two reasons. First, to prevent persons of a dubious character from settling at Herrnhut; and, secondly, to remove all suspicions from the civil and ecclesiastical government in Moravia, that inducements were held out to the emigrants to leave home. With a view of coming to an amicable understanding on this subject, Count Zinzendorf waited in person on the Cardinal Bishop of Olmutz, at Kremsir in Moravia, and on the Imperial Counsellor. His conferences with them elicited this final answer on the part of the government, "that no religious liberty could be granted in the country, but that none should be prevented from emigrating in stillness; but such as returned and instigated others to emigrate, must abide by the consequences."

The Moravians in Herrnhut, however, showed great reluctance to adhere to this regulation, and, notwithstanding their deference to Count Zinzendorf, were not disposed to yield implicit obedience to it. Many went secretly to Moravia, in order to rescue their nearest relations and intimate friends from spiritual tyranny. Christian David more especially was not to be restrained. He considered himself as called by God, to instruct his countrymen in the way of salvation, and to assist all who desired it, to obtain their liberty. On his repeated journeys into Moravia, he was often in imminent danger of his life, but experienced no less frequently the most signal deliverance. He also took a journey into Bohemia to discover the descendants of the Bohemian branch of the Brethren's church. And wherever he visited, his testimony of Jesus was blessed for the awakening and conversion of many. By his endeavors, and those of others, the light of divine truth still spread in Moravia, and the emigration continued for some time; so that five years after the building of Herrnhut, thirty-four houses had been erected, and inhabited by about three hundred persons, of whom at least one half were Moravian exiles, and lineal descendants of the ancient Brethren's church.

All the difficulties, unavoidably connected with the formation of a new colony, especially when undertaken by such poor and despised people as the Moravian Brethren, were rendered easy to them, and all their troubles were sweetened by the grace which prevailed among them, by their zeal in the cause of God, and by the Christian spirit which influenced all their proceedings. A few extracts from a letter written by Augustin Neisser, will serve to display the spirit which animated the first inhabitants of Herrnhut.

"The love which fills the soul, when the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts, and we are united by the love of Christ, into one body under Him the Head, is far better known by experience, than described in words. May Jesus by his almighty power, confirm, strengthen, preserve and increase in us this holy flame, till it shall be perfected in eternal life. 'If we love one another God dwelleth in us, and his love is perfected in us. Hereby we know that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit! The conversation is indeed very different from that of others. It seeks deep into the heart: and I can bear witness that by the power of God your discourses have often penetrated my heart. Few hours pass in which I have not the most lively recollections of the subjects we used to discourse upon. Some of those subjects I did not then understand, much less experience: but God be

praised, who confirms in one so poor and weak as I am, the truth of his divine word, having given me a right understanding into the way of a sinner's justification and sanctification, and taught me that justification by faith, and righteousness of life, are not to be confounded, and that true love to God and man, is the fruit of faith, derived from the fulness of Jesus; and that, 'God hath chosen us in Christ before the foundation of the world, that we should walk holy and unblameably before him in love.' Without this faith all is mere delusion, which can never renovate the heart; and it is to be feared that many *thus* believe to their eternal damnation. May God so enlighten the eyes of our understanding, that we may know the power of evangelical truth, whereby all are saved who believe, and each 'may know what is the hope of his calling, and what are the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints!' I wish, my dear brother, that I might be permitted once more in my life to converse with you, and that this might take place in Herrnhut: there you would see with your own eyes the wonders God hath wrought for us within these few years; whose glory would have been still more manifest, if we had not often impeded his work. But thanks be to him for what he hath done! For my own person I experience what the Son of God saith, 'Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you.' May our great King Jesus, who has begun to establish his kingdom in very many places, defend it against the powers of darkness, and give might and victory to his people."

The proceedings of the Moravian exiles acquired in a short time too much notoriety to be long beheld with indifference by others; and the newly formed congregation had in its very infancy, to pass through evil as well as good report. Herrnhut was therefore visited by persons of all descriptions, who came to see and hear for themselves. Others, living at too great a distance, requested information by letters, or solicited information of the Brethren. This led to the sending of *Deputations* into several, and often very remote countries. Thus a door of usefulness was opened to them, for displaying the spirit of their ancestors, by showing the same zeal for propagating the gospel wherever opportunity offered.

The early exertions of the Brethren, to extend the kingdom of Christ, were not limited to Europe and its Christian population. They burned with desire to preach Christ in those regions of the globe, where his name had hitherto remained wholly unknown, viewing *all* mankind as equally involved in sin and ruin through the apostacy of the first Adam and their own disobedience; they longed to diffuse among them the knowledge of the second Adam, who is the Lord from heaven, that by faith in him they might participate in his redemption. Constrained by the love of Christ, they considered his command, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature," as binding on them, and panted for an opportunity of obeying it. The more destitute, degraded and savage any people were, the greater was their pity for them, and the stronger their desire to offer to them the consolations of the gospel.

Actuated by these principles we find them consulting together, as early as the year 1728, on the practicability of converting Greenlanders, Negro slaves, and other barbarous nations, to the faith of Christ; though at that time they saw little prospect of realizing their wish.

Two years after, an apparently trifling, but in its consequences most

important occurrence, prepared the way for the realization of their hopes. Count Zinzendorf being in Copenhagen for the purpose of attending the coronation of king Christian VI. of Denmark, his domestics became acquainted with a Negro of the name of Anthony. This man visited Herrnhut, and by his account of the deplorable condition of the Negro slaves in the West Indies, revived and strengthened, in the minds of the Brethren, the previously existing desire of preaching the gospel to them. Two young men and intimate friends, Leonard Dobers and Thomas Leupold, were stirred up to devote themselves to this service. Each having first examined himself on the sincerity of his motives, and intreated the Lord to direct him, they communicated their thoughts to each other, and were much strengthened in their purpose by the correspondence of their views. They determined to disclose their sentiments in a letter to count Zinzendorf, who rejoiced at their zeal.

Their letter was afterwards read to the congregation, without however disclosing the names of the writers. They declared themselves willing, even to sacrifice life in the service of Christ, and, should it be required, to sell themselves for slaves, if thereby they might gain but *one* soul for Him.

Their object, however, was generally disapproved, being considered as the effect of youthful, though well meant zeal, and not likely to succeed. This opposition occasioned the delay of a whole year, which afforded ample time for all parties to weigh maturely the subject in all its bearings. Leonard Dober remained firm to his purpose, but at the suggestion of count Zinzendorf, consented to have it decided by the lot, agreeably to the practice of the ancient Brethren's Church in the case of any important but doubtful enterprise. This was accordingly done, and the lot decided, **THAT HE SHOULD GO.** All minds were now set at rest. The success with which the Lord has been pleased to crown their missionary labors, has fully satisfied the Brethren, that, in this instance, they rightly interpreted his will. Those going to the Danish island of St. Thomas, in the West Indies, left Herrnhut on the 21st of August, 1732, and those going to Greenland, in the succeeding January, 1733. Preparations were soon made for missions in North and South America.

Many difficulties impeded the early labors of the Missionaries, the necessity imposed on them by the poverty of their church, to support themselves by the labor of their hands, was attended not only with great personal inconvenience, but trenched upon the time and care, which ought to have been solely devoted to the duties of their proper calling. Their want of a liberal education rendered the acquisition of foreign and barbarous languages, like the Greenlandic, Arawka and others, very difficult, retarded the translation of the Holy Scriptures into those languages, and thereby deprived them of the principal means of conversion. Lastly, the novelty of the work, in which they had no predecessors, or at least none by whose advice and example they could profit, rendered them liable to commit mistakes, both in the mode of preaching to the Heathen, and conducting the missionary service in general.

Considering these and many other disadvantages, with which the early missionaries of the Brethren's Church had to contend, the pious observer of their proceedings will be excited to devout acknowledgments for the grace of God, which attended their labours. He will glorify God for their disinterested zeal, their patient self-denial, their unremitting exertions, and their persevering constancy, which, being induced and

influenced by the love of Christ, no adverse circumstances could extinguish. And now, when the character and work of a Missionary are honored, when his temporal comforts are liberally supplied, and when in the Brethren's Church as well as in other Christian communities, provision is made for his acquiring a competent knowledge of human learning; we may wish that the spirit, that animated the fathers of the Brethren's Church, may descend to their latest posterity.

[To be continued ]

---

**ART. II.** *Charges Delivered at the Installation of the Rev. John G. Smart, to the pastoral inspection of the Associate Presbyterian Congregation in the City of Baltimore, Md. May 2, 1838.—By Rev. C. WEBSTER.*

(Continued from page 150.)

### CHARGE TO THE PEOPLE.

**BELOVED BRETHREN,**

This day's transaction calls loudly upon you for thanksgiving to God. After several years of privation and much tossing, your eyes now behold your teacher. God has afflicted and tried, but not forsaken you. Let then all painful recollections of the past be swallowed up and forgotten in the general joy which ought to pervade every bosom on an occasion like the present. And "the Lord make you glad according to the days wherein he has afflicted you, and the years wherein you have seen evil."

But your responsibility is also augmented by an increase of privileges; and the messenger which the Lord has sent among you must necessarily become the bearer either of heavy or joyful tidings. To some of you his message will doubtless be fraught with unspeakable blessings, and there is little doubt that to others it will prove a burden of wrath. Of the latter kind was the message which the prophet Isaiah was compelled to bear to the rebellious house of Israel—"The voice of the Lord said" to him, "go and tell this people, hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes, lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with the heart, and convert and be healed." It is true this tremendous message, strictly speaking, forms no part of the gospel proclamation; but is nevertheless the awful and inevitable result of its abuse or wilful rejection. It is a wall of fire around the gospel, protecting it from the insults of ungodly men. When the Son of God appeared on earth in our nature, he was "sent for the fall and rising again of many in Israel." According to ancient prediction—"he shall be for a sanctuary; but also for a stone of stumbling and rock of offence to both the houses of Israel; for a gin and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. And many among them shall stumble and fall, and be broken, and be snared, and be taken." And the same thing is true of every faithful servant of the Lord Jesus Christ. If men quarrel with the instrument, they fight against the hand that holds it. And they that reject the servants of Christ, reject Christ himself, and they that reject Christ, reject the Father who sent him.

Consequently, the settlement of a gospel ministry among a people is the most important event that can befall them in the providence of God. Your minister has been this day set over you, not only for the defence of the gospel, but "for the fall and rising again" of many among you. For the gospel proclamation is backed with the sovereign authority of Jehovah. It is an offer of mercy carrying in it all the binding obligation of an imperative law. The same God who declares "the soul that sinneth, it shall die," also declares "he that believeth not shall be damned." So that the gospel of the grace of God may no more be trifled with than the law of his justice. And when a people have long enjoyed the means of grace to no good purpose—when religious duties sink into a mere form, so as to become "vain oblations"—when attainments in knowledge become the aliment of pride, so that a people are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight—when men are honored or despised in the church merely on account of their outward condition—when their profession is maintained according to the maxims of human policy—when there is respect of persons in judgment, so that "they justify the wicked for a reward, and take away the righteousness of the righteous from him—when sordid avarice becomes the Alpha and Omega of their existence, so that they join house to house and field to field, till there be no place, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth"—when mirth, and drunkenness, and debauchery absorb the faculties of the soul and fill up the measure of their days, so that they rise up early in the morning, that they may follow strong drink, and the harp and the viol, the tabret and pipe, and wine are in their feasts; then it is that their eyes are SHUT, their ears are CLOSED, and their heart made FAT. Then it is, that they become like barren spots of earth bringing forth only thorns and briars, and are rejected of God, are nigh unto cursing, and their end is to be burned. Then it is, that the gospel becomes a savour of death unto death; and the faithful preaching of the gospel only inflames the lusts, accelerates the downward course, and aggravates the eternal condemnation of such a people.

But beloved, we hope better things of you, and things which accompany salvation, though we thus speak. And that you may be made partakers of better things through the instrumentality of your minister, I charge you, in the name and by the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ—

*Give diligent and prayerful attention to his instructions.* You have heard that he must give himself WHOLLY to the work of the ministry; and it follows that you must hear him constantly. For the duties of ministers and people are reciprocal. So far as outward means are concerned, the word is the grand instrument of salvation. It is by the word you must be born again. (1 Pet. i. 23.) It is by the word that your sanctification must be promoted and carried on to perfection. (John xvii. 17.) It is by the word that you must be preserved from apostacy and ruin. For you "are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation;" and "faith cometh by hearing." Alas! for the inattention, levity, and indifference of gospel hearers! Alas! how few attend the preaching of the gospel at all! And how few of those who do attend are benefitted! It appears as though God had poured upon this generation a spirit of deep sleep. The lively oracles of God have become to many a sealed book, "which men deliver to one that is learned, saying, read this I pray thee; and he saith, I cannot; for it is sealed: and the book is delivered to him that is not learned, saying, read this I pray

thee ; and he saith, I am not learned." (Is. xxix. 11, 12.) One is too learned and another is too ignorant either to read the scriptures or hear the gospel preached ; and so they wrap it up. But we beseech you, brethren, by the mercies of God, let your conduct be different. Let no unwarrantable excuse detain you from the house of God, whenever his word is spoken. It is not the authority of man but of God that binds you to pursue this course of conduct. For what saith the scripture ? "He that turneth away his ear from HEARING the law, even his prayer shall be abomination." (Prov. xxviii. 9,) And again, "Blessed is he that readeth and they that HEAR the words of this prophecy, and keep the things which are written therein ; for the time is at hand."—(Rev. i. 3.)

*Submit yourselves in the Lord to the reproofs, admonitions, and if need be, rebukes of your minister.* You have heard that he must watch for souls, for your souls. And it may become his painful duty at times not only to reprove, but also to inflict the just censures of the church, which have been ordained by the King of Zion, and which are designed for the recovery of the backsliding ; for the excision of unsound members, and as a caution to all to be prayerful and watchful. "Of some have compassion, making a difference ; and others save with fear, pulling them out of the fire ; hating even the garment spotted by the flesh." (Jude, verse 23.) In this work the minister's hands should be strengthened by the counsel and co-operation of the eldership, who are equally responsible with the minister for the comely order and purity of the congregation. Let not the faithful discharge of their official duties be offensive to you. Let not their smiting break your head ; but account it as a precious oil. So long as they judge for the Lord, the Lord is with them in the judgment. Therefore, we beseech you, "obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves ; for they watch for your souls as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy and not with grief ; for this is unprofitable for you."

*Be much engaged in prayer for your minister.* If an inspired apostle regarded an interest in the prayers of christians of so much importance, that he not only exhorted, but enjoined it upon them as a duty to pray for him ; how much more urgent must be the necessity of ordinary ministers, and how much more imperious the obligation resting upon you to pray for your minister ? You have heard that the work of the ministry is exceedingly great and difficult ; that no man is sufficient for the right discharge of its high and holy functions any further than he is enabled by the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ. Independent of the magnitude of their work, ministers of the gospel are more exposed to temptations than any other class of men on earth. "Within are fears ;" he is conscious of his own weakness ; that he himself has only a partial knowledge of divine mysteries ; that he is constantly exposed from extraneous influences which bear upon him on every side ; that his best performances are immeasurably below the excellency and dignity of the gospel ; and he fears that evil may result through his imperfection, when he is most anxious to do good—"Without are fightings ;" the selfishness of men raises their expectations of a minister's duties beyond all reasonable bounds, the ignorant will pervert his greatest virtues into unpardonable faults ; the lukewarm and indifferent are offended with earnest appeals to the conscience ; and the zealot, whose zeal is not tempered with knowledge, is amazed that a minister should be so cold and doctrinal. But in addition to this, party spirit, and prejudice, and the

natural versatility of man, and the love of novelty, and the natural repugnance of the human heart to that holiness which the gospel requires, and the restless malice, and the violent opposition of the enemies of the truth, together with the "fiery darts" of satan, all conspire to render the ministerial office one of difficulty and danger; and all unite in demanding from you a faithful discharge of this duty. Let, then, your minister be constantly borne up on your spirits to a throne of grace. Pray for him, not only this night when you retire from this worshipping assembly, but "always with all supplications." Let not your prayers, either for him or yourselves, be like rushing and turbed streams, produced by the thunder storm; but like living springs, which take their rise deep in the bowels of the earth, and cease not to send forth their refreshing streams, despite the drought of summer and the frosts of winter. "And so shall the Lord guide thee continually, and satisfy thy soul in drought, and make fat thy bones; and thou shalt be like a watered garden, and like springs of water, whose waters fail not." (Isaiah lviii. 11.)

Pray that he may be endowed with all necessary gifts and graces of the Spirit; that compassion for the miseries of men, and agonizing desires for their salvation, may distinguish the whole course of his ministry; above all, that God would communicate messages of peace to your own souls through his instrumentality. For there is abundant evidence to believe that a general neglect of this duty is one cause why the gospel is attended with so little success. May it not be owing to this cause that our sermons are imbued with so little of the spirit and power of the gospel? that we hear so much cavil, and complaint, and disgust with ministers and sermons? And would it not be well for people when retiring dissatisfied from the house of God, to put the question to themselves, whether sin lie not at their own doors? Did they, before entering the sanctuary, pray in secret for their minister? Did they pray that God would meet with and bless them in the observance of his own institution? If not, they have incurred the guilt of offering a "vain oblation;" and no wonder at their disappointment; for it is the greatest of all wonders that wrath has not broken forth upon them. They entered the house of God with their heads and their hearts so full of the world; and so little affected either with a sense of their necessities, or of the mercies of God, that they had not a single petition to offer, nor even a secret desire that they might obtain the blessing. Is it at all surprising in such a case that spiritual food becomes unpalatable, and the preaching of the gospel unprofitable?

*See that you provide an ample temporal support for your minister.*

You have heard that it is his duty to give himself **WHOLLY** to the work of the ministry. It follows of course that you must minister to his temporal necessities. Many very unscriptural notions have become prevalent on this point. The enemies of the gospel in order to overthrow it, have assailed its ministers in every possible shape and manner. And in none perhaps more successfully than in their efforts to divert the liberality of the people from the support of a gospel ministry. Some, who, by the way, are not very zealous to hear the word preached, profess to attach such an uncommon degree of sanctity to the ministry, that it would be little less than sacrilege to speak of money as connected with such a holy office. As though it were unholy for ministers to live like other men in the use of food and raiment! Others again, who can take one-half the Sabbath to indulge in indolence, take

medicine, or recreation, have such a horror at the thoughts of sabbath-breaking that they could not endure to hear a minister speak of the duty of supporting the gospel on the Sabbath. And even among professing christians some manifest their determination not to be guilty of supporting a "hireling ministry." Others give as a mere gratuity, or that they may obtain a right to a burial place, or church privileges for their children. And many regard money appropriated for this purpose as little better than thrown away; to such it is doubtless thrown away. For the support of gospel ordinances is a duty binding upon christians equally with any other. Therefore, a conscientious discharge of this duty, from a regard to the authority of God, is a mark of grace, for men will contribute their money for that which they value most. And the christian knows that it is the will of God that he should honor him with a portion of his substance. It is not the amount given, but the mind with which it is contributed. It should be a free will offering, proceeding from a ready mind; and when it is performed for conscience sake, the widow's mite may receive a higher commendation than the large sums which the rich contribute out of their abundance.

Owing to the sneers of ungodly men, or a false delicacy, it is to be feared that ministers are not sufficiently careful to remind people of their duty in this respect; for it is a part of the whole counsel of God which they are bound to declare. "Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things, live of the things of the temple? and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar? Even so hath the Lord ORDAINED, that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel." And "if we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things?" Without a proper regard to the authority of God, in this respect you may, like Israel of old, be left to barren ordinances till you become sensible of your sin, and return again to your duty. "Bring ye all the tithes into the store-house, that there may be meat in my house, and prove me now herewith saith the Lord of Hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing till there be not room enough to receive it."

Finally: *We beseech you, brethren, know them who labor among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and esteem them highly in love for their works' sake. And be at peace among yourselves. And the God of peace that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that Great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant make you perfect in every good work, to do his will, working in you that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory for ever and ever.— Amen.*

---

### ART. III. *Some Structures on the Associate Presbyterian Magazine.*

MR. EDITOR:—Shortly after you announced the new periodical styled the Associate Presbyterian Magazine, edited by Rev. P. Bullions, D. D., the first number fell into my hand. It would not be easy to give expression to all the thoughts that rose on the perusal of it, and it might not be for edification. Something of this nature was anticipated some

time ago. When men are convicted, they have but one alternative, either to confess and forsake their sins, or to cover them. I regret to find that these men have chosen the latter course. The cause of truth does not require a formal answer to their allegations; to an unbiassed mind, they carry their own confutation. And I would not refer to their publication in any way, were it not for two or three things; but I shall be brief. Some of the scripture quotations require a few words, as some honest people may be imposed on by the appearance of scripture authority.

The first with which we meet is on page 2d, as follows: "We ought to obey God rather than man," (Acts v, 29.) It appears from the context that the Apostles had been performing many stupendous miracles in the name of Jesus, declaring in their discourses that he is the Christ, and that he is risen from the dead. At this "the High Priest and those that were with him (which is the sect the Sadducees) were filled with indignation," and cast them into prison. But this was to no purpose, for the Angel of the Lord opened it again and brought them out and commanded them to go and speak in the temple *all* the words of this life. For this they were again brought up: "And the High Priest asked them, did not we straitly command you that ye should not teach in this name, and behold ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine and intend to bring this man's blood upon us." "Then Peter and the other Apostles answered, *We ought to obey God rather than men*; the God of our fathers raised up Jesus whom ye slew and hanged on a tree; Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, &c." Here I would observe that the crime laid to the charge of the Apostles was preaching Christ and the Resurrection. For their doctrine they advance evidence which even the High Priest dared not to contest, and their authority to preach was immediately from heaven. There was not even an attempt to dispute it. And there was nothing set up against it, but the bare authority of man.

Let us now hear how these brethren apply this argument.

"It will doubtless be represented to you by those who have taken the lead in those offensive measures of which we complain, that if we wished merely for a redress of grievances and a return to scriptural principles of discipline, we ought to have submitted to the decisions of the Synod in the mean time. Representations of this kind may indeed mislead the simple and unsuspecting part of community, but they can have no influence on intelligent and consistent Protestants. They well know from the best authority, that *We ought to obey God rather than man.*"

Questions for "intelligent and consistent Protestants."

1. Have these brethren given as clear and convincing evidence to the Synod or to any other party in the world, that they have Christ's authority for their present course as the Apostles gave to the council for theirs?
2. Is it as clear that the Associate Synod are enemies to Christ and his doctrine, as that the Sadducees were so?
3. Is the difficulty between them and the Synod, that **THEY** are determined to preach **ALL** the words of this life at the risk of poverty, reproach, suffering and death, and that the Synod are determined to stop them?
4. Has the editor of that Magazine been always fired with this holy zeal ever since he was licensed to preach? and is this the fault which

the Synod has laid to *his* charge? Ought he not to answer this question before he takes station by the side of Peter and the other Apostles?

5. Whether is it most like sincere, honest and godly men (which these claim to be) when they are convinced in their hearts that the long established church order by which they had solemnly vowed to walk, is unscriptural, to leave the society in a peaceable manner, or to stay until they can subvert the minds of the people?

On the same page another text is brought forward to speak for them. "We could not (say they) give place by subjection; no, not for an hour." The words are found, Gal. ii. 5. By a little attention to the passage, the true meaning will readily appear. "I went up," says the Apostle, "by revelation and communicated to them that Gospel which I preached among the Gentiles, (but privately to them which were of reputation,) lest by any means I should run or had run in vain. But neither Titus who was with me being a Greek was compelled to be circumcised. And that because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage, to whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour, that the truth of the Gospel might continue with you." The question at issue was, not whether Jews ought to circumcise their children; that was not disputed. Paul himself took and circumcised Timothy, because one of his parents was a Jew; but shall Gentile converts be circumcised? A set of men, who thought that no country but their own ought to have the honor of sound divinity and true religion, and wished to incorporate their Jewish prejudices and their legal principles with the Gospel dispensation, rose up and said, They must. "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye can not be saved."

Conscious that they could not carry through their union scheme by fair, honest and frank measures, they rather than sacrifice their national pride and vanity to the glory of the Gospel of the Son of God, had recourse to mean, Jesuitical, underhand work. "They came in privily and unawares, to spy out our liberty," &c. But Paul and those with him said, "No; not for an hour will we give place to you." This were to subvert the whole gospel scheme at once—to fall from justification by grace and to seek it by works. "Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing." (Ch. v. 2.)

Now the reader ought to observe, that it was no feeling of wounded pride, national prejudice or self-conceit, that made Paul so positive and peremptory in relation to this point—but it was the evidence of *immediate Revelation* bearing upon his mind; that is, absolute certainty. He says, "I went by revelation and communicated that gospel which I preached," &c.

Are these brethren equally certain that their course is correct? Will it not admit of a doubt? Observe also that it was not the decision of the Synod at Jerusalem, or of any regular ecclesiastical court, to which he would not yield for an hour, but "*false brethren*," who had come in by stealth to be spies. It will be a hard problem for the brethren to prove the parallel here. Certain as the apostle was of the importance of the question to the truth of the Gospel and of his correctness in it; he was no less cheerful and ready to honor the authority of Christ in the courts of his house, by admitting an appeal from the decision of himself and Barnabas, to the Synod at Jerusalem, on this same question at Antioch. Here it was, if it could be any where, that the words

quoted should have been said to serve the cause of the suspended brethren. Why did he give place by submitting to their "determination" to carry the question up when he was made *infallibly* certain already? What do the brethren say to this? Why, perhaps, that Paul knew before hand that the Synod at Jerusalem would decide right. Very well, they "*know in fact*," before hand, too, that the majority of the whole is on their side, and that when the Associate Synod sits at Pittsburg, it too decides things right! Why did they not wait for it? Do they really believe that the surreptitious deed of constituting themselves into a Presbytery, which the Synod annulled at Philadelphia, is so vital to "a good conscience and the principles of religion," that they could not exist without it "for an hour?" They know better. What valuable purpose their use of the text can serve, we cannot see—that it may deceive and mislead "simple and unsuspecting people," is not so difficult to comprehend.

On the same 2d page we find a third text quoted.

"We feel it indeed," they say, "to be a heavy trial to be ecclesiastically separated, although it should prove only for a season, from many loved and respected brethren in that church, who have "*not consented to the counsel and deed*, of those who happenod to be the majority at the last meeting of Synod." The words are found in Luke xxiii, 51, and the connection is as follows: "And behold there was a man named Joseph a counsellor, and he was a good man and a just, the same had *not consented to the counsel and deed of them*;" that is, the "counsel" which the Chief Priests and Scribes took to put Jesus to death, and the "deed" of their sham trial and vote on Christ that he is worthy of death.

The reader cannot miss their scope here. Those who did not vote with the majority, are "honorable counsellors, good and just men," like Joseph of Arimathea. If they love to be flattered, they cannot complain here of a scant measure. But the majority who voted that these brethren *were not the Presbytery of Albany*, are like the Chief Priests and Scribes who took counsel to put Jesus to death!! This, indeed, is no great flattery—yet it serves as valuable a purpose. It proves what manner of spirit they are of. That cause must be *desperately* scarce of sound argument to support it, that is obliged to have recourse to such an one on their second page.

There are other quotations which I may notice again perhaps. They assure their followers and the world—"that they only follow the examples of the Protestant Reformers and the Fathers of the Secession Church, in refusing submission even for a time to the unscriptural decisions of church courts." Would that it were even so, that they were only following the footsteps of these godly men. But it is very far otherwise, as they themselves must know. "Representations of this nature may indeed mislead the simple and unsuspecting part of community, but they can have no influence on intelligent and consistent protestants."

Between them and the fathers of the Secession, there is this mighty difference, that the latter were cast out of the established church for *maintaining* and *defending* the authority and order of Christ's house; but they have been suspended for *opposing* it and *trampling* on it.

"The steps taken," says our Narrative, p. 27, "by the brethren who were cast out of the established church were not *rash*, or such as men usually take who are moved by resentment. They had eleven Presby-

terial meetings chiefly for prayer and conference. And at the twelfth meeting, August, 1735, they appointed a committee of their number to prepare a draft of a Judicial testimony. And after much conference on the subject, and many prayers for direction, this work was finished and passed as a judicial deed, at their *twenty-fourth* Presbyterial meeting, Dec, 1736." But the suspended brethren have *already* proceeded to exercise the highest judicial authority.

I am sorry to see my kinsmen, according to the flesh, exhibit the extreme weakness and something far worse, of endeavoring to enlist Scotch sympathy on their side. We should remember that it is the glory of the Gospel, that "in Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek," Scotch nor American.

And in the cases that have lately been before the courts, I am clear to say there has been no nationality displayed; I wish I could say, without the exception of these brethren themselves and a number of their advocates. In the last meeting of Synod, the Scotch and the American brethren were on both sides. In the Presbytery of Albany they were on both sides. And so they were in Cambridge Presbytery.

It is very well known, that Scotchmen have, from the beginning, opposed these men in their course. And it is also well known, that none have manifested more bitterness, or done more injustice to Scotchmen, both ministers and laymen, than they themselves have done. And yet, after this they would have us believe that the whole of this business resolves itself into a crusade against the Scotch! This attempt, therefore, to cast a fire-brand into the midst of the Associate church is without excuse, and must pass for what it is—the sign of a very bad cause. Was it by such base means that the "Protestant Reformers and the Fathers of the Secession" kept their ground? The Jews were as a people once famous for sound divinity and true piety, and then they were small in their own esteem; but after they had slidden back from the ways of God and apostatized and refused to be reclaimed, they thought themselves the only people in the world that were favored of Heaven, and all the rest of the nations were unclean dogs.

There *never* was a time when it would have become ministers of Scotland to boast; but there *has been* a time when their conversation did show that they were in good earnest about maintaining reformation principles. They were men whose solidity and worth gave honor to their names. Were *THEY* now to look up from their graves upon the state of things, they would write *ICHABOD* upon it, and pronounce those who vainly suppose that their names ought to give honor to them, a spurious race. This is the weakest species of self-deception, and we ought to despise it. It is an artifice to fetter our reason by national partialities, and we ought to beware of it. Nothing can be more degrading to the name, or more completely disprove our title to it, (if there be thought any peculiar worth to reside in it,) than to espouse a measure or a tenet because the men who advance it were born in the same part of the earth that we were; and in matters of religious nature it is to rebuild those partition walls which it was the glory of the Christian dispensation to demolish.

Were it even so that our names were cast out as evil, the far better way, and the way taken by the "Protestant Reformers and Fathers of the Secession," would be to bear it with meekness and patience. But it is not so, the words laid to Mr. W—— notwithstanding. They were his words alone (if used) and the mystery which these men pretend to

have unravelled by them, has *no existence*. Therefore, I say again to all my countrymen, beware of this artifice; it is designed to blind our eyes and rend the Associate Church in pieces. A SCOTCHMAN.

---

**ART. IV.** *Observations on the Divine Glory of Christ, as the Son of God,*

[From the Edinburgh Christian Magazine.]

The Gospel is good news and glad tidings to perishing sinners, as it reveals and exhibits a full and free salvation. A principal part of this good news is, the revelation of the character of the Saviour, and the assurance we have of his all sufficiency, by the testimony given to the divine glory of his person. None but the great God can be the Saviour of sinners. No sinner that is properly sensible of his condition, or understands what salvation he has need of, could depend for it on any other than a divine person. Our Lord himself accordingly proclaims his divine glory as the grand encouragement to sinners to look for salvation at his hand, Is. xiv. 22. *Look unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else.*

Now, as the doctrine of the true and proper Deity of the great Redeemer is of so great importance, and so necessary as a foundation of our faith and hope for eternity, we have reason to bless God, that it is a doctrine so fully and clearly revealed in the Bible. Wherever he is mentioned, some divine name or title, some divine perfection or prerogative, some ray of the glory of his divine character meets our eye, if it be not willfully shut against the light. There is particularly one name and title frequently given to him, whereby the glory of his divine character is displayed in a very striking manner, and with peculiar evidence, the SON—the SON of GOD. This name and title the Apostle John, both in his gospel and epistles, seems to dwell upon with delight; and it is thought that the reason of his using this designation so much, when speaking of Christ, was the opposition to the doctrine of his divinity then taking place. It is not therefore a matter of indifferency what account we make of the Sonship of Christ, or what we assign as the reason and ground of his getting that name and designation *the Son of God*. Though we admit the other evidences of his divinity, that will not justify our giving up with the evidence that is contained in this designation, by representing it, as not belonging to the original glory of his person, but as given him on the account of his incarnation, on the account of his mediatory office, or on the account of his resurrection and glorious exaltation in our nature; whether we fix on any of these separately, as the ground and reason of that title, or, as some do, join them all together.

The bounds of this paper will not admit of entering very particularly and fully into this subject; but a few things may be noticed to show, that the name and title *the Son of God*, belongs to the original and necessary glory of Christ, and is not founded upon his office, his incarnation, or mediatory exaltation.

It is a true and proper Sonship that the scriptures ascribe to our Lord Jesus, though it do not in all things correspond with what is to be found among men, any more than the nature of God, and the manner of his existence, can correspond with that of the creature. He is called, the

Son, *God's own Son*,\* in such a way as cannot admit of understanding this in a metaphorical sense, or as referring only to his being some way honored as a son. He is called the Son of God in a sense peculiar to himself; in such a sense as neither angels nor men can be the sons of God. The only begotten Son; the only begotten of the Father.† A miraculous formation and birth; a high office, or exaltation therein; could not make any one the Son of God in such a sense as Christ is. The Sonship ascribed unto Christ in scripture is such as implies, and intimates unto us, his divine glory. And if any one will open his Bible and carefully read the passages where Christ is mentioned by this name, and lay the emphasis upon it that the sentence requires, one would think that nothing more would be necessary to convince him of what is here asserted.

Such a Sonship belongs to Christ as implies his equality to the Father, John, v. 17.—26. *My Father worketh hitherto, and I work, &c.* The argument from this passage does not lie in this, that Christ, when calling himself a Son, and calling God his Father, claims to himself divine prerogatives; for whatever be the particular import of the name by which he is designed, or under which he speaks of himself, all divine perfections may be ascribed to him; and they are so even in these passages where he is named the Son of man.‡ But the argument is this, that Christ called himself the Son, and called God his own Father, in such a sense as implied an assertion of his equality with the Father. The Jews so understood him, and therefore sought the more to kill him, because he said *that God was his Father, making himself equal with God*, John v. 18.—We are not, indeed, to form our judgment about this matter by that of the carnal Jews; but Christ evidently admits the construction they put upon his words, and goes on to justify the claim of equality that was contained in calling God his own Father. He shows them, that though he was now in human nature, and in a state of humiliation in that nature; and that though, in the exercise of his office, he did not act by himself independently on the Father, or without the Father's commission; yet he was possessed of all the divine perfection; he was one with the Father in being, will, and operation; and, in the discharge of his office, exercised all divine perfection in the same sovereign way that is competent unto the Father, John v. 18. 21. 25. 26. The same thing is evident from the 10th chapter of John. Jesus said, verse 30. *I and my Father are one.* The Jews understood him as thereby *making himself God*, and charged him with blasphemy on that account. And it appears from verse 36. that the ground of the charge was Christ's calling himself the Son of God;—or, which is the same thing, his calling God his Father, rather than his calling himself one with the Father. Now in this passage, any more than in the former, there is no intimation that they had misunderstood the import of Christ's assertion; and that his calling himself the Son of God did not amount to an assertion of his godhead; but leaving that as a matter certain, he proves from scripture what good reason he had to claim that title which gave them so much offence.

Some who maintain that Jesus is called the Son of God on account of his incarnation, and of the union of the divine and human nature in his person, would evade the force of this argument for the necessary and eternal Sonship, by alleging, that the Sonship they plead for also implies his divinity, because it includes both natures, the divine and human.—But the Jews had no notion of such a Sonship, or of any such union of

\* Rom. viii. 32.

† John i. 14. 18. : iii. 16. 1 John iv. 9.

‡ John iii. 13.

these two natures, as that thereby he should become the Son of God:— They were so far from considering the human nature as necessary to constitute his Sonship, that this was the very thing that made them object against it, and charge him with blasphemy. *Thou being a man maketh thyself God.*

Another eminent proof that the Sonship of Christ necessarily belongs to the original glory and dignity of his person, is the use that is made in scripture of that name, the Son of God—his only begotten Son, to set forth the great love of God in sending him into the world to suffer and die for sinners, John iii. 16. *God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish.* 1 John iv. 9. 10. *In THIS was manifested the love of God towards us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him.* **HEREIN** is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. Some will not admit that there is any argument in this, because it is also said, that *God commendeth his love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us*; Rom. v. 8. And it is acknowledged, that the name Christ is expressive of his office. But it may be observed that this text is not altogether parallel to the former: It sets forth the love of God by a different consideration, namely, that of our being sinners and enemies when Christ died for us; while in the other, it is the consideration of the person who was given, and who was sent to suffer and die, that our attention is directed to, as the grand demonstration of the love of God. It is necessary, therefore, that the person be so named and described, as that we may know who he is, what is his highest glory and dignity, and how wonderful that love is, that gave him for sinners. Neither will it avail to tell us, that the Sonship they plead for implies his divinity, as it takes in both natures; and consequently, according to their scheme also, the love of God is manifested in this, that he sent his Son, that is, a divine person, to be the propitiation for our sins: For this does not come up to that demonstration of the love of God here meant, which does not lie merely in this, that he was a divine person who was given for us, but that he was the Son of God, his only begotten Son, and dear to him as the Son of his love. It is not merely the dignity of his person as one of the Trinity, but his peculiar relation to the Father, that is here referred to as evidencing the love of God in giving him. And where would be the force of that evidence, if this relation was not necessary and eternal, but only a relation arising from, and commencing with his incarnation and office.

It may now be proper to take some view of the arguments in support of a temporal Sonship, and the grounds alledged for it. Some hold that he became the Son of God only when he became man, and that this designation is given him on the account of his incarnation,—the miraculous formation of his human nature,—or the union of the two natures in his incarnation. Beside what hath been already said about the Sonship of Christ as belonging to the original glory of his person, it may be observed, that the Scripture gives us no such account of the incarnation as to warrant our considering it as a generation, upon the ground of which Christ is called the Son of God. The Father authorised it, and sent his Son into the world, and therefore is said to have prepared for him a body. The Holy Spirit formed the human nature in the virgin, and the Son himself assumed that nature into union with his divine person. But none of these things, nor all of them together, are represented as a gen-

eration constituting this Sonship. Some indeed imagine, that the words of the angel to Mary are a clear proof that the Sonship of Christ is founded in and arises from his incarnation, Luke i. 35. *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore that holy thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God.* Here, they suppose that the miraculous formation of the human nature along with its union to the divine in the person of Christ, is given as the reason and ground of his being the Son of God, and of his being so called. The words, *therefore also*, intimate a connection between the two parts of the verse; but not such as they suppose. They might be rendered, *even because*; and so they would point out his being the Son of God as the reason of his miraculous incarnation, and not this as the reason of his being the Son of God. But the meaning of these words appears plainly to be this: They refer us to the miraculous incarnation, as the proof and evidence, that Jesus, born of the virgin, was really the Son of God, and to be acknowledged in that character. The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; and therefore that holy birth, or that holy child born of thee, shall be, and shall be called, the Son of God. There is a reference to the ancient prophecy, that a virgin should conceive and bear a son, who was to be a divine person, even the Son of God. That prophecy was now to be accomplished: the virgin was, in this wonderful manner, to conceive and bear that son; and therefore that son so born of her, should indeed be the divine person mentioned in the prophecy. The child Jesus born of her would really be, and should be called the Son of God; because this miraculous conception proved him to be that divine person to whom the prophecy refers.\* And there are many instances of such particles being used, not as intimating the reason and ground of what is asserted, but the proof and evidence of it.

To assign the office of Christ as the reason of his being the Son of God, or to allege that he is so called on the account of it, is equally groundless. The Scripture plainly distinguishes between the Sonship of Christ and his office, and makes use of the designation, *the Son*, to express the dignity of the person who sustains the office, and to show us how sufficient he is for all that belongs to it, as well as how far he excels all others. In the 3d chap. of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the excellency of Christ, the great Prophet of the church and *Apostle of our profession*, and the principal demonstration of that excellency, lies in the account that is given of the dignity of his person as God, and the Son of God. A comparison is stated between him and Moses, who was the apostle of the old dispensation, for whom the Jews had a high veneration; and on this account they were much attached to that dispensation. It was indeed greatly to the commendation of Moses, that he was faithful in the house of God, and made all things according to the pattern showed in the mount; and Jesus was faithful also as the Apostle of our profession.—But the authority of Moses was not to be set up against the authority of Jesus. Moses was only a part of the house of God: Jesus was the God that built the house. Moses was a faithful servant in the house, and no

---

\*A certain author imagines, that he finds a good reason for considering the incarnation of Christ as a divine generation, and a ground of his being called the Son of God, in this, that the word which signifies to beget, is applied to that subject. But the Greek word is of a more general signification, and is equally applied to the conception and birth by the mother. If the author will open his Greek Testament at Luke i. 13. he will see the word applied to Elizabeth, as the mother of John the Baptist.

more than a servant: Jesus is a *Son over his own house*. The contrast here stated is not between a higher servant and a lower, but between a servant and a Son; not between a servant in a humbled state, and a servant exalted and honored like a Son; but between a servant however eminent and honored, and a Son whose property the house is, and all that are in it. In a word, it is a contrast between the creature and the great God; and the property that Christ, as a Son, has in the church, could no more proceed from his exaltation in our nature, than his other divine prerogatives could do so.

The Sonship of Christ is no less clearly distinguished from his Priesthood; and his excellency as a Priest is illustrated by this, that he is the Son of God, Heb. v. 1.—8. A comparison is stated between Christ, the High-priest of our profession, and the high-priest of the old dispensation, and an agreement in several particulars is pointed out; but at the same time a remarkable difference in respect of the original dignity and glory of his person. It was necessary that the high-priest should be a man, one of the people, that by experience of trouble he should be merciful and compassionate; and that he should be called of God. All this is found in our High-priest. The apostle begins with his call, ve. 5. and he mentions such an evidence of it as at the same time intimates and declares unto us that infinite dignity whereby he excels all other priests.—“So also Christ glorified not himself to be made an high-priest; but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.” There is no ground from this to allege that the Sonship of Christ includes his priesthood, or that these words, Thou art my Son, are equivalent to those in the following verse, Thou art a Priest, and of the same import, although the declaration might be made at the same time, and in the same way, both as to the one and the other. The words do not intimate unto us, how or when Christ was called to his priestly office, far less that he was made a Son when constituted a Priest; but they refer us to the grand demonstration of his call that was given in his resurrection; and the meaning of these words as applied to that event we shall afterwards consider. That it is the proof and evidence of the call that is here meant, none can deny, unless with the Socinians they deny that Christ was a Priest till after his resurrection. And this evidence of his call is referred to, because it is at the same time the grand demonstration of the dignity of his person above all others, and of his being able to be a Priest for ever. And though he was thus a divine person, yet he was a merciful High-Priest, and learned compassion by his infirmities and sufferings in the days of his flesh, verse 8. “Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things that he suffered.” Which text can have no meaning unless we consider this designation, *the Son*, as expressive of his original glory and dignity, nor would it be any answer to the objection which is here implied. Suffering necessarily belonged to his service and priestly office in a state of humiliation: neither could his after exaltation be any objection to his suffering them. But the difference between his Sonship and office is more clearly expressed, Heb. vii. 28. “The law maketh men high-priests; but the word of the oath, the Son, who is consecrated for evermore.” They in their natural character were but men; he, in his natural and original character, is the Son. And herein lies the primary ground of all his excellency above these priests: one evidence of it was the solemnity of his consecration, by the word of the oath; but the principal evidence and ground of it is, his infinite dignity as the Son of God.

It only remains to consider, Whether the Sonship of Christ, according to the Scriptures, be founded upon his resurrection and exaltation in our nature. That it is so, many plead, and refer us for evidence unto various passages of scripture, none of which afford any such evidence; but many of them, on the contrary, exhibit the strongest proof that the Sonship of Christ is necessary and eternal. He is indeed called the first begotten from the dead, Rev. i. 5. but it is the same expression that is rendered the first born from the dead, Col. i, 18. and no way refers to any generation constituting a Sonship. He is called the first born, because of the dignity he is exalted to as the head of the body and church of the first born; but he did not then receive his character as the only begotten Son of God. And his being the true and eternal Son of God, is a good reason for his holding the place of the first born among many brethren, and of his having in all things the pre-eminence, Col. i. 18.

But the great argument used by many to prove that he was made the Son of God by his resurrection and exaltation in our nature, is the application of the words, Psalm ii. 7. to these events, Acts xiii. 33. Heb. i. 5. "The Lord said unto me, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." The second Psalm contains a representation of the opposition that was to be made to Christ, God's anointed One; and it contains also a promise of the Father unto him, of the manifestation of his glory by his exaltation, in spite of all they could do. Now, the apostle tells us, that in the resurrection of Christ this was fulfilled. It was then said to him, and said in the most convincing and demonstrative manner, for the assurance of our faith; by that great and glorious work of God it was said, Thou art my Son. He was declared and determined to be the Son of God with power, by his resurrection from the dead, Rom. i. 4. In the same view, the words of the second Psalm are applied by the apostle, Heb. i. when speaking of the exaltation of Christ in our nature. In that chapter, the great object the apostle has in view, is to set forth the necessary and eternal glory of Christ, and particularly his glory as the Son of God; though he speaks of his exaltation also, as that whereby this glory was eminently manifested. The glory of his divine character was greatly veiled in a state of humiliation, Philip. ii. 6. 7. but it was the manifestation of it that was promised unto him, and prayed for by him, as the great reward of his service and suffering, John xvii. 5. And it is this divine and original glory, that the apostle speaks of as manifested in his exaltation; of which any one may be satisfied, by attending to the several particulars. There is the glory of his being the author of all things in creation and Providence, which does not arise from his exaltation, but is evidenced by, and is a good reason for his being appointed heir of all things, and exercising power over all, as our exalted Redeemer, com. Coll. i. 15. 16. 17. 18. In his exaltation, he is presented to the angels as the object of their worship, verse 6. but he did not then first become the object of worship, nor was that the foundation of his being so. The angels are but created spirits, ministering before the throne; but he is addressed as the God that sits upon the throne of universal dominion, and as the unchangeable Jehovah who made heaven and earth. In like manner, the Sonship here mentioned belongs to that original necessary glory that was manifested by his exaltation in our nature: And it is to this manifestation, and not a production of that glory, that the words of the Psalm are applied, verse 5. And this explains how he is said to obtain this name by inheritance, verse 4. The manifestation of this glorious name is secured to him by the promise of the Father, as the reward

of his work. Hence also, it appears how the promise "I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son," comes to be applied to his exaltation: Therein the Father acted the part of a Father to him, exalting and honoring him as his own Son, though for a while he had been made lower than the angels.

Having thus the divine testimony clearly expressed as the rule of our faith in this matter, it becomes us to rest in it without cavilling and disputing. Let none say that an eternal generation is a contradiction, and inconsistent with the eternal and necessary existence of the Son of God, unless they be able to explain to us the manner of the divine existence, how the eternity of God has no succession of parts, but is all a present now; and how there can be three distinct persons, and yet but one God. Neither let us satisfy ourselves with holding this truth as a mere opinion, or as a matter of mere speculation, but as the matter of our faith, rejoicing in this evidence of the divinity of Jesus Christ, that he is the Son of God, trusting in him accordingly, as able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by him. Let us pray for, and press after that assurance and experience the apostle expresses, 1 John v. 20. *We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding to know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ.* This (One) is the true God and eternal life. W.

---

ART. V. *General Thoughts on Psalm lxxxix. 15.*

"Blessed is the people that know the joyful sound."

These words have a primary and immediate respect to ancient Israel. By invaluable privileges they were distinguished from all the people on the face of the earth. The sublime address was sounded in truth; "Happy art thou, O Israel; who is like unto thee; a people saved by the Lord!" A particular ground of their happiness is here specified by the Psalmist. Many a joyful sound was heard among them. The allusion is just and beautiful. It refers to the *civil*, and especially to the *sacred* use of trumpets, in the congregation of Israel, (Numbers x.) Moses was commanded to make two silver trumpets; and these were used on various important occasions. But it is in a spiritual sense chiefly, and with reference to the days of the gospel, that the Psalmist speaks.— This is evident from his emphatic and rapturous language; for the words may be translated, "O the blessedness of the people that know the joyful sound!" Would he have spoken thus rapturously of any external and temporal privilege? Besides, he mentions the people who *know* the joyful sound, not those who only *hear* it. All Israel heard the sound of the trumpets; it was the peculiar attainment of some to know the spiritual meaning of such an institution. The context fully justifies this view of the passage. "They shall walk, O Lord, in the light of thy countenance. In thy name shall they rejoice all the day; and in thy righteousness shall they be exalted." Are not these spiritual privileges? Even the beginning of the Psalm, though it refers immediately to the covenant of royalty made with David, refers ultimately to the covenant of grace made with David's Son and Lord; for its promises run parallel with time, parallel with eternity. The gospel is the revelation of that covenant; and "O blessed is the people who know the joyful sound!" Let us brief-

ly consider the *gospel* as a *joyful sound*, the *knowledge* of it, and the *felicity* connected with that knowledge.

The *gospel* is a *joyful sound*; the most joyful indeed that ever met the ear of man. Was the account of it by the angel to the shepherds exaggerated? Nay; the half was not told, "Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people." (Luke ii. 10.) The *gospel* announces, that the true sacrifice is offered up and accepted. During the ceremonial dispensation, trumpets were blown over the sacrifices. What a joyful sound to the worshippers! As the sound of life, that God had accepted a victim in their place. But that victim necessarily derived all its value and efficacy from the Lamb of God. "Behold" him who really and completely "taketh away the sin of the world." "We joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement?" The *gospel* is the means of gathering the dispersed. The congregation of Israel was convened by sound of trumpet. Men have been scattered by sin. They are far from God, and alienated from one another. But it was predicted that to Messiah the gathering of the people should be. The *gospel* is the means of gathering them, to see the power of God and his glory in the sanctuary, to bend the knee in humble adoration, to celebrate the praises of the Lord, to hear the words of eternal life, to enjoy, to worship, to unite as children of the same family, to mingle their sorrows and their joys. The *gospel* is the invitation to a feast. Trumpets were blown on occasion of the sacred festivals among the Jews; and these festivals were always accompanied with the offering of sacrifice. Man, as a sinner, is in a state of greater want than the prodigal whose situation is so feelingly described in the parable. The sinner endeavors to fill his soul with husks, empty, base enjoyments, which instead of *satisfying*, cannot even *support*. But the *gospel* announces a feast, suitable to the nature of the soul, large as its desires, lasting as eternity; a feast for the understanding, for the conscience, for the heart. It is a feast upon a sacrifice. "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us." God is in him reconciled. "O taste and see that God is good!" The *gospel* proclaims liberty. The year of jubilee was introduced by sound of trumpet. It occurred every seventh, and every fiftieth year. In the former, the servant might go free, and the debtor was discharged: in the latter, the mortgaged inheritance returned to the original proprietor, or to his legal heir. The time of the *gospel* is the true jubilee. Liberty is proclaimed to the captives. The slaves of sin and Satan, nay the debtors to divine justice, may go free. Even the vast inheritance of eternal life is offered without money, and without price. The *gospel* directs men in their journey through the wilderness, and animates them in the spiritual warfare. The blowing of the trumpet was the signal for the march of Israel, and was used also when they went forth to battle. By the *gospel*, which includes the whole revelation of divine mercy, we are directed in our journey to the heavenly Canaan. It secures safety and progress; victory and triumph over all enemies.—Shouts shall be heard, louder than those on the banks of the Red sea, or when the walls of Jericho fell flat to the ground: "The Lord hath triumphed gloriously." The *gospel* announces the appearance of Zion's King. Trumpets were blown at the coronation of the Jewish monarchs, and when they appeared publicly. This is a custom, indeed, which hath obtained among all civilized nations. Now, let the children of Zion be joyful in their King. He is higher than the kings of any land. Go forth, and behold King Solomon. He is a God who reigneth. Thus, the gos-

pel is with propriety called "the joyful sound." If any suppose, that the allusion which has been stated is the work of mere fancy, let them listen to the evangelical prophet, "In that day shall the great trumpet be blown," &c. Is. xxvii. 13. We cannot come and worship properly, unless we know the gospel. This leads us to observe,

That the gospel as a joyful sound must be *known*. It is not said, "Blessed is the people that *hear* of the joyful sound." Many have heard of the gospel, who never heard it; and thus remain in a guilty, joyless, miserable state: even as many of old heard of what God had done for Israel, while they did not share in such deliverances and privileges. Nor is it said, "Blessed is the people who *hear* the joyful sound." Alas! not a few hear it, who are strangers to the sacrifice, to the feast, to the liberty, to the inheritance, which the gospel announces. But the people spoken of, are they who *know* the joyful sound. Blessed with respect to external privileges are those who hear the gospel; blessed with regard to gracious experience are those alone who *know* it. Think it not enough that you attend the preaching of the word regularly, that you hear attentively, that you have acquired much speculative knowledge of the gospel, that you make a strict profession of evangelical doctrine. Do ye know the joyful sound? Have you felt your absolute need of an atoning sacrifice, of spiritual provision, of spiritual liberty; of Jesus as a leader to conduct you, as a commander to lead you forth against spiritual enemies, as a King to deliver, to defend, to save completely? If so, the gospel is to you as the sound of the jubilee trumpet. The sound has entered your inmost soul; you have felt its truth, its divine authority, its power, its suitableness. It is to you a sound more majestic than the thunder of the sky, sweeter than the music of heaven, It hath called you effectually from sin. You don't reckon the sound of the moral law harsh and disagreeable, but rather the voice of a friendly monitor. The sound of heart-felt satisfaction and of cordial praise has proceeded from your lips. You readily acknowledge that divine grace has opened your ear; and you earnestly desire to know more of the gospel, in its pacifying, purifying, and consoling power. Is it not your daily prayer, that this joyful sound may go forth unto all the earth, to the ends of the world, that it may be heard, and known, and felt, by myriads? Let us attend a few moments to the

*Felicity* of the people who know the joyful sound. They alone are truly blessed, and their blessedness is unspeakably great. It is better felt than expressed. It deserves a note of admiration, "O the blessedness!" and did the idiom of our language permit the term, "O the blessednesses of the people who know the joyful sound!" The burning style of a seraph is too cold, and the duration of eternity too short, to describe their happy state. Suffice it to mention a few particulars. Those who know the joyful sound are brought into a state of pardon, pardon full, free, irrevocable. "Blessed is the man whose transgression is forgiven." He has stood and trembled at the foot of Mount Sinai; he has heard the voice of the trumpet waxing louder and louder, denouncing vengeance against every sinner, against *him*. But the joyful sound is heard, "I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake." Hence the voice of thanksgiving, "Bless the Lord, O my soul, who forgiveth all thine iniquities." Hence the voice of triumph, "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth." Those who know the joyful sound are happy amidst personal and private troubles. Often they hear the sound of affliction, as the voice of many waters. It

comes nearer and nearer. One earthly comfort is swept away, another follows, and after that a third. The waters, perhaps, come into the very soul, in deep spiritual distress. But the sound of divine mercy in the word and gospel furnishes a sufficient warrant for the confident voice of faith; "All thy waves and thy billows pass over me; yet the Lord will command his loving-kindness in the day-time." "Though I walk in the midst of trouble, thou wilt revive me." Nor do public calamities affect the happiness of the people who know the joyful sound. Are there wars, and rumors of wars? Is the clangour of arms increasing? Is the Lord roaring out of Zion, and uttering his voice in Jerusalem? Hear the joyful sound, "The Lord will be the hope of his people, and the strength of the children of Israel." Does the hollow voice of death meet the ear of the man who knows the gospel? Come see, in what peace, with what dignified composure, with what humble triumph the Christian can die! "O death! where is thy sting? O grave! where is thy victory? Thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ." God the judge shall descend from heaven with a shout. Completely happy, then, the people who have known the joyful sound. The last trumpet, which to the wicked proclaims-eternal war and misery, announces to the righteous, that the day of their redemption is come. And they shall

"ascend to glory,  
While their Hosanna's all along the passage,  
Shout the Redeemer."

Are the people who know the joyful sound thus blessed? Shall not our ears drink in the word of life? Shall we not desire, and endeavor, that others may hear and receive it? Shall not the deaf, the dumb, the miserable, who have been made to hear, to speak, to taste true felicity, unite in acclamations of praise for ever and ever? [Edin. Ch. Mag.]

---

**ART. VI. *Liberality without Principle.***

A person in any measure acquainted with the present state of society, can hardly have failed to observe how much, of late, certain cant terms are employed in popular publications, and perpetually trumpeted forth in public harangues. Such are *freedom, civil and religious liberty, rights of conscience*, and, above all, *liberality*. The last is so often echoed in conversation, in speeches, from the pulpit and press, and its collateral terms, *liberal gentlemen, liberal press—illiberals, bigotry, intolerance*, in one connexion or other, form the manifestoes of so many religious and political journals, and the burden of so many fine-spun orations, both by churchmen and politicians, that it demands some consideration.

In its strict and proper acceptation, liberality is a valuable mental endowment; we are free to profess ourselves among its fondest admirers, as all intolerance, bigotry, and persecution, we regard with entire abhorrence. But, taking into account the sentiments and conduct of those who are most noisy in the praise of liberality, and judging the tree by its fruits, it is obvious there is a spurious liberality current in our day, which only bears the outward impress, but contains not a particle of the genuine coin. In fact, a very slight acquaintance with public men and measures is sufficient to satisfy us, that the most boasting liberals of the day are, in reali-

ty, the most illiberal, and that such as are most ready to brand others with intolerance, are only tolerant of views and practices that tend to disorder, or help forward their own schemes of innovation; while the virulence and deadly hate with which they pursue men of a better way, show them to be most intolerant, and is, in truth, a fair exemplification of bigotry and modern persecution, under the specious pretext of liberality. Were we to offer a leading characteristic of such liberality, we would say, it is "*liberality without principle.*" Sir Edward Parry, on a late occasion, well characterised it, when he described it as "*an increasing disregard of all scriptural and vital religion whatever.*"

The profession of liberality is made in reference to *religion* and *politics*: with its application to different philosophical systems, and with certain views of political economy, we are not immediately concerned; and we shall, therefore, for the present, only notice some applications of the term to the two great departments which we have mentioned, in which there is a plain and manifest dereliction of right principle.

In the first place, it is held, by liberals, to be arrogance and presumption to pronounce what doctrines are true or false, inasmuch as the subject is involved in mystery, and great and learned men have differed in opinion, and professed themselves unable to come to a satisfactory decision. The subject is confessedly obscure and mysterious—good and wise men have differed; therefore it is wrong to dogmatize, and the safe course is to hold no fixed opinion ourselves, and to make a very liberal allowance for diversity of opinion on the part of others. Now all this amounts, in reality, to affirming, that there is no fixed, infallible and immutable standard, by which religious sentiments can be determined; or that the Bible, the Divine standard of faith and practice, is so obscure that it cannot be taken as a guide to which the conduct of the understanding may be safely entrusted. We are free to avow ourselves of the old school of philosophy, in maintaining that the distinction between truth and error is not a mere changeable relation, but is real, permanent and immutable; and we hold, that though truth, like some precious metals, lies deep, and is not to be discovered without patient investigation, yet it may be found, by diligent research, in connexion with a right moral frame of understanding and heart. And, furthermore, we think it clear that the Bible would not deserve to be received as a revelation from heaven, and could not be regarded as a proper standard—a perfect and sufficient rule of faith and practice, if it did not inculcate important truths of religion, in a manner so plain and unambiguous, that not philosophers merely, but the mass of mankind, may come to a general understanding of its contents. That there are mysteries in the Bible, we freely admit; the nature of the subjects which it reveals renders this indispensable; in fact, without these mysteries, the volume of inspiration would want one grand proof of its Divine original, just as the volumes of creation and providence would want a main evidence of their emanating from the Infinite Mind, if they held forth no marks of a wisdom unsearchable, of designs unfathomable. But while even of the mysteries of revelation it may be truly said, "all things are plain to him that understandeth," the Bible contains much in relation both to faith and practice that is easily understood, much that is so plain, that "he that runs may read." The Word is said to be "a light to the feet and a lamp to the path," and the way of life is declared to be a way in which "the wayfaring man, though a fool, shall not err." The things of salvation are declared by the Saviour to be "*revealed to babes,*" while they are

hid from the wise and prudent; and in very clear and unambiguous terms he has said, "If any man will do the will of my Father, he will know of the doctrine whether it be of God." The radical defect lies here. Men's hearts are in fault: their disinclination to do God's will blinds their judgment, perverts their understanding, and leads them away from truth into the perplexed mazes of error. They do not come with a prayerful and docile spirit to the Word: they ask not, with sincerity, the Spirit to guide them into all truth; for they feel not their need of his guidance; and we may, therefore, cease to wonder that they are unable to come to definite views, or that men should entertain different and discordant sentiments on fundamental doctrines. The reason is, they refuse to take God's way of understanding the truth. While they act thus, is it not righteous that they should be left to wander vainly in counsels of their own?

The prescriptive argument in favor of scepticism or error, taken from the opinions and conduct of learned men, avails little. While it may be easily shown, that men of the most enlarged minds, some of the most eminent philosophers, and men of science and literature, have been the advocates of evangelical religion, we freely admit that a large proportion of the learned world have either been sceptics, or the avowed enemies to Christianity, or the advocates of dangerous error. But this is just what might be expected, just what the Bible itself declares. "The world by wisdom knew not God." "Not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called. But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise." Self-denial and humility of heart are indispensable to all right acquaintance with Divine things. "If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise." Pride of intellect, inordinate desire of fame, and even baser principles than these, sadly predominate among men of learning—principles directly opposed to the spirit of the Gospel. Need we wonder that men under the influence of such principles should rather be found leagued with systems that foster them, than with that which aims to eradicate them entirely? He that spake as never man spake explains the whole matter, when he says, in reference to such characters—"How can ye believe who receive honor one of another, and seek not that honor that cometh from God only." The liberal and plausible pretence against strictness in religious sentiment, taken from the conduct of men of learning, is indeed liberality without principle: in fact, it amounts to a plea set up in favor of universal scepticism, as Christianity itself has had its keenest opponents among the learned, and there is hardly an opinion, however absurd in religion, which has not had learned men for its supporters. Those who advance an argument of this kind, had need to beware lest they themselves number among such as are "*ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.*" (1 Tim. iii. 5, 7.)

Secondly.—Another chief maxim of the *liberalism* of the day is, that different modes of worship are equally acceptable to God, and that, consequently, it were altogether wrong to condemn men for their way of worship. This averment is made in different ways. Missionaries frequently meet with it in Mahometan countries, in the assertion, that one form of religion is good for one country, and another totally diverse for another, and that both are equally from God.\* Among ourselves, every

\* See Glen's *Missionary Tour to Astrachan and Karass.*

attempt to proselytize from a false worship to a purer system is virulently denounced: and those who disseminate the Scriptures amongst the ignorant are branded as most illiberal. Sincerity is regarded as every thing, and purity of worship as of little or no value. John Wesley more than once, in his writings, declares, that it matters little where we worship, if we are sincere: and many religionists, and men of no religion, since his day, have avowed the same sentiment. Let it suffice to remark, that the liberality which regards false worship with such favor, receives not the slightest countenance from sacred Scripture. "Confounded be all they that worship graven images," is the solemn denunciation of the inspired Prophet. The Faithful and True Witness himself declares—"In vain do ye worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." It need not be pleaded that the worship is not offered to the picture or image, but to God through the image, as a help to devotion—even granting this, which is far from the fact, in many instances, where is the least scriptural warrant for such a mode of worship? Do not the Scriptures every where represent Christ as the alone Mediator between God and man? Are we not warranted, from their plainest and oft-repeated declarations, to affirm, that to worship God through any other medium, is to pour contempt on Him who is "the Way, the Truth, and the Life;" to offer strange fire before the Lord; and is, in short, will-worship and idolatry? The liberality which extends favor to false worship—which would place the rankest superstition on a level with enlightened and scriptural piety—which exalts blind sincerity to the throne of Divine truth—and condemns, in unmeasured terms, efforts to enlighten the votaries of superstition and idolatry—is, in truth, unprincipled and inhuman—unprincipled, as those who are most ready to avow it themselves compass sea and earth, and often employ the vilest fraud and artifice, to make one proselyte—inhuman, as it betrays the most callous unconcern, worse than those who, beholding a hopeless maniac careering on the top of a precipice, make no effort to save him.

Furthermore, it is alleged that religious sentiments affect not morals, and it is plausibly urged, that men of acknowledged excellence are to be found among all denominations. Were it even admitted, that, under different systems of religious belief, there have been various instances of moral worth, this would, by no means, justify such a conclusion. It may be granted, that, in some few cases, men have regulated their life by a better standard than the defective creed which they held; while, on the other hand the purest system has sometimes failed to influence the lives of some that have outwardly professed to adhere to it; and yet still the connexion so well expressed by the poet holds good—

"Faults in the life breed errors in the brain,  
And these reciprocally those again."

Indeed, the mere outward conduct, in particular instances, cannot warrant general conclusions respecting the moral or religious principles. The morality of actions can never be determined apart from a consideration of the motives from which they spring. The Heathens themselves maintained so much. "As the lowest parts of a ship," says Demosthenes, "ought to be the strongest, so, also, ought the *principles* and foundations of actions to be true and just."\* In the Ethics of the Bible, the *love of God* is regarded as the grand motive which constitutes the

---

\* Demosth. Olynth. II.

goodness of an action ; and the *law of God*, the rule by which it is to be determined. Well has the poet expressed it :—

“ Talk they of morals, O thou bleeding Love !  
Thou Maker of new mortals to mankind. The grand morality  
Is love of thee.”\*

The Scriptures always represent the truth alone as the grand instrument of sanctification. Though we cannot inspect the internal principles of others, yet, when they publicly avow their opposition to the truth—when they build not on the only foundation, or openly profess that a love of fame, self-interest, and, in fact, any thing but the love of God, is the *governing* principle of their life, then is it liberality far beyond what the Scriptures warrant to hold, that such persons have equal claims to be considered Christians, as the sincere believer in the Trinity, or that their actions, however praised, proceed from right principles.

The *symptoms* of this spurious liberality in religion are plentifully furnished. We see it in the good fellowship maintained by religious men with infidels, the determined enemies of all religion, and in the favor shown by Protestants to the devoted hirelings of Rome. For political purposes, Protestants say a confederacy with such ; and it has become fashionable to palliate the abominations of the Popish Church, speak of Papists as fellow-Christians, and to apologize for using the uncourtly terms, Popery and Papists, when speaking of the Anti-christian system and its abettors. Speaking of Roman Catholics, the *Eclectic Review* says—“ The imputation of fraud, hypocrisy, or insincerity, which are personal qualities applied to bodies or communities, will be found, on examination, alike absurd and ungenerous.”† A religious man, it is obvious, must either abandon his principles, or he can have no consistent fellowship with those who would subvert his dearest hopes ; and every Protestant, of whatever name, is solemnly pledged to consider Popery as a system of blasphemy, idolatry, lies, and delusion. What Protestant is prepared to say, that Popery, as a system, is not the great “ *Mystery of Iniquity* ?” Have not all sound expositors agreed, that it is the coming of this system which is said to be “ with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish, because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved ?” (2 Thess. ii. 10.) Whence, then, originates all this favor for a system so monstrous—all this countenance to those who are employing their most strenuous efforts to uphold it ? On the part of Protestants, can it be considered less than liberality without principle—the abandonment of the great principles of their forefathers’ protest—the relinquishment of those scriptural principles, which they themselves have solemnly professed to embrace and maintain ?

Farther evidence of *liberality* without principle is furnished in the facility with which men break the most solemn vows, change their sentiments, or, what is still worse, pretend, before men, to hold fast their profession, while they labor to undermine the very principles to which they are solemnly pledged. Individuals, and even religious communities, in our day, seem to account vows as mere ropes of sand. The cause of

\* Night Thoughts

† An able writer, in the *Edinburgh Christian Instructor*, justly observes, that “ this nicety of distinction betwixt persons and communities, is abundantly ridiculous. At this rate, to impute fraud or dishonesty to a band of robbers, must be equally absurd and ungenerous ; because fraud and dishonesty are personal qualities, and a band of robbers, too, is a community.”

apostacy is even openly pleaded under the deceitful maxim, "that wise men change often—fools never:" and men eat the bread of the Church, while they labor to overturn the fundamental principles of her constitution. Under the covert of high pretensions of piety and zeal for reform, they appear to wish it to be overlooked or forgotten, that they have ever been bound by solemn vows; or they seem desirous that such deeds should now be considered antiquated—the enactments of a former age, which were never intended to have any practical application. All this is now fashionable liberality; but it requires no great extent of discrimination to perceive, that it betrays an utter destitution of proper principle. Engagements between man and man, when properly formed, are esteemed sacred. Shall men, therefore, dare to break their covenant with God, with impunity? If it is sinful after vows to make inquiry, how can any pretensions of superior light or liberality justify the direct violation, or the secret contravention of solemn vows? It requires no proof to show, that liberality of this nature is stretched much too far—that it is liberality without principle.

A last evidence of spurious liberality which we notice, is the manner in which the loudest declaimers in favor of liberality violate the plainest principles of Christian charity. One of the chief characteristics of the charity of the Gospel is, that it "*vaunteth* not itself." Compare this with the publications of the liberal press, with the speeches and discourses of so called liberals, which are full of boasting and self-gratulation—and how wide the contrast! As the very reverse of the Charity "which thinketh no evil," is "not easily provoked," and "rejoiceth in the truth," the spirit of modern pretenders to liberality leads them to bear false witness—in all possible ways to vilify and reproach the friends of true religion—cover their names with obloquy, and impute opinions and motives to them, and consequences to their sentiments, which they abhor. A principle productive of such fruits must proceed from another source than the Spirit of Truth: under its closest disguise, it must be pronounced to be an unprincipled liberality, which discovers an unceasing hostility to the form and power of vital godliness.

[The remainder of this article having a direct bearing on British politics, is omitted.—*Ed. Rel. Mon.*] [*The Coveanter.*]

---

#### ART. VII. *The Sandwich Islands.*

Having obtained information of the present situation of this interesting portion of Polynesia, from one who has observed it in person, we have set down some hasty and detached memoranda of our gleanings.

Four hundred children usually assemble in the Sunday-school, at Wailokui. About two hundred and fifty of these read very well, and are capable of comprehending almost any subject in morals or religion which is plainly exhibited.

Diseases introduced by Europeans during the visits of Cook, Vancouver, and others, have devastated the Islands, and still exert a fatal influence on the population.

Books cannot be prepared in sufficient variety to meet the wants of the people, as they learn to read. This want is particularly felt in the schools.

One of the pupils of the High School executes very correct maps by copperplate engraving.

The Sandwich Islands are chiefly mountains. The summits of the two highest are covered with snow. The population live on or near the shores. The mountains are evidently of volcanic origin, and the surface even now is almost covered with lava. Not a twentieth part of the surface has been cultivated.

Forty square feet of well watered land will produce taro enough to sustain one person for a year.

The productions of the island are taro, potatoes, yams, onions, sugar-cane, corn, beans, cabbage, melons, tomatoes, bananas, bread-fruit, grapes, a species of apple, guavas, figs, oranges, limes, pine-apples, mulberries, &c.

Two Americans have obtained a lease of a large tract of land for the cultivation of silk.

Cotton may be raised with very little labor. The body and mind of the Sandwich Islander are in strong contrast; the former being large and strong, the latter dwarfish and feeble. Education and religion have improved this native imbecility of intellect, but it is still one of the greatest obstacles in the way of their elevation. The minds of children, however, are found to be as capacious and ready as those of any nation, and their progress at school is very encouraging. The missionaries are often astonished at the industry in study they evince, compared with the indolence and stupidity of the nation in general. Some of them are successfully taught the higher branches of mathematics.

The native temper is docile and pliant, but capable of deep malice and cruelty. The people are naturally improvident and idle.

Notwithstanding the existence of many vices which habit has rendered national, it may be said that the Islanders are now a moral people. With a small exception they have become temperate, and with the excessive use of ardent spirits that once prevailed, have passed away the impure and violent amusements which attended it. The Sabbath is virtually observed as a day of rest, and if the school and place of worship are not attended, they remain at home. The characteristic crimes of the nation are licentiousness and theft.

They are ready to conform to the outward duties of religion. Hence arises a great difficulty in judging of the sincerity of the professed converts, and a great liability of their yielding to some system of religion that will be satisfied with nominal adherence. The conscience is weak; there is little strength of purpose or perseverance. There are many bright exceptions to this remark in the churches, that have been founded on the island; but this is one of the difficulties of their evangelization.

There are between twenty and thirty thousand who can read the New Testament intelligently. Multitudes have committed to memory a short catechism, containing a summary of Christian truth, and many of these have learned it from each other, without being able to read.

In the immediate vicinity of the stations the majority of adults, probably, know what is right and wrong according to the Bible, and what they must do to be saved: but owing to their habitual want of thought and reflection, their ideas are often very crude and confused.

The most successful way of preaching to them is by reducing every statement to the simplest possible terms. They do not understand gene-

ral principles. Every item of instruction and of inference must be brought down to their apprehension by the plainest illustrations. They understand the Saviour's parables better than any other part of the Scripture; and are interested by the personal history of Christ. The boys in the high school are making fine progress in learning, and this source is looked to for supplying good teachers for the nation and eventually preachers.

A few men are now employed in giving public instruction to the people under the direction of the missionaries. One of these is named Bartimeus, a middle-aged man, and nearly blind; a decided Christian and an eloquent speaker. His acquaintance with the Bible is remarkable, and his services are very valuable. David Malo, another native, is superior to Bartimeus in education and intellect, but not so powerful a speaker, or as strong in his influence, though always a very useful assistant to the mission.

The civilization of the Islands is advancing. In dress, dwellings, and domestic habits, there is a gradual though slow progress of improvement.—*S. S. Journal.*

#### ART. VIII. *"Forsake not the assembling of yourselves together."*

It has pleased God in the wise arrangement of his providence, to establish places of worship; and to appoint ambassadors, to proclaim His revealed truth in all its simplicity and purity. His designs evidently evince, that the ignorant might be instructed in things divine; the careless sinner convinced and converted from the error of his evil ways; his believing people reminded of their responsibilities; and that all should know the duties they owe to Him, and to each other, from the least to the greatest. Notwithstanding the obligations resting on every one, where the Gospel is preached, not to forsake the services of the sanctuary, how vast a number, in this highly favored city, act as if they had not souls to be saved, and as if there were no God to be obeyed and revered! I know that the form of godliness may exist without the power; but the power seldom exists without the form. Those, therefore, who do not put themselves under the influence of truth, on the Sabbath, show that they neither possess, nor desire to enjoy, the love and approbation of God. But there are personal advantages to be derived, as well as duties to be discharged, by attending regularly on the preaching of God's word, in his house of prayer. The man of faith will not absent himself from that sacred place, because, he knows it is the will of his Master that he should be there; one hour spent in God's service, is to him worth a thousand; he would rather be a doorkeeper in the house of the Lord, than to dwell in the tents of wickedness; his heart is open to the influence of truth; it is the manna on which he lives, till he arrives at the fulness of the stature of a perfect man in Christ.

The almost Christian will be much profited by assembling with God's people in his earthly courts; his doubts will be removed, his faith strengthened, his grace increased, until he enjoys the perfect liberty, whereby the Saviour sets his people free. The ignorant, careless sinner, will get his portion also in due season; the eyes of his mind will be open-

ed to discover the dangerous ground on which he stands; the precipice, overhanging regions, deep and dismal, will be fully disclosed to view. He may be induced to retrace his steps; flee by faith and love, to Jesus Christ, whose arms are ever extended to receive the returning prodigal. God has a word of good to address to all classes and conditions of men in his house of prayer. The proud will see their folly, when they learn that God giveth grace ONLY to the HUMBLE. The wealthy will discover the value of earthly treasures, when they are convinced that riches cannot purchase a good conscience. The poor will be taught here, that the absence of wealth is no evidence of sin; and that God in much mercy, often withholds from his people, that thing which might prove their destruction. The imaginary distinctions existing among men, created by worldly circumstances and vanity, must necessarily be forgotten in this holy place, when the high and the low, the rich and the poor, the old and the young, meet on a common level, in the presence of *Him* who is no respecter of persons. All who desire the blessings of the sanctuary, must appear in the *same* attitude; humble, contrite suppliants at the throne of God's heavenly grace. The poor in spirit are pronounced blessed; the rich in faith and good works are commended; and all are urged by the power and eloquence of truth divine, to lay up treasures in *Heaven*, that where their treasures are, there their hearts may be also.

Reader! neglect riches, honors, pleasures, and be blameless; but as you value your everlasting happiness, neglect not the public worship of God. We have no promise in the Scriptures, that God will continue his ordinances with us; bless us with his truth; and be the glory in the midst of us, unless we obey his truth, reverence his institutions, and honor his name. The mandate may be issued, “they are joined to their idols, let them alone.”—What apology will the man of learning and influence make to God and his own conscience, for the evil example he sets to the rising generation, in turning an adder's ear to the apostolic injunction? And what can society expect from the young, having before their eyes the example of men who care for none of these things? Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? I would say to the young, in love and sincerity, suffer not the example or entreaties of those who do not fear God and obey his precepts, to prevent you from assembling with God's people; you cannot spend the Sabbath, dedicated to public worship, so well as in God's house. You will find no evil companions there—nor acquire habits of thinking and acting, of which you will have just cause to repent, while the men of pleasure are pursuing the phantom of an hour, which vanishes like the morning cloud, leaving the mind unoccupied and distressed, you will acquire in the house of God, a substantial good; knowledge of yourself, and of Jesus Christ, whom to know is eternal life. As the rains and dews of Heaven, with the rays of a genial sun, bring the tender plant of spring to perfection—so you will be watered with the dews of God's heavenly grace; invigorated and enlightened with the beams of the *Sun* of righteousness in his house of prayer, until you are prepared to be transplanted to the upper Sanctuary, where you will bloom and flourish forever, in the presence of your God and Saviour.—*Family Gazette*.

ART. IX. *Ministers' and Deacons' Children.*

It will be remembered that the results of some investigations, respecting the families of ministers and deacons, were published in the last report. Similar investigations have been going on ever since. As in the former case, the inquiries have been extended to all the families of the Orthodox Congregational clergymen and deacons in every town in this State, which the Secretary has visited, and in the neighboring towns, so far as has been practicable. The results, including the 108 families mentioned in the last Report, are as follows:

In *two hundred and sixty-eight* families of ministers and deacons, there are *one thousand two hundred* children over fifteen years of age. Of these children, *eight hundred and eighty-four*—almost three-fourths—are hopefully pious; *seven hundred and ninety-four* have united with the church, *sixty-one* have entered the ministry, or are engaged in their preparatory studies; and only *seventeen* are dissipated, about one-half of whom only, became so while residing with their parents. In eleven of these families—four of them ministers and seven deacons—there are *one hundred and twenty-three* children, of whom *all but seven* of them are pious; *seven* of them are deacons, and *fifteen* ministers! In *fifty-six* of these families there are *two hundred and fifty-nine* children, and *ALL hopefully pious!*

The character of these facts are interesting, probably beyond the anticipation of the most sanguine; and their interest will be greatly increased, by contemplating some of the peculiar obstacles with which this class of parents have to contend, in the education of their children. The Sabbath—that day when every thing conspires to aid other parents in the religious instruction of their children—is, with the minister, a day of labor, fatigue and anxiety; a day in which he can command but little strength, either of body or mind, to devote to his family. Again, the employment of the minister is very unlike that of the farmer, the mechanic, and even the merchant, which will enable the father often to take his sons with him, and exert an almost constant influence in forming their characters. A large part of his time, the minister must be shut out from the world, engaged in severe mental labor that demands his entire and undisturbed attention. Another obstacle that the minister has to contend with is this: all his plans and efforts for forming the manners and general character of his children, are oftentimes deranged or counteracted by the attentions and indulgencies which they receive from the numerous visitors who ever find a welcome at the father's hospitable dwelling. These attentions and indulgencies, so kindly intended by those who bestow them, frequently encourage a boldness and forwardness; very unlovely in children, and extremely difficult to be checked. But one of the greatest obstacles with which ministers and deacons both, have to contend, in the religious education of their children is, the influence of the irreligious. A clergyman, whose parents were not pious, once acknowledged that it used to be his daily study and effort, when a school-boy, to persuade the children of *pious parents* to do things which were wrong—to quarrel and swear—thinking that their improper conduct would afford a sort of license to do wrong himself. This kind of influence is exerted *peculiarly* on the children of ministers and deacons. Deep-laid plans and combinations are often formed to lead these children into sin. Who has not witnessed the cruel and fiend-like efforts of those vile wretches

that congregate and lounge about the *drunkard's home*, to tempt the minister's or deacon's sons to taste their cup of shame, or indulge in their other wicked pleasures, for the purposes of dishonoring the holy religion and profession of their fathers?

So strong is the power of ridicule and shame on an unsanctified heart that many a youth has been tempted to plunge into open sin, just that he might prove to his wicked associates that his *father's title*—which they, in ridicule, had applied to him, was inappropriate. No doubt, many of these wayward, dissipated persons, whom these tavern-loungers tauntingly tell us are the *sons of clergymen or deacons*, were made what they now are, through *their instrumentality*. And theirs is the guilt, like that of Jeroboam the son of Nebat, of whom these dreadful words are so often repeated, "*Who made Israel to sin?*" O, what will be the doom of those who have tempted others to dishonor their own and their father's God! These are some of the peculiar obstacles with which this class of parents have to contend; and yet it appears, from the facts stated above, that a large proportion of their children, through the blessing of God on parental instruction, are hopefully converted; and they are among the most virtuous, respectable, useful members of society. That there have been instances, ever since the days of Eli, the *priest of Israel*, where this class of parents have come short in duty, and where their children have, *in consequence*, become wayward and profligate, no one will pretend to question; but these instances do not compare in number with those that have always been occurring in connection with any other and every other class of parents.—*Mass. S. S. Society's Report.*

#### ART. X. *Precious Remedies against Satan's Devices.*

(Continued from page 187.)

CHAPTER V.—*The fifth Device that Satan hath to draw souls from religious services, and to keep them from holy duties, is, By presenting to them the poverty, &c. of those who walk in the ways of God, and hold on in religious practices.* Saith Satan, Don't you see that those who walk in religious ways, are the poorest, the meanest, and most despicable persons in the world? This took with them in John vii. 47. 'Then answered the Pharisees, Are ye also deceived? Have any of the rulers, or of the Pharisees believed on him? But this people who know not the law are cursed.'—Now the remedies against this device are these that follow:

*Remedy 1.* Consider, that though they are outwardly poor, yet they are inwardly rich; though they are poor in temporals, yet they are rich in spirituals; the worth and riches of the saints are inward:\* 'The king's daughter is all glorious within. Hearken my beloved brethren, hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom, which he hath promised to them that love him?' saith James. 'I know thy poverty, but thou art rich,' saith Christ to the church at

\* "Do not you see (saith Chrysostom) the places where treasures are hid are rough and overgrown with thorns? Do not the naturalists tell you that the mountains that are big with gold within, are bare of grass without? Saints have as scholars, poor commons here, because they must study hard to go to heaven."

Smyrna. What though they have little in possession, yet they have a glorious kingdom in reversion. 'Fear not little flock, it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom.' Though saints have little in hand, yet they have much in hope. You count those happy in a worldly sense, that have much in reversion, though they have but little in possession; and will you count the saints miserable, because they have little in possession, though they have a glorious kingdom in reversion of this? I am sure the poorest saint that breathes would not exchange (were it in his power) what he hath in hope, for the possession of as many worlds as there are stars in the heavens, or sands in the sea, &c.

*Rem. 2.* Consider, that in all ages God hath had some who have been great, rich, wise, and honorable, who have chosen his ways and continued in his service in the face of all difficulties; though not many wise men, yet some wise men; and though not many mighty, yet some mighty have; and though not many noble, yet some such have served the Lord;\* witness Abraham, and Jacob, and Job, and several kings, and others, that the scriptures speak of; and how many have we among ourselves, who have served the Lord, and who have swam to his service through the blood of the slain, and who have not counted their lives dear unto them, that they and others might enjoy the holy things of Christ in his own way.

*Rem. 3.* Solemnly consider, that the spiritual riches of the poorest saints, infinitely transcend the temporal riches of all the wicked men in the world;† they can sit down satisfied with the riches of grace that are in Christ, without worldly riches and honors, &c. 'He that drinks of the water that I shall give him, shall thirst no more.' The riches of poor saints are durable, they will bed and board with them, they will go to the prison, to a sick bed, yea, to heaven with them. The spiritual riches of pure saints, are as wine to cheer them, as bread to strengthen them, as clothes to warm them, and as armour to protect them.—Now all you that know any thing, know, that the riches of this world cannot satisfy the souls of men, that they are as fading as a flower, or as the owner‡ of them are, &c.

*Rem. 4.* Consider, that though the saints considered comparatively, are few? though they be a 'little, little flock, a remnant;' Luke xii. 32, 'a garden enclosed, a spring shut up, a fountain sealed;' Cant. iv. 12, though 'as the summer gleanings;' though but as a handful to a houseful, a spark to a flame, a drop to the ocean; yet consider them simply in themselves, and they are an innumerable company, that cannot be numbered, as John speaketh, Rev. vii. 9. 'After this I beheld, and lo, a great multitude which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands.' So Matthew speaks, Matt. viii. 11. 'And I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven.' So Paul, Heb. xii. 22, 23. 'But ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels. To the general assembly, and church of the first-born, which are written in

---

\* Good nobles (saith one) are like black swans, and thinly scattered in the firmament of the state, even like stars of the first magnitude, yet God hath had some in all ages.

† Alexander's vast mind enquired, if there were any more worlds to conquer.

‡ Crassus was so rich, that he maintained an army with his own revenues, yet he and his great army, with his son and heir, fell together, and left his great estate to others.

heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect.\*

*Rem. 5.* Seriously consider, that it will be but as a day before these poor despised saints, who are God's jewels, will shine brighter than the sun in his glory: they shall soon be lifted up, upon their thrones to judge the multitude—the world, as the apostle speaks, 'Know ye not that the saints shall judge the world?' And in that day, O! how will the great and the rich, the learned and the noble, wish that they had lived and spent their days with these few poor contemptible creatures,† in the service of the Lord! Oh! how will this wicked world curse the day that ever they had such base thoughts of the poor saints, and that their poverty became a stumbling-block, to keep them from the ways of holiness.

I have read of Ingo, an ancient king of the Draves, who making a stately feast, appointed his nobles, at that time pagans, to sit in the hall below, and commanded certain poor Christians to be brought up into his presence chamber, to sit with him at his table, to eat and drink of his kingly entertainment; at which many wondering, he said, 'He accounted Christians, though never so poor, a greater ornament at his table, and more worthy of his company, than the greatest peers, unconverted to the Christian faith, for when these might be thrust down to hell, those might be his consorts and fellow princes in heaven.' You know how to apply it. Although you see the stars sometimes by their reflections in a puddle, in the bottom of a well, or in a stinking ditch, yet the stars have their situation in heaven; so, though you see a godly man in a poor, miserable, despised condition, as to the things of this world, yet he is fixed in the region of heaven: 'Who hath raised us up, (saith the apostle) and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus.' Oh! therefore say to your own souls, when they decline the ways of Sion, because of the poverty, &c. of those who walk in them, 'the day is at hand, when those few, poor, despised saints, shall shine in glory, when they shall judge this world, and when all the wicked thereof will wish that they were in their condition, and would give ten thousand worlds, were it in their power, that they might but have the honor and happiness to wait upon those, whom from their meanness they have neglected and despised in this world.

*Rem. 6.* Consider, that there will a time come, even in this life, when the reproach and contempt that is now cast upon the ways of God, by reason of the poverty, &c. of those that walk in those ways, shall be quite taken away, by his making them the head, who have days without number been the tail, and by his raising them up to much outward riches, prosperity, and glory, who have been as out-casts, because of their poverty and paucity.‡ John speaking of the glory of the church, the

\* When Fulgentius saw the nobility of Rome sit mounted in bravery, it raised his meditations to the heavenly Jerusalem.

† Mr. Fox being once asked whether he knew a certain poor man who had received succor of him in time of trouble, answered, I remember him well, I tell you I forget lords and ladies to remember such. So will God deal by his poor saints: he will forget the great and mighty ones of the world, to remember his few poor despised ones. Though John was poor in the world, yet the Holy Ghost calls him the greatest that was born of women. Ah, poor saints! men that know not your worth, cannot have such low thoughts of you, but the Lord will have us high.

‡ These following scriptures do abundantly confirm this truth: Jer. xxxi. 12. Is. xxx. 23. and lxii. 8, 9. Joel ii. 23, 24. Micah iv. 6. Amos ix. 13, 14. Zech. viii. 12. Is. xii. 18, 19. iv. 13. lxxvi. 6, 8. lxxv. 21, 22. lxi. 4. lx. 10. and Ezek- xxxvi. 10. Only take these two cutions, 1. That in these times the saints' chiefest comforts, delights, and contents, wll

new Jerusalem that came down from heaven, Rev. xxi. tells us, 'That the nations of them that are saved, shall walk in the light of it, and the kings of the earth do bring their glory into it.' So the prophet Isaiah. 'They shall bring their sons from far, and their silver and their gold with them. For brass I will bring gold, and for iron I will bring silver, and for wood, brass, and for stones, iron.' And so the prophet Zechariah speaks, chap. xiv. 14. 'And the wealth of all the heathen round about, shall be gathered together, gold and silver, and apparel in great abundance.' The Lord hath promised, that the meek shall inherit the earth; and heaven and earth shall pass away, before one jot or one tittle of his word shall pass unfulfilled. Ah poor saints! now some thrust sore at you, others look shy upon you; and most men (except it be a few that live much in God, and are filled with the riches of Christ) do either neglect or despise you because of your poverty; but the day is coming, when you shall be lifted up above the dunghill, when you shall change poverty for riches, your rags for robes, your reproach for a crown of honor, your infamy for glory, even in this world.

And this is not all, but God will also mightily increase the number of his chosen ones; multitudes shall be converted to him. Is. lxvi. 8. 19. 'Who hath seen such things? Shall the earth be made to bring forth in one day? Or shall a nation be born at once! For as soon as Sion travailed, she brought forth children. And they shall bring all your brethren for an offering unto the Lord out of all nations, upon horses, and in chariots, in litters, and upon mules, and upon swift beasts, to my holy mountain Jerusalem, saith the Lord; and as the children of Israel bring an offering in a clean vessel unto the house of the Lord.' Doth not the scripture say, that the kingdoms of this world must become the kingdoms of the Lord? Rev. xi. 15. Hath not God given to Christ the heathen, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession? Hath not the Lord said, that in the 'last days the mountain of the Lord's house shall be lifted up above the hills, and shall be established in the top of the mountains, and all nations shall flow unto it.' Pray read and meditate upon Is. lx. and lxvi. and iii. 1—5. and there you shall find the multitudes that shall be converted to Christ; and O, that you may believe, and be mighty in wrestling with God, that he would hasten the day of his glory, that the reproach that is now upon his people and ways may cease!

---

#### ART. XI. *Brief Memoir of Andries Stoffles.*

(From the *Missionary Magazine of the London Missionary Society.*)

We extract the following account of the life and death of a convert from heathenism, as an illustration of the power of the Gospel, and of the happy effects of the attempts which are at present making to evangelize the dark places of the earth.—EDITORS.

##### *His birth and early life.*

Andries Stoffles was born about the year 1776, on the banks of the

---

consist in their more clear, full, and constant enjoyment of God. 2. That they shall have such abundant measure of the Spirit poured out upon them, that their riches, and outward glory shall not be snares to them, but golden steps to a richer living in God.

Bosjesman River. He was a Hottentot of the Gonah tribe, which, as a distinct tribe, though once numerous, has now almost ceased to exist. The country which they inhabited, is called the Zuirveld, lying between the Gamtoos and the Great Fish River. From his boyhood, Stoffles was a close observer, and was gifted with an excellent memory. With a naturally sound judgment he possessed an active mind and a sanguine temperament; and consequently at an early age he was found mingling in the fierce feuds and conflicts which arose at that period between the Dutch Boors and Hottentots. In one of these engagements he was severely wounded, and narrowly escaped the loss of life. On another occasion, a wagon went over his body, and nearly killed him. These accidents caused much pain to him in after life, and, in his own opinion, considerably aggravated, if they did not originate, the disorder under which he eventually died. After his conversion, the remembrance of occurrences which had so nearly proved fatal, always deeply affected him, and he was frequently heard to remark, that had he died then, he would have been lost forever.

#### *His Conversion.*

An event which greatly determined his future course of life, was the circumstance of his being taken prisoner by the Caffres, and carried from his own country into Caffreland. There he resided for some time, learnt the Caffre language, and was employed as an interpreter. In that capacity he was taken by a Caffre chief to Betheldorp,\* about the year 1810. Stoffles was then in a savage state, and arrayed in the Caffre fashion, his only clothing a dressed cow skin thrown loosely over his shoulders, and his body smeared with grease and red ochre. When first he attended divine worship at Betheldorp, he was so ignorant of its purpose and meaning, as to suppose that the people had assembled to receive rations of provisions, or presents of beads and buttons. But he was soon undeceived—Divine grace speedily reached his heart, though it was some time before his mind was fully enlightened as to the way of salvation. His second attendance in the house of God has been thus characteristically described by himself:

“The preacher spoke of every thing I had done from my childhood. I said to myself, ‘This is very strange, surely my cousin must have gone to the Missionary and told him all about me.’ My cousin said, ‘No, I never spoke about you to the Missionary. The Bible is that which tells you about your own heart.’”

The conviction of sin smote immediately on his conscience, and he was no longer the same man. True, he returned to the Caffres, and tried to be happy in his former ways; in dancing and merriment, and idle mirth; but conscience pursued him, and he could find no rest.

Laboring under a deep sense of sin, and having in vain sought relief to his mind in heathen companionship, Stoffles returned to Betheldorp, and again listened to the preaching of the Gospel; but his convictions were only strengthened, and the agitation of his mind increased in proportion. Overcome by his internal conflicts, he frequently hastened from the Chapel to the bush, weeping aloud. Here, it is said, he would spend hours, and even days, apart from human intercourse, praying to God for mercy, and seeking for rest to his heavy-laden spirit. In this

---

\* One of the Missionary Stations of the Moravian Society or Brethren's Church.

state he continued for two or three years, bowed down under the consciousness of guilt, beset by the terrors of self-condemnation, and unable to apply to himself the rich remedies of the Gospel of peace. But He who hath promised not to break the bruised reed, nor quench the smoking flax, at length shed abroad a clearer light in his soul—the way of salvation through a crucified Saviour was fully revealed unto him—his penitential sorrow did not cease, but its bitterness was gone—he saw by faith the “Lamb slain from the foundation of the world”—the burden of sin passed away—his eye glistened, and his mouth was filled with joy, for the blood of Christ had imparted peace to his soul.

*His attachment to the Missionary cause.*

When the Missionaries for Lattakoo arrived in Africa, Stoffes accompanied them to their station, through the country of the wild Bushmen, to many of whom he was the first to convey the glad tidings of salvation. He assisted in the opening of the Lattakoo Mission, and remained there four years. To the Missionaries, who placed the fullest confidence in him, he rendered essential service. Stoffes had such a knowledge of the native character, that the brethren could always beneficially consult him. He travelled with the Missionaries to all the towns and villages of the Bechuanas and Corannas—he conducted the Rev. J. Campbell on his second journey in Africa to Kurrechane, and the Rev. Mr. Miles through Caffraria to the Tambookie country; he likewise travelled much with the Rev. Dr. Philip. In all these journeys, though often wearied from the day, Stoffes never went to rest without singing a hymn and prayer.

*His visit to England, and death.*

In February, 1836, Stoffes embarked for England with the Rev. Dr. Philip, Mr. Reid, jr. and Jan Tzatzoe, the Caffre Chief, and arrived in London on the 14th of May. He wished to exert himself in England on behalf of his nation; to see, he said, the people by whom the Gospel had been sent to his country, and to express his gratitude to them for the inestimable blessing. These objects he effected, but not to the extent which he desired. Before the Aborigines' Committee of the House of Commons he stated the grievances of his afflicted countrymen, and produced a strong impression in favor of their claims and his own. To the friends of Missions, in various parts of the kingdom, his animated and eloquent addresses, joined with his fervent, unaffected piety, afforded the highest interest and the most hallowed delight. But in October, 1836, his health began rapidly to decline, owing to the hostile influence of the climate, and causes before referred to, and it was recommended that he should leave England immediatly. On the 7th of November he embarked for Africa, with the Rev. J. Reid, jr. and the Rev. E. Williams. At the commencement of the voyage his health apparently rallied; but, after crossing the line, a relapse followed, and on his arrival at the Cape he began rapidly to sink. He was confined at Green Point for a short time, but was finally released from suffering on the 18th March, 1837.

In his dying hours his mind was calm and resigned. He had never, he said, enjoyed more of the presence of God his Saviour than during the voyage. When he ceased to anticipate recovery, he expressed regret at not being spared “to go and tell his people what he had seen and heard in England. He would go and tell his story in heaven, but

he thought they knew more there than he could tell them." The death of Stoffles will be lamented by multitudes of the natives, both within and beyond the Colony; the people of Kat River were scarcely to be comforted, and it was to be feared by some that his wife and daughter, who were exceedingly attached to him, would fall sacrifices to their grief. But many prayers have been offered on their behalf, that their deep affliction may bring forth abundantly the peaceable fruits of righteousness.

---

#### ART. XII. *Prayer in Affliction.*

There is deep meaning in that scriptural direction, "Is any among you afflicted? let him pray." Other remedies have been proposed, but they have all proved their insufficiency. The sympathy and kindness of friends, or the diversion of the mind by worldly amusement, may in some cases answer to render the sense of affliction less oppressive; but there is a multitude of cases which no earthly remedy can reach, and in all cases such remedies are temporary and inadequate.—God, on the contrary, is a safe and unfailing resort. His compassion interests him in the distresses of man, and his power can furnish the most suitable remedies; he first pities and then relieves. There are many considerations which suggest the propriety of an immediate application to God in such cases. Afflictions are sent by him for the purpose of awakening in us a sense of our dependence on him, and hence, until we, feeling our dependence, come to him as humble suppliants, it is not likely that we shall obtain relief. We must feel the discipline, until we learn the lesson it is designed to teach. We are encouraged, moreover, to approach him, by the assurance that he afflicts us not willingly; that his tender mercies are over all his works, and that he would rather promote our happiness, when he can do it consistently with his perfections, than permit us to suffer. We have a confidence, too, that whatever can be effected by infinite power and mercy combined, can be accomplished by him. The promise of God is likewise pledged to afford the requisite relief, when it is humbly and fervently sought;—he healeth all our diseases and redeemeth our life from destruction. A trial of prayer in the hour of affliction will convince the most sceptical that it is the best adapted means of obtaining relief. The burden is removed just in proportion as the heart rises towards its Creator and Redeemer. The very exercise of prayer affords a very sensible alleviation. There is no fact more familiar to the people of God than this, and hence they know it to be idle to make application in any other place. It is well, however, that we should know *how to pray* in such circumstances. It is only to prayer of the right kind that the promise is made, and not to such as is selfish, which undertakes to dictate, or which is mingled with murmurs. The afflicted man must be sensible that God has done him no wrong in the chastisements which he has sent; he must acknowledge the entire equity of the Divine proceedings, and he must humble himself under the hand that holds the rod, with such feelings he may approach and pray with all due submission, either that God would entirely remove the affliction, or that he would enable him to endure it with uncomplaining patience; and in either case,

that he would so sanctify it as to make it answer the design for which it was sent. If God should remove the cause of suffering, the relief would be immediate, and if he should impart strength to bear it, the relief would be almost equally great. The particular mode should be, and must be left entirely to him who knoweth best what would be good for us. Whatever may be the peculiar form of suffering, whether mental or bodily, it is equally within the reach and under the control of this remedy. Suppose it consists in privation;—our means of subsistence have been taken away, or our dearest friends have been summoned to death; surely God who possesses the resources of the universe in his hands, can easily supply the want thus created. Or suppose the most painful diseases have fastened upon our frames; the great Physician has the power to heal, or he can mitigate and soothe. Whether trouble springs from worldly or spiritual causes; whether it assails the heart or agonizes the body, one word from the Almighty can still the raging storm. The experience of saints in all time past is this, "God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble." Let the people of God never forget this, and let sinners be persuaded to try the experiment. It is not merely we who assure them, but the Lord himself, that they will not be disappointed. If, however, men will harden their neck; if they will brave the Almighty, they will not only find it futile to rush on the bosses of Jehovah's buckler, but destructive. He that afflicts them now with temporary pains, can make them suffer throughout eternity, under the infliction of a pain, which is emphatically described as a worm that never dies, as a fire that shall never be quenched.—*Presbyterian*.

---

#### ART. XIII. *Memoirs of Ezekiel Cheever.*

The following notice of one of the early settlers of New England, is worthy of a place in a religious journal, both on account of the excellent, religious, and useful character of the subject, and the exhibition it gives of the primitive simplicity of those fathers of New England, who fled from oppression and persecution for conscience' sake, in the and that gave them birth, to seek liberty and peace in the wilderness.

From Allen's Biographical Dictionary, published 1809.

CHEEVER, EZEKIEL, an eminent instructor, born in London, January 25, 1615, came to this country in June, 1637, for the sake of the peaceable enjoyment of Christian worship in its purity. He was first employed as a schoolmaster at New Haven, for twelve years; then at Ipswich, Massachusetts, eleven years; and afterwards at Charlestown, nine years.

He removed to Boston, January 6, 1671, where he continued his labors during the remainder of his life. He died August 21, 1703, in the ninety-fourth year of his age.

Most of the principal gentleman in Boston, at that time, had been his pupils, and took pleasure in acknowledging their obligations, and honoring their old master. He was not only an excellent teacher, but a pious Christian. He constantly prayed with his pupils every day, and cate-

chized them every week. He also took frequent occasions to address them on religious subjects. Being well acquainted with divinity, he was an able defender of the faith and order of the gospel.

In his old age, his intellectual powers were very little impaired.

He published an essay on the millennium, and a Latin *Accidence*, which has passed through twenty editions, and has not lost its reputation to the present day.

DR. COTTON MATHER, in "An Historical Introduction" to his funeral sermon upon MR. EZEKIEL CHEEVER, after learned remarks on grammarians and schoolmasters, gives the following account of his own revered preceptor:—

"We generally concur in acknowledging that New England has never known a better. I am sure I have as much reason to appear for him as ever *Crito* had for his master *Socrates*. The short history of his long usefulness is to be comprised in the following article.

In the Sermon, Dr. Mather says, "It was noted that, when scholars came to be admitted into the *College*, they who came from the *Cheeverian education*, were generally the most unexceptionable. He flourished so long in the great work of bringing our sons to be men, that it gave him an opportunity to send forth many *Bezaleels* and *Aholiabs* for the service of the tabernacle, and men fitted for all good employments. He that was my master seven and thirty years ago, was a master to many of my betters no less than seventy years ago: so long ago, that I must even mention *my father's tutor* for one of them."

Particular notice is taken of "his piety, and his care to infuse documents of piety into the scholars under his charge, that he might carry them with him to the heavenly world. He so constantly prayed with us every day, and catechized us every week, and let fall such holy counsels upon us; he took so many occasions to make speeches to us, that should make us afraid of sin, and of incurring the fearful judgments of God by sin,—that I do propose him for imitation."

Having shown what his "master was in the school," he adds, "Out of the school, he was one, *antiqua fide, pricis moribus*; a Christian of the old fashion; an OLD NEW ENGLAND CHRISTIAN; and I may tell you, that was as venerable a sight as the world, since the days of primitive Christianity, has ever looked upon. He was well studied in the body of divinity; an able defender of the faith and order of the gospel; notably conversant and acquainted with the scriptural prophecies.

"He lived as a *master* the term which has been, for above three thousand years, assigned for the life of man; he continued to the *ninety-fourth* year of his age,—his intellectual force as little abated as his natural."

In a poetical "Essay" on his memory, Dr. M. ascribes the learning of New England to him and to Corlet, another eminent schoolmaster, who taught the grammar school in Cambridge for many years, and who is celebrated in the *Magnalia*:—

"'Tis *Corlet's* pains, and *Cheever's*, we must own,  
That thou, New England, art not *Scythia* grown."

In the following description, we perceive characteristics of the writer, as well as the *master*:—

"He *lived*, and to vast age no illness knew;  
Till Time's scythe, waiting for him, rusty grew.  
He *lived* and *wrought*; his labors were immense;  
He ne'er declined to *preterperfect* tense."

*Note on Ezekiel Cheever, by William Lyon, Esq., of New Haven, Conn.*

In a note [Coll. Hist. Soc., Vol. VIII.] under the account of Ezekiel Cheever, some further information is desired respecting him.

I am ignorant whether he came from England with Governor Eaton, in 1637, or joined him at Boston; but he came to New Haven with him. His name appears in the Plantation covenant, signed in Newman's barn, June 4, 1639. Although a poor man, he must have been in considerable estimation, as he signed among their principal men.—Every thing was done with much formality at that time. By their doomsday-book, I find his family consisted of himself and wife only.—She died in 1649. His estate was set at £20, and a few acres of wild land beside. He taught school, and sometimes conducted public worship. It is probable that he wrote his ACCIDENCE at New Haven. In 1644, his salary was raised to £30 per annum; for three years before he had received but £20 per annum.

When the church was gathered, John Davenport directed them "to select eleven of their most godly men as a nomination for church pillars; that there might be no blemish in church work." Cheever was chosen for one. These were to select seven among themselves, because we read in Proverbs, "Wisdom hath hewn out her seven pillars."

---

#### ART. XIV. *Miscellany.*

**PERJURY OF JURORS.**—JURORS are sworn to try the cases before them according to law and evidence, and not according to their own notions of what the law ought to be. If, therefore, because they think that the punishment of death ought never to be inflicted, they bring in a verdict of *not guilty* on an indictment for murder, when they believe that, according to the law and evidence, the accused is guilty, they commit perjury. As an admonition on this subject, we copy the following, from the N. Y. Gazette:

*Let the Law be abolished or enforced—one or the other.*—The miserable woman Kief, tried lately in Maine, for the murder of her own husband by administering poison, and acquitted by the jury, appears to have been not only palpably guilty of the crime charged upon her, but *proved* guilty by the testimony before the Court and Jury. The only reason assigned for this preposterous perjury—for it was nothing else—is the fact that there is "a growing dislike among jurors to convict for a capital crime." We believe there *is* that dislike, and we regret to believe that it is "growing." We have been convinced for some time that there is a spirit becoming more and more prevalent in the world—not only not to convict for capital crime, but to consider it repugnant to the advanced "enlightenment of the age," to punish crime at all. The world is getting too good to be governed. "Human freedom" has opened shop, and intends to do business hereafter in connexion with the ultra virtuous, under the firm of "*Universal Philanthropy.*" Very well, let the world try it. There is no uncertainty in the result. Human freedom will swim for a few years in the blood of its own shedding, until the philosophy will tire of too much of its own etheriality, and hand over said world to a more vindictive code of punishment than it has ever yet known, simply to save itself from the cruelty of its own system!

But, until the community *has* come to the conclusion to do away with

all law but the promptings of the sublimated philanthropy that is abroad, it is as well, we think, for juries to do their duty, as it is enjoined by the laws that are still nominally allowed to be in force, and not to commit perjury for fear of running counter to an abstraction. Jurors are never chosen to act as legislators, and have no right to assume the functions of legislators."—[*N. Y. Observer.*]

**MOURNING FOR FRIENDS.**—Grief at the loss of friends is natural. To say, therefore, that tears for the deceased are unseasonable, because they are unprofitable, is to speak without regard to the state and condition of human nature. A pious tear is a sign of humanity and generosity—but still, exceeding care must be taken that men do not run into excesses of this kind. To *grieve* may be laudable—to be loud and querulous is childish, and to carry matters so far as to refuse comfort is inexcusable. It is impious towards God, without whose permission nothing happens in the world—it expresses too great a disregard to other men, as though no one remained worthy of esteem or love—and it is highly prejudicial to ourselves, as it impairs our health, weakens our minds, unfits us for our several offices, and sometimes ends in death itself.—*Bishop Comybeare.*

**PRUSSIA.**—*The Tyrolese Exiles.*—The Editor of the Lutheran Observer publishes a letter, addressed to him by "Marianna, Princess William of Prussia, wife of the brother of the present King of Prussia, one of the most amiable, interesting, and deservedly popular princesses in Europe." In introducing it, he says:

"No class of Christians in the world are more devout and devoted than those of Germany, and in no country do we find, comparatively speaking, so many eminent Christians in the higher and more refined walks of life as in Prussia. A considerable portion of the Court—many of the highest officers in the army and of the state, and of the most eloquent and popular preachers are not only orthodox but decidedly pious, and burn with a holy ardor in the cause of Jesus Christ.

In her letter the princess remarks:

"I occasionally hear from your country through a minister of the Moravian Church in Nazareth; his name is Mr. Reuchel; perhaps you may fall in company with him, and hence I mention his name; he is a truly pious young man. The ambassador from the U. States to this court, the Hon. Mr. Wheaton, also occasionally gives me information concerning your country.

"I usually spend my summers on an estate in Silesia; last summer I enjoyed my country residence very much. The expelled Christians from Tyrol (die Zillerthaler) had settled in our immediate vicinity; they left every thing in Zillertal for the sake of their religion—O how my faith was strengthened, and my affections elevated by my intercourse with those devoted Christians. I regard it as a distinguished favor of God that they were brought into our neighborhood."—*N. Y. Ob.*

#### ART. XV. Notices.

"*Proceeding of the Associate Presbytery of Cambridge, in Relation to Rev. D. Stalker and Rev. A. Bullions, D. D.*

There has been just issued from the Press of Hoffman & White, of this city, a pamphlet of eighty-four pages of the above title; it has

been prepared and published by a Committee of Presbytery appointed for the purpose. It consists chiefly of the documents relative to the cases which issued in the *deposition* of the two brethren, by their Presbytery; which sentences were confirmed by a large vote of the Associate Synod at its late meeting in Philadelphia. Ample and strong testimony is given from the most unexceptionable witnesses, proving all the material points in the proceedings. The facts brought to light in the history of these proceedings, while they are truly painful and humiliating to contemplate, abundantly vindicate that Presbytery and the Associate Synod from the calumnious aspersions which have been heaped upon them by the partisans and abettors of these men. These facts also show what has been the spirit of that opposition which has for ten years past been carried on against the discipline, order and peace of our church in this section, and exhibit some mournful instances of departure from moral rectitude. Dr. B., according to his own acknowledgement, has been guilty of raising and circulating "unfounded and slanderous charges against the brethren," which, if true, would have disqualified them from sitting in an ecclesiastical court, or indeed exercising any part of the ministerial office; and yet he refuses to express "*unfeigned sorrow*" for it, and will submit to a rebuke for it "only in deference to Presbytery."

The proof convicting him, of having either written or caused to be written, and circulating certain anonymous slanderous letters, is conclusive and pointed:

1st. By witnesses proving the identity of his hand-writing.

2d. By his having read and showed one of the letters, or a copy, to two of his brethren assisting him on a sacramental occasion many months before any of them appeared to have been put in circulation.

The history of Mr. Stalker's case, which also issued in his deposition, exhibits a singular instance of obstinacy.

---

*The Associate Reformed Synod of New-York.*—This ecclesiastical judicature held its Annual Session at Salem, in Washington County, on the first and second weeks of September. We have not yet seen the minutes of their proceedings—we hope in due time to notice such of their proceedings as are of general interest. We have, however, learned with satisfaction, that Synod have succeeded in carrying some reforming measures—particularly in relation to the scheme of intercommunion—and although the friends of reform were disappointed in making the use of the Scripture Psalmody a term of communion in that church, yet they received such encouragement as to hope to carry the measure by another year.

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,  
AND  
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

NOVEMBER, 1838.

---

ART. I. *Exposition of Romans viii. 18—23.*

“For I reckon, that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us. For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected *the same* in hope; because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now: and not only *they*, but ourselves also, which have the first-fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, *to wit*, the redemption of our body.” Rom. viii. 18—23.

From the first verse of this chapter to the verse commencing our text, the Apostle points out the strong consolation which the justified in Christ Jesus possess through his blood. Against remaining corruption, he comforts them in the first part of the chapter. Sin shall not have dominion over them. United to Jesus, they are secure from condemnation. The body must die because of sin; yet its death will be but a preparation for putting it in possession of a better life. “If the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you.” Believers are all the children of God; yea, they are heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ. If a child of God, what need you fear? If an heir of God, what can you want? If Omnipotence is your shield, what enemy can touch you? If Jesus is your Advocate, and by the merit of His death pleads for you perpetually before the throne, why need you dread that remaining corruption will prove your ruin? Well might the Apostle in holy triumph exclaim:—“Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God’s elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.”

An objection to his reasoning the Apostle proceeds to notice in the 17th verse, which may be termed the commencement of the second part of his argument. He had comforted believers in the former verses under the burden of remaining sin. From the 18th to the 31st verse he

presents the precious consolations which the believer possesses against the afflictions of life ; and over them he triumphs in a strain of unrivalled sublimity from the 35th verse to the close of the chapter. How, an objector might argue, how can believers be heirs of God, and possessors of glory, when we see them through life the victims of sorrow, and encompassed with suffering throughout the wilderness journey ? They are, (he tells us in reply, in the 17th verse,) heirs of God ; but as such they must be fitted for their heavenly inheritance. Through much tribulation they must enter the kingdom of Heaven. Through the waters of affliction and death, they must pass into Canaan. Not that their afflictions are meritorious of Heaven. They are but means God has appointed for purifying their souls :—a way he has marked out, and in which they must walk, before they can enter on the possession of the promised glory. Sensible however of the weakness of our nature, the subtlety of Satan, and his readiness to take advantage of the sufferings of believers to drive them to despair ; the Apostle instantly proceeds to suggest grounds of comfort against afflictions. If we suffer with Christ, we shall also be glorified together with Him. We must take up the cross and crucify the flesh, if we would enter as conquerors the paradise of God. Though no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous but grievous : nevertheless, afterwards it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness :—and the fruit of this righteousness is peace, and the effect of it quietness and assurance forever. It is the hand of mercy that smites the believer. Afflictions embitter sin to the soul, and fill the heart with humility and love. God sends them for our profit, and to make us partakers of his holiness. Still under all He is our own covenant God. Who ever trusted to His promise and perished ? Who ever sought a refuge under the shadow of His wings, and fell before the storm, or perished by the bolt of vengeance ? Under all trials and amid all his wanderings the believer is safe.

In the 19th verse the Apostle then illustrates his argument by showing that, if the faithful disciples of Jesus, enduring hardness, and warring a good warfare as His devoted followers, we shall not only reign with Him in His kingdom, but reign as the sons of God ; encircled with such a glory as not only to overbalance the afflictions of this present life, but such as shall far exceed the loftiest conceptions of the longing soul. The body too, subjected to suffering and pain, he proceeds to show, longs for the revelation of this glory. So great is this glory, so transcendent the bliss to be bestowed on the souls and bodies of the redeemed, at the manifestation of the sons of God ; that believers, groaning under present sufferings, though bowing with submission, yet earnestly (as one desiring the approach of some long-looked-for and much-loved object) long and wait, and look for the dawning of the resurrection day. "For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God," &c. The great difficulty in the explanation of this passage, is to determine what is meant by the term "the creature." Perhaps it may help to a correct and clear understanding of the passage : 1. To point out the different meanings which have been attached to this phrase "the creature," and the unnecessary difficulties with which it has thus been encumbered. 2. To show what we believe to be the true meaning of the expressions here used, and endeavor to prove the correctness of our position, by a critical examination of the whole paragraph.

1. The various meanings which have been given to the expression

“the creature” in the text:—1. By *κτίσις* here translated “creature,” some suppose that angels are meant;—those ministering spirits, who long for the time when the children of God shall be rescued from suffering, and brought home to Heaven. This, however, cannot be the meaning of the word, because this creature is here represented as groaning and travailing in pain—as subject to sorrow, and corruption; all of which is utterly inconsistent with the state of the holy and happy intelligences of Heaven.

2. Some again suppose that by *the creature* is meant mankind in general. It is true, that all men have been brought by sin into a state of bondage, corruption and death; but it is not true that all are longing for deliverance. They love the chains of sin which bind them; yea, are taken captive by Satan at his will, and have no desire after spiritual blessings. Neither is it true that all mankind shall be brought into the glorious liberty of the sons of God in Heaven.

3. Some again by *κτίσις* *the creature* understand the Heathen or the Gentile nations; the world as distinguished from the church. This supposition is liable to the same objection stated above. It is not true, that all the Gentiles shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, and made heirs of glory. It cannot be proved that all the Gentiles shall be freed from the dominion of sin, and made sons of God. If such a latitude of meaning is assigned to the term, and the context and connection of the passage in the argument of the Apostle thus lost sight of, it is impossible that the explanation given can be correct. If by “the creature” is meant the Gentile world, or all men in general, the Universalist, with perfect consistency, might insist that it proved the salvation of all—the certainty of all being put in possession of the “glorious liberty of the children of God;” nay, that “every creature” on earth, and in hell, is here represented as groaning and longing for deliverance, and that, in due time, they shall all, fallen fiends and lost souls, be delivered from their bondage and taken to Heaven. Other objections to the idea that “the creature” means the Gentile world might be stated. It represents them as *unwillingly* subjected to vanity; as longing for the manifestation of the sons of God, and as finally made partakers of the privileges of the people of God; neither of which are true.

4. Some again by “*the creature*” understand the brute creation. This idea however is not only unsupported by the text, but absurd in itself.

John Wesley, in his usual arrogant mode of speaking the most confidently, on subjects he the least understood, after asserting that the brute creation is here meant, says; “Away with vulgar prejudices, and let the plain word of God take place. They shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into glorious liberty, even a measure, according as they are capable of the liberty of the children of God.” And again: “May I be permitted to mention here a conjecture concerning the brute creation? What if it should then please the all-wise, the all-gracious Creator to raise them higher in the scale of beings? What if it should please Him when He makes us *equal to angels*, to make them what we are now? Creatures capable of God; capable of knowing, and loving, and enjoying the author of their being?” While this conjecture is very absurd and unscriptural, still it must be admitted that if by *the creature* here is intended the brute creation, then it is asserted in the text, and does inevitably follow, that they will be raised from the dead and exalted to a state of liberty and glory equal to the sons of God—equal not

only as is here conjectured to what we are now, but equal to the angels and the glorified spirits of the just made perfect. No *prosopopœia*, no figure of speech would warrant such expressions as these of the brutes; and it is wrong to charge upon Paul such *semi-Pythagorean* doctrine. Such a tenet is not taught in the Bible, and no figure of speech would justify the assertions that they hope for such a thing.

5. Some again by *the creature* suppose the whole visible creation is meant; and, by a figure of speech personified, is represented as groaning and waiting for deliverance. The arguments used in opposing the notions stated above, show that this opinion also is untenable. There is no reference in the passage to the *material* creation. In the 22d verse the Apostle, for the sake of illustration, refers to *καθ' ἑαυτῆς κτίσις every creature*, or the whole creation of rational and accountable creatures of whom he was speaking—all mankind—the “whole creation” of men.

If as the advocates of this notion assert, “*the creature*” in the 21st verse means the whole *inanimate* creation; then what difference, according to this interpretation, is there between the *κτίσις* of the 21st verse, and the *καθ' ἑαυτῆς κτίσις* of the 22d verse? Paul it is plain makes an evident distinction between “*the creature*” and “*every creature*,” while this explanation would confound them. Besides, who needs be told that the inanimate creation did not by its own will bring its sufferings upon it; or what figure of speech could justify the assertion “*the creature*—the whole inanimate creation shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.”

II. We proceed then secondly, to show what we believe to be the true meaning of the expressions used, from an examination of the whole passage. Let it be observed, that whatever meaning is attached to “*the creature*” here spoken of, must be in consistence with what is said of its present condition and future prospects. This *creature*, whoever and whatever we suppose to be meant by it, must and shall be a partaker of the future resurrection, final bliss, and eternal liberty of the redeemed of the Lord. Carry this connection along, remember this fact asserted by the Apostle; and it will free the passage from many of those difficulties which absurd explanations have thrown over it and at, once confute them. Though singular and alone, “therefore, I said, I also will shew mine opinion.” (Job xxxii. 10.) By “*the creature*” then, I believe is meant *the bodies of believers*. Both text and context seem to me to prove this. It is always necessary in explaining a passage, to attend to the subject matter of which a writer treats, and the immediate connection of the passage under consideration, with what precedes and follows. This would remove textual difficulties; and this, by the advocates of the opinions opposed above, I cannot but think has been too much overlooked. They seem to have considered it as an isolated passage, standing unconnected by itself—presenting an apparently inscrutable meaning, and defying the powers of criticism: while the explanations given have been at utter variance, both with the context and the analogy of faith. Consider in connection the subject the Apostle is discussing, and the difficulties vanish. “If the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God; and if children, then heirs, heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together. For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time,” &c.

“The glory to be revealed in us,” in the 18th verse, “the manifestation of the sons of God,” in the 19th verse, “the glorious liberty of the children of God,” in the 21st verse, and “the redemption of the body,” in the 23d verse, all point out the same deliverance and glory for which “the creature” is waiting, and of which it shall be put in possession. In the 17th verse the Apostle points out the inestimable privileges of believers—“heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ.” In the 18th verse he proceeds to show that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with that glory which shall encircle the souls and bodies of the redeemed on the day of the resurrection and final judgment. It is *not* of Heaven itself that the Apostle here speaks; but of “*the glory which shall be revealed in us*” in believers—the redemption of their bodies from the grasp of corruption and death—the perfect bliss and inconceivable splendor which shall be their portion, for which they are longing, and of which they shall be put in possession. To show that even under these sufferings the believer cherishes a hope of deliverance, and that the declaration in the 11th verse shall be made good, the Apostle introduces this contested passage in the 19th verse. “For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God.” *The earnest expectation of the creature waiteth.* This expression denotes an intense solicitude, and even a painful anxiety; and sets before us one with every muscle stretched, and neck extended, looking eagerly forward for the long desired object. The particle “for,” in this 19th verse evidently connects both it and what follows with the 18th verse, and shows that the subject treated of in both *is the same*. This then, and the following verses are introduced as a proof of the expectation and certainty of this final glorification of the sons of God. For this manifestation in the glory purchased and prepared for them, the Apostle tells us in the 19th verse, “*the creature waiteth.*” The body of the believer agonized with pain, and subjected to suffering, fervently desireth deliverance. It is not at all inconsistent to represent “*the creature*”—the body as thus waiting for its own manifestation. It is similar to the desire expressed by Paul on this subject in another passage—“For in this (body) we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from Heaven”—longing for the day when our Lord shall change the vile body, that it may be fashioned like his glorious body. He then assigns two reasons for this earnest desire of future glory. 1. The present suffering to which “the creature”—the body is subjected, as expressed in the 20th verse. 2. The glory with which *this creature*—this body shall yet be clothed, as asserted in the 21st verse.

(Vs. 20th.) “For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of Him who hath subjected the same in hope.” The word *κτίσις* here translated “the creature,” is derived from *κτίω* to create. *κτίσις*—*the creature*—denotes any thing made or created, and its definite meaning must be determined by the context. It cannot mean, we have seen, the angels—they have never suffered pain; nor all mankind in general; the whole tenor of Scripture confutes the idea that they shall *all* be made heirs of the glory of Heaven; nor the Gentile world—the Heathen—for it cannot be shown that they shall all be exalted to the privileges of the sons of God, as this “creature” will be; nor the brute creation; nor the irrational creation in general; this “creature” is capable of enjoying and shall infallibly partake of the glory of God’s children, and shall enter the palace of the King of kings. Of whom then, or

of what is all this true but of the bodies of believers. This "creature" is to be raised to the dignity of a child of God—made an heir of glory—adopted into the family of Heaven—redeemed from the grave, though now subjected to suffering and pain: facts predicable only of the bodies of the saints. The bodies of all as we are taught in the 22d verse, are, indeed, the victims of suffering and death, and must become the spoil of corruption. Still the bodies of the saints alone shall be brightened with glory. The brute creation is, indeed, groaning under bondage, and suffering oppression; but it is absurd to speak of the brute creation being raised to the glory and estate of the sons of God, while it is true of the bodies of the saints. The Heathen—the Gentile world is indeed in a state of extreme degradation and guilt; but not longing for deliverance. Nay, they are contented with the "bondage of corruption" and idolatry into which they have plunged themselves; they are sinking into eternity loving the chains which bind them, ignorant of the only name, and the only foundation by which the soul can be saved; and shall they, unsanctified, and wicked, shall they all share in the privileges and joys of Heaven? This, however, is true in all its extent of the bodies of the saints and of them above. The irrational creation, animate and inanimate is also groaning under the load of sin—on account of sin the whole earth is withering beneath the curse of Heaven, and preparing for the burning—but *this is not the truth taught here*, nor is it true that the irrational creation shall be made rational, and share in the fruits of the Spirit, in the bliss of rational and glorified beings. The "creature," therefore cannot here mean the irrational creation, whether animate or inanimate. All this, however, is true of the bodies of believers; to them the context in the 11—18 vs. and in the 23d verse, evidently refers and from the connection to them is plainly limited. This appears more evident as we proceed. "The creature (the body) was made subject to vanity, not willingly," but as constrained and contrary to the desires of the body for happiness;—"by reason of Him who hath subjected the same"—even the righteous God, who, as the guardian of justice, and in consequence of the sin of Adam our first father, has justly subjected us to corruption and death. *The creature* then, the body, is born subject to vanity and the bondage of corruption, "by reason of Him;" by the appointment of Him who had solemnly threatened, "in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die;" and who, in consequence of the first sin of our representing head as well as on account of actual guilt, justly subjects the body to suffering because the soul has sinned. Still believers are called upon to remember amid all the sufferings, that so far as it regards them it is a subjection "in hope." Exposed like all our fallen race by the sin of Adam to bondage and wo, believers shall be delivered from it by the power and the mercy of Him who raised up Christ from the dead, and who shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you. (v. 11th.) Some suppose that the 20th verse should be enclosed in a parenthesis, (with the exception of the last clause,) as explanatory of the 19th verse, and then the 19th and 21st verses read in connection. While there is no material objection to this arrangement, there is certainly no necessity for it. Still, according to either, the Apostle evidently points out the "redemption" of the bodies of those who now suffer with Christ, from the bondage of corruption; and their hope, amid all their trials, of a glorious deliverance.

(V. 21st.) "Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." "In

hope that" this sick and dying body sinking under the dominion of sin, and the curse that sin has deserved, shall, through the riches of grace be rescued from the grasp of death, and the chains of corruption broken, be raised, purified and glorified, a meet companion for the holy and happy intelligences of Heaven. Or rather, as it is rendered in our excellent version, "because" the body *shall* be delivered from the bondage of corruption—*because* of the certainty of this redemption, this earnest expectation as a support under sorrow, is confidently cherished. The Apostle then, in the 22d verse, by way of elucidating and confirming his argument, refers to the fact that all mankind are alike subject to sorrow and pain; and while there is no exemption from suffering because all are stained and burdened with sin, still to the sons of God, the adopted of the Most High, there is a blessed hope of future deliverance and triumph.

(V. 22d.) "For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now." ἡ *πᾶσι* κτίσις—the words here translated the whole creation, are literally *every creature*. It is the same word which in the former verses is rendered "the creature," and by it is evidently intended the whole race of mankind. The translators of our English version appear thus to have understood the original, and their own expression "the whole creation;" for they add in the next verse, referring to the "whole creation" as the antecedent:—"and not only *they*"—"the whole creation" of men in general groan, being burdened with a body of suffering and sin; but even believers thus also feel its polluting and accursed influence.

While "every creature" then is the most correct translation, still it is perfectly allowable, and no grammatical nor scriptural error is committed in thus designating a whole class of beings by the abstract instead of the concrete term; and saying "the whole creation" of men, instead of "every creature" of mankind. Having illustrated his argument by this reference to abounding suffering, he proceeds to state that not only *they*—all mankind in general, "but ourselves also which have the first fruits of the spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body."

"The first fruits of the Spirit." There is a reference in this expression to the first ripe fruits before a full and joyful harvest. The first fruits of the Spirit are those graces and consolations of the Spirit, which are in the souls of believers, a pledge of their perfect sanctification;—a foretaste and first-fruits of their future glory. Even the people of God, then, who possess these pledges of eternal bliss, are yet in consequence of sin pressed under a burden of temptation and sorrow: waiting earnestly for, and confidently expecting deliverance. And what is this deliverance? "The adoption, to wit, the *redemption* of the body." In this last clause the Apostle explains what he means by *the adoption*. It is the redemption of the body from the grave—the admission of the risen dead who have died in the Lord to the family of Heaven, the glory of the upper sanctuary. Is not this last clause of the 23d verse conclusive evidence of the truth and correctness of the explanation which I have given of this passage? It seems to me as if this last clause had been expressly inserted by the inspired Apostle to prevent a misconstruction of his meaning, and to point out the great subject of which he was treating. What is that for which "the creature" is represented as waiting, when groaning and travailing in pain under the effects of sin? It is the manifestation of the sons of God—it is deliverance from the bondage of corruption—it is the redemption of the body

—a resurrection of glory for the body from the dead. And is this true of the irrational creation—of all men in general—of angels—or of brutes? Is it true of any “creature” but the bodies of the saints? All the dead of all ages good and bad will be raised,—but the redeemed only will be raised in glory.

Errorists have made use of this passage in proof of their dangerous opinions, by explaining it according to some of the ways I have endeavored to refute; while many excellent men imagining difficulties, and explaining the passage according to preconceived notions, and without regard to the context, have run into the same inconsistent expositions. Let a plain man paraphrase the passage according to either of the views opposed, and he will see at once their absurdity and unscriptural bearing.

(Vs. 18—23.) The sufferings of believers are great and distressing, but still I know from the testimony of my God, that they are not worthy to be compared with that glory which shall be bestowed upon us at the resurrection. So inconceivable is this splendor,—so great this bliss,—that the Gentiles, though sunk in idolatry, greedily following sin, and ignorant of the resurrection of the body, are yet looking forward to it with delighted admiration:—yea, all the wicked on earth—all mankind, Mahometan and Infidel, are unwillingly subjected to sin:—are anxious for the manifestation and exaltation of the saints whom they hate and persecute, and shall all holy or unholy, just or unjust be made partakers of Heaven’s bliss and enjoy the glorious liberty of the sons of God.

Such must be the paraphrase and explanation of the passage, if the heathen or all men in general are meant. Whether is it better then to charge the inspired Paul with contradicting the whole tenor of revelation, and contradicting himself in this and his other Epistles,—if this explanation of his words be correct,—or to brand at once the forced and perverted meaning put on his language, as false and unscriptural.

Try to paraphrase the passage again, on the supposition that the brutes, or the whole inanimate creation is meant.

Numerous and severe as are the sufferings of believers in this life, still the glory to be revealed and bestowed upon them will infinitely overbalance all. Such is the magnificence of this glory, such the splendor of their future state, that the brutes will gaze on it in mute amazement:—yea the whole inanimate creation, expecting this manifestation of the saints in glory, and all the brute creation shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, and participate in the bliss of the rational and glorified sons of God. Yea, the whole inferior creation shall not only be made “what we are now,”—but every beast of the forest shall be a partaker of the bliss of the glorified believer;—all the cattle on a thousand hills,—all the brute creation, “as a recompense for what they once suffered while under *the bondage of corruption*, when God has *renewed the face of the earth*, and their corruptible body has put on incorruption, shall enjoy happiness suited to their state, without alloy, without interruption and without end.”\*

\* These are Wesley’s own words, and prove that the above paraphrase is no caricature. Indeed whatever meaning expositors may chuse to attach to the phrase “*the creature*,”—it is evident that to be consistent they must maintain that this creature, whether all men, or brutes, shall, by the grace of God attain a resurrection of glory, and a share in the bliss of Heaven. Now of whom, or what, I again ask is this true, but of the bodies of believers? In reference to the personification of the inanimate creation, it might have been further noticed that the groaning spoken of in 23d verse is real. Now by what law of language can it be supposed to be merely figurative in the verse preceding, as they insist who plead that by both “*creature*” and “*the whole creation*” the same thing is intended, viz: the inanimate and irrational creation?

Paraphrase the passage now according to the explanation we have given, and while the doctrines deducible from it thus explained are scriptural and correct; there is no torturing of the text to make it speak a language inconsistent both with itself and the context; but all is natural and obvious.

18. The state of suffering and temptation to which believers are now subject is painful and distressing; but by inspiration from my God I know that these trials will soon be ended, and are not worthy of being spoken of as sufferings, when compared with the pure and perfect glory of which all the bodies of believers shall partake at the resurrection of the just. Now they may be the victims of pain, the lodging house of suffering and disease; they may be exposed to the rage of persecuting tyrants; they may be tortured: sawn asunder; slain with the sword; burned to ashes; or hung in chains and left to bleach and waste and wither under the winds of heaven; still they shall openly be raised, changed, glorified and admitted into heaven. A price, so to speak, has been paid for these bodies by the Son of God, and at the appointed time he will redeem them from death, he will ransom them from the power of the grave, raise from the ashes, and by his angels gather these bodies of His elect from the four winds, and beautify them with glory.

19. Such is the greatness of his glory—the bliss of this future inheritance, that we, who are in this body, earnestly desire to be clothed upon, with our house which is from heaven;—that mortality might be swallowed up of life. Yea, our bodies earnestly desire this blissful period, when glorified and purified, we shall, in soul and body, without imperfection or sin serve the Lord.

20. For these our bodies are subjected to sin, and suffering, and corruption, by the will and appointment of Jehovah, in consequence of our rebellion and guilt. Contrary to the natural desires of the body for happiness, it is by the righteous sentence of a just God, for Adam's sin, brought into being subject to vanity and the bondage of corruption; and yet through the grace of God and the merits of Christ, as it respects the believer, it is thus subjected "*in hope.*" Though even believers are groaning under the burden of sorrow sin has brought upon all, still, unlike multitudes as good by nature as they, it is in hope of a glorious redemption, a hope which shall never make ashamed—a purpose of mercy by an unchangeable God which shall never be altered, never disannulled.

21. This assurance of deliverance may be confidently relied on, because as God has promised, so the body shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, and instead of its present guilty and degraded state, be advanced to glory and immortality, raised, and made like to the glorious body of our ascended Lord. It is not yet fit to be taken to Heaven and made one with the sons of God; it is yet subject to sin, and must become the prey of corruption; but in due time it shall be purified from every stain—made holy as the angels, resplendent with glory as the sun in the firmament;—happy as the bliss of Heaven can make us: and for this inconceivable joy we wait and long; believing that it will infinitely more than compensate for all the trials of this present time.

22. I may, by way of illustration, here remind believers that this state of suffering is common to all the fallen offspring of fallen Adam. The whole creation of men—all mankind for sin have been, and are,

suffering under the wrath of God, from the day that Adam fell “until now.” All are witnesses of this fearful truth.

23. And not only do all the guilty of our race thus groaning under the curse.—but even we, brethren, beloved of the Lord, who are called by God to be his children—who, in the first fruits of the Spirit possess a pledge of future deliverance,—even we ourselves, notwithstanding all this, groan within ourselves, and must continue thus to suffer till the manifestation of the sons of God and the “redemption of the body.” To this we look forward, for this we wait, and expecting this, all the sorrows of the present time we can count as nothing, compared with that glory with which Jesus, the conqueror of death, will then invest these now frail and suffering bodies.

Such, then, we believe to be the meaning of this important passage; and may not the appeal be confidently made to the reader, if this explanation is not agreeable both to the original, the context and the analogy of faith? The whole passage explained in consistence with itself and the context, we think, clearly proves that the view here taken is correct. For the day of deliverance, when the adoption declaring us children of God shall be consummated and manifested at the redemption of the body, the believer longs and waits. He knows that death shall not triumph forever. The Lord the Redeemer has not only by his death delivered our souls from sin, but will in due season rescue our bodies from the grave. Now, a mass of corruption, yet to be made a pillar of glory. Now, a vessel of dishonor and sin, ready to be laid in the dust, and turned to dust:—yet, even thus changed and humbled, resting in hope of a glorious redemption from this bed of corruption and death. “The trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed.” (1 Cor. xv. 22.) Ask not with scoffing infidelity “how are the dead raised up?”—Cannot He who formed man of the dust at first, restore him to life, and raise him from the dust again? Cannot He whose power is Almighty, and who holds in his hand the keys of hell and of death;—whose constant agency sustains, whose eye watches over and whose Providence supplies the wants of every living thing, restore again and raise from the dead the body which for days and years he had preserved on earth; and over which he had given death, for a season, power? How absurd for puny mortals to pretend to limit and measure, by the strength and depth of their feeble darkened understanding, the power of the Omnipotent.

Cannot He who with his storm strips the trees in the winter of their leaves and fruit, and beauty, and reclothes them with splendor in the spring—Cannot He who constantly shows us the resurrection of the day, brought back again, so to speak, with fresh beauty and new blessings in the morning from the darkness and grave of the night:—Cannot He who causes the grain cast into the ground, and left to rot and die, to spring forth again, quickened and clothed with beauty, and loaded with fruit:—Cannot His power raise and revivify the sleeping dust? He can; and his word proclaims that He will. “The hour is coming in which all that are in their graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and shall come forth;—they that have done good unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation.” (John v. 28. 1 Cor. xv. 12–20. Dan. xii. 2.) On the resurrection day, the sea will give up the dead which are in it, and death and hell deliver up the dead which are in them. Joyful day to those who now wait for the redemption of the body, and the manifestation of

the sons of God. Soon a voice shall be heard throughout the kingdom of death,—the voice of the great Redeemer proclaiming the death of death, and filling every grave of his redeemed with the voice of triumph:—"Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust, for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead. I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction."

Waiting, then, for the redemption of the body;—remembering that the coffin and the shroud, must first encompass it, ere it is encircled with glory; looking and preparing for the second coming of the Son of man, under all the sufferings of the present time, be strong, and of a good courage, striving to say in sincerity with Paul on another occasion: "I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord:—That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death: if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead."

W. E.

---

ART. II. *Historical Sketch of the United Brethren or Moravians.*

(Continued from page 201.)

The Moravian exiles had hitherto conformed in their ecclesiastical constitution to the Lutheran Church—having adopted some peculiar regulations to maintain unanimity among the different classes of Reformed, Lutheran and Moravians, who had settled in Herrnhut. The Moravian emigrants insisted on restoring the ecclesiastical government and discipline of their ancestors. They did not object to the doctrine taught in the Lutheran Church, for in general they agreed to it: but they censured its laxity in discipline, and the consequent dissolute lives of many of its members, both among the clergy and laity. "Of what use is it," said they, "that we have left house and home for the sake of religion? What benefit do we derive from our constitution, which is older than any other Protestant form of religion, which Luther himself so highly commended, for the preservation of which our forefathers risked their lives, and which they bequeathed to us as a sacred deposit?" They roundly declared, that, if it were deemed impolitic or dangerous to grant them that liberty at Herrnhut, they would go and seek it elsewhere.

Count Zinzendorf, who, both from education and principle, was firmly attached to the Lutheran Church, long opposed the wish of the Moravians, but as they urged it with so much earnestness and cogency of argument, he resolved to bring the matter to a final issue. For this purpose he submitted the following proposition to the elders of the congregation: "Whether it would not be best, out of love to others, and in order to avoid giving needless offence to pious people in other denominations, and in the hope of conciliating all parties, to relinquish their peculiar regulations, and unite with the Lutheran Church without reserve?" This proposition was warmly opposed; they, however, consented to lay it before the congregation-council convened for that purpose, on June 7th, 1731. This meeting expressed its disapprobation of the proposed measure in still stronger terms; and not only the Mora-

vian emigrants, but nearly all the other members of the congregation, were decidedly against it. They asserted, that the constitution of the ancient Brethren's Church contained nothing that was repugnant to reason or the fitness of things, that it was consistent with apostolic practice, and the usage of the primitive church, and that its utility was confirmed by the experience of nearly three centuries.

Count Zinzendorf still argued on the other side of the question, but, finding that he failed in carrying conviction to their minds, he suggested that the question should be submitted to a decision by lot. The whole assembly consented the more readily to this, because it accorded with the practice of the ancient Brethren. Agreeably to their custom, two texts were selected and written on slips of paper. The one text was: "*To them that are without law (become) as without law; (being not without law unto God, but under the law to Christ,) that you may gain them that are without law.*" (1 Corinth. ix. 21.) And the other: "*Therefore, Brethren stand fast and hold the traditions which you have been taught.*" (2 Thess. ii. 15.) They had previously come to a mutual understanding, that if the latter of these texts were drawn, they were then to adopt the constitution of the ancient Brethren's Church; but if the former, they were to unite themselves with the Lutherans. Preliminaries being thus agreed upon, the assembly joined in earnest prayer to the Lord, entreating him, as the Head and Ruler of his Church universal, to counsel them according to his mind, vowing unreserved obedience to his will. Hereupon a little child was called in, and directed to draw one of the above texts. The one thus drawn was: "*Therefore, Brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which you have been taught.*" This decision was received by the whole assembly with joy and thanksgiving, as a clear intimation that it accorded with the Lord's purpose with them, that like their forefathers, they should be a people so entirely devoted to him, as to be ready to execute his will in all things, amidst evil and good report, and serve him to the utmost of their ability, by propagating the gospel at home and abroad.

In adopting this measure there is one circumstance which ought not to be passed over in silence; namely, the firmness with which the inhabitants of Herrnhut maintained their opinion, in opposition to Count Zinzendorf. They owed him respect, both as warden of the congregation, and as lord of the manor.\* They were indebted to him for the peaceful asylum and protection they enjoyed on his estate; and were ever disposed to treat him with that deference to which his rank entitled him, and to honor him as a father. But there was a point beyond which they could not carry their veneration,—a state of things in which they would "call no man *father* upon earth." They showed themselves the children of those, who, formerly, in Moravia, had sacrificed every thing for the rights of conscience; and they acted in the spirit of their ancestors, being willing, if required, to yield to constituted authorities, by peaceably retiring from Herrnhut, and seeking religious liberty in another place. Whether the steps they took be approved or not, the spirit they manifested is justly entitled to praise. Their conduct likewise confutes an opinion, perhaps, not yet entirely exploded, that the Moravian emigrants yielded implicit obedience to the dictates of Count Zinzendorf, and that he was the *founder* of the Brethren's Church.

\* In this and many other parts of Germany a nobleman, as lord of the manor, exercises a judicial authority over his tenantry, who are in a state of vassalage. He is a magistrate, can publish injunctions and prohibitions and has his own courts for the trial of civil, and sometimes criminal causes.

How far he was from assuming any such authority, his own conduct on this memorable occasion plainly indicates. And however great the admiration entertained by the Brethren for his distinguished talents and eminent piety, their church has never conferred any higher honor on his memory than that of esteeming him a blessed *instrument* in the hand of God, to raise her from her ashes and renew her constitution.

Agreeably to the usage of their forefathers they might compile a code of laws for the government of the members of their community, and elect persons from among themselves to watch over their due observance. They might also appoint elders to edify the church by the word of God. But the general opinion and practice of Christendom, combined with the order of the apostolic and primitive age, required, that they should have regularly *ordained* men, for the performance of the ministerial functions of preaching and administering the holy ordinances of religion. This was becoming daily more necessary by the enlargement of their sphere of operation, and especially by the increase of their labors for the conversion of the heathen.

It was not to be expected, that men who had received ordination in other churches, would be found willing to leave their own vineyard in order to cultivate that of the Brethren; nor that the heads or consistories of the Protestant Church would confer this rite on men whom the Brethren might propose to them as candidates for it.

These considerations at length removed the remaining scruples of Count Zinzendorf, and convinced him of the necessity of taking this final step towards perfecting the ecclesiastical constitution of the Brethren, by procuring regular ordination for their ministers. Among the various forms of church government, the preference was, by the majority, given to the *Episcopal*, being that adopted by their ancestors, and according to their views, appearing most consonant to the apostolic practice. For these reasons they agreed to take measures for renewing the episcopacy of their church. The line of Bishops in the Bohemian-Moravian branch of their church had terminated in Amos Comenius, but the succession was still continued in the Polish branch, of which two bishops, or seniors, (as they were called in Poland) were still living, D. E. Jablowsky, at Berlin, chaplain to the king of Prussia, and C. Sitkivius, residing at Lissa in Poland.

To the former of these the Brethren at Herrnhut were well known. He acknowledged them as genuine descendants of the ancient Moravian Church, and had repeatedly expressed his joy and admiration, at their zeal in propagating the gospel, and their earnestness in renewing the discipline of their church. With this prelate Count Zinzendorf entered into correspondence, relative to the episcopal ordination of the ancient Brethren's Church, which terminated in a declaration on his part, that he was willing to confer dignity on any of their descendants at Herrnhut, who should be duly qualified and presented to him for that purpose David Nitschmann, Sen., having been duly elected for this office, was sent to Berlin, and after several interviews with Dr. Jablowsky, who examined into his faith and other qualifications, was by him consecrated a Bishop of the renewed church of the Brethren.

This transaction was performed at Berlin, on the 13th of March, 1735, in the presence of several witnesses, and with the concurrence of Bishop Sitkovius of Lissa: each of whom furnished him with a certificate, delegating to him authority to hold visitations, to ordain Presbyters and Deacons, and perform all such functions as belong to a bishop (or senior and antistes) of the church.

To meet the wishes of friends and confute the calumnies of enemies, it became necessary to digest their doctrinal opinions into a brief compendium, similar to the confessions of faith of other Protestants. But to frame a new confession was repugnant to the feelings of the Brethren, who wished to abide in union with all christians, and, as far as possible, to avoid the appearance of schism and sectarianism. They therefore, resolved, with the cordial consent of all the inhabitants of Herrnhut, whether descended from the Moravian, Lutheran, or the Reformed Church, " *To recive the doctrinal articles of the Augustan Confession, so as they were read on the 25th June, 1530, in the German language, before the electors, princes and (deputies of) cities, and delivered to his imperial majesty Charles V. BECAUSE THEY ARE ACCORDANT WITH THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.*

The adoption of this Confession was of much importance in their future labors in different countries. According to an article in the Westphalian treaty of peace, no Protestants were protected in their religious liberties in the German Empire, but those who professed to adhere to the Augustan or Helvetic Confession. In the Danish and Swedish dominions, the Augustan is the authorised standard of the national churches. Moreover, it admits that *an uniformity of external regulations and ceremonies is not essential to the unity of faith.* This concession operated in favor of the Brethren, whenever the peculiarity of their discipline was urged as a plea against their orthodoxy.

During Count Zinzendorf's journey to Copenhagen in 1731, above seventy new Moravian exiles arrived at Herrnhut. This excited observation, and the Count was accused of sending emissaries into Moravia and Bohemia, to seduce people to emigrate. He complained of this charge to the imperial father confessor Tannemann, and likewise vindicated his conduct at the court of Saxony. A commission was therefore appointed by the court of Saxony, for investigating these accusations. This was the very thing the Moravians desired, as they were kept in a state of suspense, fearing that if credit were given to these charges, they would be deprived of the protection of government, and sent back to the house of bondage.

This examination was committed to Baron Von Gerddorf, lord lieutenant of the principality of Goerlitz. Accompanied by his secretary, he arrived at Herrnhut on the 19th of Jan. 1732, and on the next day, being Sabbath, attended divine service in the parish church, and were present at all the public and private meetings held at Herrnhut, in which not the slightest alteration was made. On Monday, after the usual morning prayers at five o'clock, the whole congregation assembled in the chapel. Baron Von Gersdorf opened his commission with a short address, and then interrogated the Moravians one by one,\* concerning their awakening, their former sufferings, the cause of their emigration, the design of their present regulations, &c. After his return he expressed his entire satisfaction with Count Zinzendorf, the elders of the congregation, and his very favorable opinion of its members.

The same year a material change took place in the life of Count Zinzendorf, which had a very important influence on the affairs of Herrnhut, and eventually on the concerns of the whole church of the Brethren. He executed a design he long meditated, of resigning his office in the

\* There were upwards of three hundred persons present, who had come from more than twenty different places, forty of whom had suffered imprisonment.

regency of Dresden and assuming the clerical profession. As a preparatory step to this, he sold his estates, by a regular contract to his wife. This freed him from the necessity of acting as a magistrate. Soon after this he obtained the royal permission to resign his official situation in the government; and on the 8th of March, 1733, took leave of his colleagues in an address, in which he delivered his sentiments with great freedom. What were his own views and feelings in taking this step may be seen from the following extract taken from one of his letters:

“I have endeavored to conform to what the Apostle Paul says: ‘No man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of this life.’ My resolution is now taken, to renounce all worldly honors, care and protection; and devote myself, with all I have, to my Creator, to become a disciple of the Lord, and to expect that any apparent loss in temporals will be made up to me in some way or other in the clerical state. For the future, I am free to serve the Lord, wherever he may employ me: I have now only to care for the things of the Lord. If my wife, children and parents, die before me, I may indeed be reduced to great poverty; yet I have nothing to fear, while God preserves my health, because I can maintain myself by the labor of my hands, like thousands besides, among whom there are many disciples of the Lord. And should sickness or age render this impracticable, I rely on the word of Jesus: ‘Take no thought for the morrow; for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things.’ I also renounce all the honors and prerogatives of my rank. I have found it difficult to remain in my present official situation, because I have daily met with occurrences which made me fear that I act in opposition to the precept of the Lord: ‘They that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors: but ye shall not be so!’ At court I have resembled Mordecai, and I did not always find it easy to make ministerial firmness agree with the meekness of a disciple of Christ, and this has been a hindrance to my advance in the religion of the heart. Sometimes when I ought to have sought for victory by patient endurance, I have endeavored to obtain it, by making use of my civil prerogatives; but I have not always succeeded. Other and greater sufferings, such as have befallen my brethren, may await me in future; but I lay aside the armor of Saul, and choose him for my defence, who gave strength to the Shepherd’s boy.”\*

Being now set free from worldly engagements, he took serious measures for accomplishing his design of becoming a minister of the gospel. He applied to be examined by the Divines in Stralsund, who gave a very favorable testimony of him, and of the doctrines held by him. His next step was to apply to the university of Tuebingen, for their opinion concerning his assumption of the clerical profession. He presented a Latin Declaration to the theological faculty, setting forth his motives and intentions in devoting himself to the ministry. To this declaration the faculty returned a favorable answer, dated Dec. 19, 1734, formally recognizing Count Zinzendorf as a minister of the gospel. He entered upon the regular discharge of the duties of the clerical office, by delivering two sermons in the church at Tuebingen, and a few days after returned to Herrnhut. Count Zinzendorf was afterwards elected and ordained an antistes or bishop of the Brethren’s Church. The conse-

---

\* State of the kingdom of the cross, p. 113.

cration took place at Berlin, on May 20th, 1737, in the house of Dr. Jablowsky, in presence of some brethren from Herrnhut. The first bishop of their renewed church, David Nitschmann, assisted Jablowsky by imposition of hands, and also joined him and Sitkovius in affixing his signature, agreeably to the canons of the ancient Brethren's Church, to the signature of consecration, given to Count Zinzendorf.

The ordination of Count Zinzendorf to be a bishop of the renewed Church of the Brethren, afforded sincere joy, not only to those whom it more immediately concerned, but to many others both high and low, who esteemed him more for his zeal in the cause of God, than his elevated rank. The day after it had taken place, the king of Prussia sent him a letter, written with his own hand, in which he thus expresses his good wishes: "It was with satisfaction I learned, that according to your desire, you have been consecrated bishop of the Moravian Brethren. That this transaction may turn out to the glory of Almighty God, and the salvation of many souls, is my heart's desire. I am always your very affectionate, Fred. William,—Potsdam, May 21, 1737."

The various regulations made at Herrnhut, in the hope of thereby promoting godliness, and preparing its inhabitants for becoming useful and devoted servants of God, arose out of circumstances gradually developing themselves. Among the inhabitants of Herrnhut, were many young unmarried men, whose number in 1730, exceeded one hundred. They were all mechanics, and either lived with their parents, or lodged in other families. A separate habitation was built at the suggestion of Count Zinzendorf, provided for such young unmarried men, as were willing to avail themselves of it. By this regulation, they had daily opportunities to edify one another, and to be united together in true brotherly love. With a view of affording them the means of acquiring such a general knowledge of the sciences, as is more or less indispensable to a laborer in Christ's vineyard, they received instruction in the languages, Geography, History and Physic; Count Zinzendorf assisting in their instruction. As they had to earn their daily bread by the sweat of their brows, the hours devoted to study could only be gained by curtailing the time allotted to sleep. Yet by indefatigable diligence, by conning over their lessons while occupied at the loom, or other manual labor; by engaging solely for the Lord's sake, and by asking and obtaining aid from him, the attainments of some of them were very respectable, especially their knowledge of the original language of holy writ, and theological subjects in general. In proportion as the cause of the Brethren extended, it became more and more indispensable that those, who were its principal agents, should possess a competent share of human learning.

About the same time a similar regulation was made among the young women at Herrnhut; at their own request, influenced by the same desire of keeping themselves unspotted from the world, a number in 1733, moved into a house fitted up for them, where they made their own domestic arrangements. And this regulation, like that among the young men, conducted very materially towards promoting their growth in spiritual knowledge and piety, and preparing them, as far as was proper for their sex, for active service in the church.

These regulations have ever since been retained in the renewed Church of the Brethren; and in every regular settlement, houses have been built for the accommodation of the young married men and the unmarried women, called *Single Brethren's* and *Single Sisters' Houses*.

These houses have hitherto furnished the greater number of Missionaries, employed among the Heathen, and also many other useful servants in the labours of the Brethren's Church at home. To a more casual observer these institutions might assume the appearance of Monasteries; but nothing is further from the fact. Here is no vow of celibacy, or any other vow; nor are any, whether males or females, compelled to enter these houses against their will; neither is the piety of the inhabitants of these houses considered of a superior order to that of others. The egress is open to all, whenever they wish to avail themselves of it, without thereby incurring the censures of the church.

The appointment of *Elders* to direct and superintend the concerns, both spiritual and temporal, of the congregation, was of great importance to its welfare; and it is pleasing to find that the great head of the Church raised up men, from the exiles from Moravia, whom he endowed with the needful gifts for this office.

It seems evident, that the doctrine of the atonement of Jesus Christ, was made the foundation of the faith and practice of the Brethren. To the sacrifice of Christ alone, they looked for pardon and justification; but their views of sanctification were not so clear and evangelical at first as they afterwards became. With the gospel, which points to the blood of Christ as the only source, both of pardon and cleansing from sin, they mixed some mystical notions. Much was also spoken of the dignity of the human soul. They were agreed on the necessity of an entire devotedness of the heart unto God, and its renewal in righteousness: but the manner in which many endeavored to attain this mark of true Christianity, was not in all respects evangelical. They showed great earnestness in fasting and prayer, in watching against every temptation to sin, and in striving to be delivered from the effects of natural corruption.

This want of clearness in evangelical doctrine is not much to be wondered at, when it is recollected, that most of the inhabitants of Herrnhut had just escaped from a land of spiritual darkness, where the light of divine truth was not only obscured, but almost extinguished by human traditions. And even in Protestant Germany, the native simplicity of the gospel had lost much of its lustre, by the introduction of scholastic divinity. Those who were teachers in the Brethren's Church were true to their knowledge, and faithfully improved the light they had received. They endeavored through much poverty and difficulty to acquire such a portion of human learning as was necessary for the correct understanding of the Holy Scriptures, being frequently under the necessity of laboring at their several avocations during the greater part of the day. Many anecdotes might be given, which would show the great acquirements many persons made in these unfavorable circumstances for study.

Martin Dober, was a Bohemian exile—and a potter by occupation; but by close study, he acquired so much knowledge of theology, that he acquitted himself with credit in his examinations before several universities. He was highly esteemed at Herrnhut for his talents as a preacher and expounder of the Scriptures. A minister once put the question, how those meetings were conducted, at which the *potter* (meaning Dober) was the teacher? He received for answer: "When a lesson is read from the Old Testament and expounded, the *potter* in general makes use of a *Hebrew* Bible. When he is absent, Count Zinzendorf or the Rev. Mr. Rothe, supplies his place; but the *potter* is the most

acceptable to the congregation." Dober's discourses aimed at the reality of religion, and seldom failed to reach the heart; which made Count Zinzendorf say: "When Dober opens his lips in the meeting, his words flash into the soul like lightning."

Within the space of fifteen years after the revival of their church, the Brethren had, come to a mutual understanding on the principles of their constitution, the doctrines of Christianity, and their application to all the necessities of the sinner. Hereby they were prepared to be instruments in the hand of God for extending and building up his church on earth, by successfully preaching CHRIST CRUCIFIED to Christians and Heathen.

(To be continued.)

### ART. III. *The Associate Presbyterian Magazine.*

MR. EDITOR—I am indebted to a friend for the first number\* of a periodical work recently started in your city entitled "*The Associate Presbyterian Magazine*—under the sanction of the Associate Presbytery of Albany and several other ministers, and under the immediate superintendence of the Rev. Peter Bullions, D. D."

A title so imposing; a Presbyterian periodical; and not only Presbyterian, but *Associate* Presbyterian, a denomination which for a century has been distinguished for its indomitable attachment to the peculiarities of Presbyterianism, both in doctrine and discipline; and edited not only by a minister of the Associate Church, but a learned Doctor of Divinity, under the sanction of a whole Presbytery, and several others ministers; could scarcely fail to raise in the mind of the reader expectations of no ordinary character. A title so imposing, warranted the man of letters to anticipate an intellectual repast,—the infidel, powerful and well-aimed blows against the citadel of darkness—the pious man, a defence of the sublime doctrines of the gospel, on which are based all his hopes of future happiness and glory, managed in the words of truth and soberness—the man groaning under a sense of guilt, an exhibition of the obedience and sufferings of the Son of God, as a stable foundation on which the chief of sinners may build his hopes of heaven—and the weak and infirm something of the bland spirit of him who came into the world, not to *destroy*, but *save* men's lives, which might soothe and comfort the wounded spirit.

But, knowing, as I did, that the Rev. Peter Bullions, with some others, who claimed to be the Presbytery of Albany, had been **SUSPENDED** from the ministerial office and the communion of the Associate Church, for the highest act of contumacy known to the Presbyterian form of church government, I must confess that I had great fears when I first heard of this new publication, that it would not correspond to the imposing import of its title. And on a careful perusal, my fears have been fully realized. I laid it down with grief and shame; *grief* on account of the deep wound it inflicts upon the common cause of christianity; and *shame* for its authors. Indeed, it cannot fail to crimson the cheek of every pious man, that such a display of human frailty should have been made through the medium of professed ambassadors of the Prince of Peace.

\* This has been in our possession more than two months.—Ed. Rel. Mon.

These excised brethren, having, as appears to me, determined to resist the constitutional provisions of their own church for the removal of scandal and offences; from "a deep consciousness" that their conduct could not bear the legal application of the rules of discipline, which they had sworn to maintain, their only hope of sustaining themselves was to make a *false issue* respecting the matter in controversy between them and the church; and to create an impression that the whole church had all at once abandoned their principles, for the sake of persecuting them! These brethren, if I mistake not, knew very well that abuse of church courts would be exceedingly palatable to a corrupt age—that ignorance and prejudice stood ready to enlist in their cause—that a skillful concealment of the *merits of the question* could impose upon some honest people—that many would never see a reply to their statements—and that all these things combined would raise a party sufficiently strong to maintain them, or at least keep them in countenance for the present; and this course being more congenial to the pride of the human heart than a confession of sin and return to the path of duty, was accordingly chosen—and **SCHISM** was resolved upon. It is of comparative small importance whether men regard this as a causeless separation or not. To their own Master they stand or fall; and to his tribunal both they and their former brethren must stand, whether they will or not.

Much might be said and many animadversions might be made in relation to the contents of this first No. of the brethren's Magazine, but at present I shall confine myself to one single observation, which is, that this publication appears to me to *betray an unchristian spirit*.

This observation, it is believed, will appear well founded by a simple comparison of the language of the Magazine with that of divine inspiration. (1 Pet. iii. 8-17.) The reader is requested to turn to this passage and read it with care, as it is too long for citation. Many other portions of God's word speak the same language; but this is sufficient. It will be seen that it lays down "unity, compassion, brotherly love, pity, courtesy, rendering good for evil, refraining from evil speaking and guile, doing good, seeking peace, suffering for righteousness sake, well doing, and giving a reason of our christian hope with meekness and fear," as marks of grace or evidences of a christian spirit. Now let the intelligent reader contrast these heavenly words with the following, which are applied to the ministers and elders of the Associate Synod. They have suspended and deposed brethren without "just cause" or "plausible pretext"—"Sinful proceedings,"—"ill usage,"—"persecution,"—"corrupt exercise of discipline,"—"oppressive measures,"—"maintaining "falsehood for truth,"—"tyranny and oppression,"—"arbitrary and despotic principles,"—"a persecuting spirit,"—"accusers, witnesses and judges,"—"doing as the Popes did,"—"holding doctrines and principles held by the Romish Church,"—"repealing the law of God,"—"party spirit,"—"convicting the accused in the absence of all testimony,"—"influenced by anger, jealousy, and evil passions,"—"corrupt decision," "falsehood,"—"flagrant injustice,"—"perpetrating outrages," &c. are lavishly applied to the whole Associate Synod. And a number of members are held up to the world as engaged in a "mystery of iniquity,"—"ineffable baseness,"—"scheme of infamy,"—"allowing an individual to prove what he had already declared to be unwarranted and unfounded,"—"proved to be false and malicious slanderers in a court of justice," &c. &c.

Now, we ask the reader to judge for himself, whether this be not the

language of "railing." Does not such language always manifest a want of facts and sound argument? Does it not clearly betray an unchristian spirit? which was the thing proposed to be proved. So obvious does this appear to the mind of the writer, that he will not insult the reader's understanding by dwelling any longer upon it. It may, however, be remarked, that men almost uniformly speak as they feel; for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth *will* speak. The man under the influence of inebriation, not only sees double, but is amazed that the world is so given to drunkenness—the maniac raves because mankind have gone mad; the peevish man is made miserable by the ill-nature of others, and the angry man is resolved to chastise the fury of others; and some have so great love for *peace*, that they are ever ready to fight for it. If these principles be correct, to what an awful state of feeling must not the conductors of this Magazine be reduced? "O my soul, come not thou into their secret; unto their assembly, mine honor, be not thou united; *for in their anger they slew a man.* Cursed be their anger, for it was fierce; and their wrath, for it was cruel: **I WILL DIVIDE THEM IN JACOB, AND SCATTER THEM IN ISRAEL.**"

But if it should be inquired what has irritated these men to speak as they have, the answer is, **DISCIPLINE.** Had the church courts allowed themselves to be trampled in the dust, and gross immoralities to find a secure asylum in the church of God, no doubt our peace had now been like the dead calm of a stagnant pool. It is the character of Christ's witnesses that they "*torment* them that dwell on the earth." And in no way more than in the exercise of discipline, as all ecclesiastical history fully demonstrates. These offended brethren "confess acts of indiscretion;" and disavow all "intention to vindicate the conduct of Dr. Bullions;" but then he belongs to our party and you shall not apply the rules of discipline to him. Mr. Stark also belongs to our party, and he also shall be exempt; but if others offend, both civil and ecclesiastical law shall be applied to the letter, not excepting even the pound of flesh.\* And even if the civil suit, of which they speak, was as they represent it, which is not admitted, then by their own showing, patient submission to the requirements both of civil and ecclesiastical law, when enforced by the spirit that influenced men of old to gnash their teeth upon the Son of God, shall be no satisfaction! Is this the spirit of the gospel? Is this agreeable to the subordinate standards of the Secession Church? "Persons active in reviving old and dead scandals, or those that have been *legally removed*, shall be considered as scandalous." (Book of Dis. p. 59.) And yet this was repeatedly done in Synod and now again in their Magazine, by these *persecuted* brethren. They had themselves voted for the conviction of another for a like offence, and that other submitted to censure for it, and yet they have never acknowledged this as any kind of satisfaction; from which it appears, that they understand the rules of discipline to be applicable only to their opponents, and that their design is not the *reformation* but *destruction* of the offender. And yet these are the men that stigmatize the deeds of the Synod as the measures of "a party." Thanks be to the mercy of the

---

\* Our correspondent here alludes to the fact, that when Mr. Webster, through the want of pecuniary ability, failed to defend himself in the civil suit, and when in the absence of all defence the jury brought in a verdict of \$400 against him, Mr. Stark did, contrary to the general practice in all such cases, require the full payment of the said \$400—he exacted at the hand of his brother "the uttermost farthing"—he extorted, like the Jewish miser, the pound of flesh.—(Ed. Rel. Mon.)

Lord our God, there is still *a party* in the Synod, who have suffered all manner of reproach and much persecution for the cause of truth and righteousness, and who, I trust, are prepared to maintain this cause with the last breath of this mortal life, even though life itself should be the forfeit. "Whoever shall lose his life for my sake shall find it."

Some may suppose, that the example of our Saviour justifies railing language against individuals and church courts, when they are supposed to do wrong. He did indeed denounce the judgments of heaven upon the Pharisees and others; but then he was God; He had a right to say, "Vengeance is mine, I will repay." But the apostle Peter speaks of certain characters, who "walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness and **DESPISE GOVERNMENT**; presumptuous are they, self-willed; they are not afraid to **SPEAK EVIL OF DIGNITIES**." Whether this passage of holy writ be applicable to our insubordinate brethren we undertake not to decide; but the apostle adds, that "angels, greater in power and might, bring not railing accusation against them." And Jude tells us, that Michael the arch-angel durst not bring a railing accusation against the devil, but said "the Lord rebuke thee." If the authors of this Magazine be greater than the Arch-angel, by whom some understand the Son of God, and the Synod worse than the devil, then perhaps they may be justified in their railing accusations; otherwise they have betrayed an *un-christian spirit*. I close with a remark of Dr. Gill on the last cited text—"If the Prince of angels did not choose to give a railing word to the devil, who is so much inferior to him, and when there was so much reason and occasion for it, then how great is the insolence of those men, that speak evil of civil and ecclesiastical rulers without any just cause at all?"

SIMPLEX.

---

ART. IV.—*Letter from the Associate Synod of Original Seceders to the Associate Synod of North America.*

EDINBURGH, May 10, 1838.

*Reverend and Dear Brethren*—The union of Christians in the faith and profession of the Gospel, is of vast importance. No duty is more warmly inculcated in Scripture. It is there described as the badge of discipleship among the followers of the Redeemer, and as one of the most distinguished evidences that we are born of God, and know God. It constitutes, in no small degree, the internal strength of the Church, and contributes greatly to her energy and success in contending for the faith of the Gospel. It is glorifying to God who is love, and who is in Christ reconciling the world to himself, and mankind of every rank and of every country to one another. And it is honoring to the Redeemer who is "our peace," and who is praying in heaven that all whom the Father hath given him may be joined together in one holy brotherhood, as he and his Father are one. Nothing can warrant separation from any particular Church, but her departure from scriptural attainments, and even that only after every other means for reclaiming her have been tried without effect.

With these sentiments and feelings we assure our brethren that it was with the deepest grief that we found ourselves shut up to part with former brethren, and to form ourselves into a separate communion. We

took that step not from any personal pique, for the greater part of us had to part with brethren with whom we were connected not only by the bonds of ecclesiastical fellowship, but by the ties of private friendship, contracted in youth, and consolidated in advanced life. A sense of duty compelled us to take the step we did take, and from the progress these brethren have made in defection from the original principles of the Secession, we find no reason to regret what we have done.

It was when placed in this painful situation that our hopes were greatly revived as to the success of the cause for which we were contending, by the friendly correspondence with which your Reverend Synod was pleased to favor us. The expressions of feeling for us in the distressing circumstances in which we were placed, and the approbation you were pleased to give of our conduct in the appearance we had made in the defence of our principles, were to us "good news from a far country." Like Paul, on another occasion, we "thanked God and took courage." We were still more gratified when, after you had seen the new statement of our Testimony, you judicially declared that you were so far satisfied with it, as to continue the connexion which had by a former decision been so happily formed between the two Synods.

Our prospects, however, have been in a great measure overclouded by your late decision, in which you seem to disapprove of the doctrine of this Synod respecting the Magistrates power *circa sacra*, and National Covenanting,—two points of great importance in our distinguishing profession, being interwoven with the great cause of the Reformation, in defence of which we are associated as a distinct ecclesiastical body. We are not disposed to view that decision in the most obnoxious light, or as a sufficient ground all at once to break up our connexion with our brethren in America. When we consider the difficulties which a number of ourselves once felt with regard to these subjects, and the unreasonable prejudices which we had imbibed against certain brethren who had made a stand in their defence,—prejudices founded not on their real sentiments, but upon false aspersions vented and propagated to their prejudice; when we consider that similar reports have been industriously spread with regard to this Synod even in America; and that our brethren, owing to their distance, and other circumstances, have not the means of ascertaining from their own observation, the truth or falsehood of these reports; and when, in addition to this, we take into the account the small number of the copies of our Testimony which have reached America, which must have prevented many of our brethren from deliberately examining that document; we are not so much surprised as we would otherwise have been, that there should have been some difference of opinion in your Synod about our sentiments on these topics. These considerations also afford us some hope that your Synod, after more mature examination, will come to a decision more satisfactory and encouraging to us than that to which we have referred.

It would be improper at present to trespass on your time by entering at any length upon the agitated questions. It may, however, be necessary to state to you some reasons why they held such a prominent place in the new statement of our principles. Had we been placed in other circumstances when our late Testimony was drawn up, it is probable the question respecting the Magistrate's power would not have occupied more than a few sentences in that paper. It is likely that we would have satisfied ourselves with renewing our adherence to the Westminster Confession on that head, as approved and adopted by the General Assembly

of the Church of Scotland in 1647, with certain limitations respecting his power to call Synods. But when the union was proposed between the Constitutional Presbytery and the Associate Synod, it was supposed there might be a difference of sentiment about the Magistrate's power and National Covenanting in the two bodies, and it was proposed as a preliminary step to settle matters with regard to these two questions. You have the result of their deliberations in the Articles on which we suppose your objections are founded. When the Testimony was framed it was considered proper to insert these Articles in the historical part of the Testimony, to show how the two bodies came to be of one mind on these subjects, about which they were supposed to differ.

Another reason of their insertion was, the importance of the questions themselves, and to vindicate, so far as lay in our power, the Westminster Confession from the aspersions thrown out against it as favoring Erastian principles. With regard to the Confession itself, though we will not assert that a form of words equally scriptural might not be drawn up at present as a subordinate standard, yet we humbly conceive that no Confession of modern construction in the present state of the Church could have the same authority. It was compiled by a class of men that have seldom had their equals in any period of the Church for solid learning, fervent piety, and ardent zeal for the Redeemer's glory,—men who were collected from different departments of the Church, and whose joint labors received the sanction of all the constituted authorities in the country. It was approved, and is still highly venerated by the Reformed Churches on the Continent; and to this day it is still held in some form or other as a subordinate standard by all the Presbyterian Churches in Britain and Ireland, and so far as we know, by the greater part of them in America. Moreover, it is a standard of uniformity consolidated by solemn confederation and vows to God. When therefore, God gathers into one his scattered heritage, what public document is so likely to be adopted with success as a basis of union among the Reformed Churches as the Westminster Confession? This was the end proposed by its original compilers; and though it has hitherto only had partial success, may we not hope that their pious designs may yet be carried into full effect?

From these considerations, the Westminster Confession was recognised by our Fathers in the Secession as a part of the covenanted uniformity; it is still held as such by us, and we consider that any unnecessary objections started against the Confession, must tend greatly to weaken its authority, and to mar its usefulness. If found erroneous, it should certainly be abandoned; but if it can be shown that whatever constructions may be put upon certain phrases taken singly, yet, taken in connexion with other passages referring to the same subject, it contains nothing that can be construed as favoring Erastian principles, why condemn any part of it, and thus in the eye of the public throw suspicion upon the whole? The result of our deliberations accords with what we have now mentioned. We found that, taken as a whole, and explaining certain phrases by more plain and explicit assertions, it assigns to the Magistrate no power at all *in* the church; and no power *about* the Church which is not warranted by Scripture, and consistent with her free, spiritual, and independent nature.

But the question itself has assumed additional importance since these Articles were drawn up and obtained a place in our Testimony, from the great increase of the voluntary principles which would exclude religion

altogether from national managements. Though in the articles to which we have referred, we have said a great deal in explanation of what we consider the true meaning of the Westminster Confession; yet neither in these articles, nor in any part of the Testimony have we taken the high ground which some have done on the head of civil establishments of religion. Though our principles on this head may certainly be considered as inferring the duty of the State to afford to the Church national support when this is necessary, in order that every part of a nation may enjoy the privilege of religious instruction; yet we have no where given judgment with regard to the extent of that support, or brought it forward as essential to a civil establishment. All that we have pleaded for is, that nations and their rulers, when favored with supernatural revelation, should give their public countenance to the true religion; remove every thing out of their civil constitution inconsistent with it, or tending to retard its progress; frame all their laws, and regulate the whole of their administration, in all moral respects, according to its tenor; take care that no encroachment be made upon the other liberties of the Church, or the free and spiritual kingdom of Christ, that her ministers be protected in the administration of her ordinances, and her members in the maintainance of their Christian profession; and, in fine, that those in public authority should employ the influence of their station in every way competent to them, and consistent with the free and independent nature of the Church, that every part of their dominions shall enjoy a scriptural dispensation of religious ordinances.

We are far from pleading, as some have done, that magistracy is founded in grace; on the contrary, we maintain, that it has its foundation in natural principles. But though Christianity confers upon magistrates no new power, yet it greatly enlarges the sphere of the operation of that power which they possess as civil rulers from the law of nature. This law binds the subjects of God's moral government, jointly and severally, to embrace and reduce to practice whatever God is pleased to reveal as the rule of their faith and duty. Christianity was evidently intended to operate as a remedial system upon society, civil as well as ecclesiastical—to make better husbands and better wives,—better parents and better children,—better masters and better servants,—better citizens as well as good church members,—better subjects and better rulers. Accordingly, it prescribes the duties men owe to one another in civil life, as well as those duties they owe more immediately to God, and enforces the practice of these duties upon Christian principles. That Christianity has produced these salutary effects wherever it has been generally embraced is evident. It has contributed more by its direct and indirect influence to the civilization of barbarous nations,—to the improvement of their government, laws, and institutions,—to the general amelioration of the state of society,—and above all, to the improvement of public morals, or that "righteousness which exalteth a nation," than all the discoveries of human science, and the power of the civil arm combined, either in ancient or modern times. It was from a conviction of the truth of these statements that our reforming ancestors combined a civil with a religious reformation, by making provision that their civil code and the whole of their civil administration should, in all moral respects, be consistent with the laws of God laid down in his word; and that those vested with civil authority over them should be friendly to the religious reformation that had been attained to and settled among them. But according to the modern principles, a stop must be put to the salutary influence of Chris-

tianity on civil society, by excluding it from having any connection with civil life in the concerns of nations and their governments. The magistrate is "the minister of God for good," and though the more immediate end of his office is the order and peace of civil society, this end cannot be gained without public morals, and the morals of a country cannot be secured without religious principle; but according to these principles, the magistrate must be prohibited from employing his influence as a magistrate for promoting the religion, and the only religion which effectually "teaches men to live soberly and righteously," as well as godly, in this present world, though this may be done in ways almost innumerable, without encroaching upon the due liberties of conscience, or the offices and spiritual independence of the kingdom of Christ. As the minister of God for good, the magistrate is to study the safety of the nation over which he presides, and employ every moral means for that purpose; but according to these principles, he must not use his influence as a magistrate to suppress idolatry, infidelity, blasphemy, or Sabbath-breaking,—national crimes which, in every age, have been the forerunners of national destruction. God "hath put all things under the feet of his Son, and given him to be head over all things to the church;" and he has enjoined the kings and judges of the earth to acknowledge his supremacy, to "kiss the Son lest he be angry;" but according to these principles they must not do this lest they confound religion with politics. "They who rule among men must be just, ruling in the fear of God," which certainly implies, that even in framing their civil code, and in the whole of their administration, they must have a supreme regard to God's authority in his word; but according to these principles, the magistrate, as a magistrate, must give no preference to the Bible, but put it on a level with the Alcoran.

These, we apprehend, are a few, and only a few, of the demoralizing consequences of the principles now mentioned. We are far from thinking that many excellent men who have adopted them see their consequences, else they would be the first to abandon them. But convinced as we are of their tendency to promote the cause of immorality, infidelity, and profaneness, in a country, we find ourselves constrained to lift up and to maintain our humble testimony against them.

In this country, recent events have, by the avowal of all parties, practically decided the point, that to adopt the principles of Voluntaryism, as it is called, is, not to abandon merely, but completely to reverse, the original grounds of the Secession. And, if it should not be deemed presuming in us, we might add that, even in America, the practice of nationally and legally excluding the true religion from public and civil management, appears to us to have produced effects deeply injurious to the honor and happiness of society at large.

Our brethren, we hope, will not mistake us. We are far from maintaining that a civil establishment is indispensable to the spiritual prosperity of a church, or even approving of any civil establishment existing at present. Nor are we insensible to the perversion of the principle, by applying it to the purpose of supporting a false religion, or a corrupt profession of the true; but the arguments brought forward against it on these grounds apply, we conceive, equally to Christianity itself, which has often been perverted by men of corrupt minds into an engine for promoting their ambition and schemes of worldly policy. We are also aware of the difficulties which would lie in the way of re-erecting a national establishment of religion in the present divided state of the church.

These are, however, difficulties arising from the present corrupt state of society, and the limited influence of the gospel itself upon the minds of men, and cannot affect the validity of this or any principle founded on the Divine law, natural or revealed. And when "the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the seas," and when "the watchmen on Zion's walls shall see eye to eye," all these difficulties will vanish.

In regard to our Brethren's difficulties with respect to our principles on the head of National Covenanting, we are not prepared to say almost any thing, as we are not informed of the exact grounds on which they rest. If they proceed upon the ground of our pleading for the lawfulness of national covenanting, which we scarcely think they can, as we always supposed that your Synod approved of our national covenants, and acknowledged their perpetual obligation; then the same arguments must be brought in its support that have been adduced in support of a national profession of Christianity. If the one is unwarrantable, the other must also be unwarrantable. But if it is admitted that nations and their rulers are subjects of God's moral government, and as such bound to recognise and embrace whatever God shall reveal as a rule of faith and manners, and conform to its dictates, in all moral respects, in their national managements, then we would suppose that it must be warrantable in nations to confederate and enter into solemn vows to maintain and promote in every way competent to them the cause of revealed religion and liberty among them, the functionaries of the church always taking the lead in framing the engagement, and administering the oath or vow by which it is consolidated. We are aware that the public were greatly misled—we do not say intentionally—by a publication about thirty years ago, which obtained an extensive circulation, not only in this country, but also in America, with regard to the views of the members of the Constitutional Presbytery on the head of covenanting. They maintained, and this Synod continue to maintain, that confederation and vowing to God is a moral-natural duty, like prayer and praise, and that though it cannot be performed acceptably but in the exercise of faith in Christ, more than any other duty, yet it is not like Baptism and the Lord's Supper, exclusively an ecclesiastical service. It was never meant to deny the warrantableness of that covenanting which is purely ecclesiastical, or that churches may covenant in support of their religious profession, as the Secession Church has done; but what is insisted for is, that Christians may confederate in support of their religious privileges and civil liberties, and solemnise their engagements with a vow to God in the faith of acceptance through Christ, though they be not united in the bonds of ecclesiastical fellowship. Of this nature was the solemn League. It was not only a confederation between nations and churches, and had for its object the formation of a bond of union among these churches in all the intimacies of ecclesiastical fellowship; but at the time it was entered into, the parties belonged to different ecclesiastical communions; yet our fathers in the Secession found no fault with it on this ground, but maintained that it was for its object laudable,—for its matter warrantable,—and for the time seasonable; and our Brethren know as well as we do, that till the late union, every office-bearer in our branch of the Secession Church, on entering upon office, was required to declare his approbation not only of the National Covenant, but also of the Solemn League, and his belief that these national vows were of continued obligation upon all ranks in these lands to the latest posterity. If the difficulty arises from

the mixed nature of the Solemn League, were we called to vindicate it on this head, we could not bring forward a better defence than that produced by one who is well known to have been no friend to secularized churches. After he had observed that the cavils against the Solemn League on account of its mixed nature might have been prevented had our ancestors framed two bonds, the one in defence of their civil, and the other in defence of their religious liberties, he adds, "After all, the situation of these worthy persons made it scarcely possible for them to have done otherwise than they did. Aspiring princes aimed at their religious rights, in order to deprive them of their civil property, while ambitious dignitaries in the church conspired with the princes to rob them of their natural rights, in order to seize on their spiritual liberties. Attempts being thus made, and from different quarters, upon both their civil and religious rights, they were violently forced upon a necessity of blending them in the defence of them. What were united in the mode of opposition, it was natural and almost necessary to unite in the mode of defence. It was from this source alone, and not from an attachment to Erastianism, that they made the teaching and swearing of these a condition or qualification for civil or military trusts."

We are sorry to have taken up your attention so long, but we considered it necessary fully to explain to you our views and feelings on the subjects to which your late decision referred. We consider that a testimony must be adapted in some measure to circumstances. Were we disposed to find fault, we might fix upon parts of your Testimony that do not come up to our views on certain subjects; and perhaps upon other parts where you carry certain matters of testimony farther than we would be inclined to do. But we consider it, on the whole, to be a faithful testimony for the truths of Christ, adapted to your circumstances, and we are not disposed to object against those who may come to you from us giving their assent to it, at licence or ordination. At the same time, to require this assent from any preachers and ministers attested by us, before admission to communion, or being allowed to officiate, appears to us so far to nullify the external badge of union hitherto subsisting between us, that, on the supposition that your Reverend Synod still intend to maintain that union, it appears to us to require some further explanation; inasmuch as it seems to place us on the same footing in relation to your Reverend Synod with any other body of professing Christians.—Had you found yourselves at liberty to express your views of our Testimony in a way similar to that in which we have now spoken of yours, or adhered to the mode of expression employed in your first decision respecting it, though of a general nature, we would have found no fault with it; but we cannot conceal the difficulties into which we are thrown by your late decision, which, whether intended or not, seems to carry in it a condemnation of two points which we consider of vital importance to be held fast by us, as witnesses, not only for the reformation cause in this country, but in defence of the grand truth that the kingdom of Christ, though not of the world, is set up in the world to diffuse its salutary influence among all members of society, by rectifying every thing wrong in its civil constitutions, purifying its laws, raising the tone of public morals, and bringing about the period foretold in ancient prophecy, when, even "upon the bells of the horses, shall be inscribed HOLINESS UNTO THE LORD, and the pots in the Lord's house shall be like the bowls before the altar," and when, not by constraint, but by voluntary consent, "the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ."

However much we feel on account of your late decision, we wish to do nothing rashly. By future explanations we hope our difficulties may be removed. We are willing to consider that our connexion with you still exists as formerly, till we hear from you again. And it is, dear brethren, our earnest prayer, that the great Head of the Church may be present with you and with us in all our deliberations, leading us to such measures as shall be for his glory, the advancement of the cause of truth and righteousness in the world, and the peace and prosperity of our Zion.

Signed, in name and by appointment of the Synod,

JAMES MEEK, *Moderator.*

ROBERT SHAW, *Syn. Clerk.*

**ART. V. *Proceedings of the Associate Reformed Synod of New York.***

From the published minutes of the late meeting of this Judicatory, we make the extracts given below. We are not aware that our readers will be at all surprised at this Synod's decision on the subject of Psalmody.-- At their meeting in 1837 certain Resolutions were offered, directing the ministers of said Synod either to use the Scripture Psalms or to omit singing in public worship, when they officiated in the churches of other denominations. These Resolutions were referred to a committee of which Dr. M'Carroll, their professor of Theology, was chairman. The Dr's Report on the subject involved in those Resolutions was adopted by the Synod in preference to the more scriptural Report of Mr. Blakie of the minority of said committee. The Synod, by the adoption of Dr. M'Carroll's Report, have confirmed the views which our church have always entertained on that part of the constitution of the Associate Reformed Church which treats of the subject of Psalmody.— We have always contended that that Constitution allowed the Associate Reformed people to sing what Psalms or Hymns they pleased in their families and while worshipping in other denominations, provided they used the Scripture Psalms in the Associate Reformed CHURCHES. But these views have been characterized as *strained* if not *calumnious*. The Associate Reformed Synod of New York, however, have now judicially confirmed their correctness. Our readers will at once perceive that there is no truth in the reference of Dr. M'Carroll to the "Testimony of the Associate Church." Our Testimony *does not* contain the sentiment imputed to it. We cannot understand what the Dr. means, unless it be to practice a deception on his brethren and the christian public. From some of the doctrinal positions taken by the Dr. in his Report, we entirely dissent; but we have not time to particularize. The sum total, therefore, of the Synod's decision is, that their ministers and people may

sing what Psalms they please, if they only adhere to the Scripture Psalms in their CHURCHES; that is to say, that the inspired Psalms may or may not be used in the worship of God throughout the churches of Christ, according as circumstances dictate.

*Decision on the subject of Psalmody.*

The subject of Psalmody was called up. A paper was received from Dr. M'Carroll, the chairman of the committee, on the subject, which was read as follows:

The committee to whom was referred the preamble and resolution, respecting the Psalmody to be used by our ministers when officiating in the churches of other denominations, respectfully report:

That after an attentive consideration of the subject committed to them, they are of opinion that it would be unnecessary and improper to pass the resolution proposed, for the following considerations: In the existing state of our ecclesiastical laws and regulations, we have for several years been enjoying a very large share of prosperity, and evident tokens of the blessing of the King of Zion. No new regulations seem to be called for, to improve a condition for which we have been, annually, and for many years, giving public thanks to God. While other denominations, on the right hand and on the left, have been "biting and devouring one another," we have been placed by a kind Providence in a happy mean between the extremes of latitudinarianism on the one hand, and excessive strictness on the other. We tried one of these extremes, and, after much loss, barely escaped with our lives. We have tried the middle way, and thus far found it safe and prosperous. Having escaped Scylla, let us not rush into Charybdis.

The passing of this resolution, would endanger the harmony and even the entireness of this Synod. Those who could not in conscience obey it, must either remove from our communion, or, by resisting authority, expose themselves to the hardship of expulsion. Small and weak as our denomination is, it would be injudicious to peril our very existence on an untried experiment.

The resolution in question is, in the form of it, an addition to the obligations which our ministers have voluntarily assumed at their ordination. It cannot, therefore, be imposed on them without their consent, nor become a part of the standing law of the church, without passing through the process required for altering the constitution. It is expressly provided that "no regulations intended to be universal and permanent shall be established, without previously transmitting them to the several Presbyteries, that they may have time to consider and report their judgment thereon." It would be unconstitutional for this Synod to assume the power of legislating for the ministers and church, and therefore not only uncalled for, but wrong.

Nor would it be proper to move the church, for the purpose of adding this resolution in a regular manner to our constitution. Our Confession is already sufficiently large. To its principles our ministers are all cordially attached, as they freely professed. It is intended to be the municipal law of our own denomination, and is derived from the Holy Scriptures. But it does not enter particularly into the subject of our foreign relations or inter-ecclesiastical law. This delicate and difficult subject it has wisely left to the consciences of the one family of God, enlightened by his own word, only directing that the "communion of saints, as God

offereth opportunity, is to be extended to all those who, in every place, call upon the name of the Lord Jesus." If, then, there be any thing wrong on this subject, (Ch. 26, Sec. 2,) it had better be corrected by an enlightened public sentiment and personal intercourse, in kind and christian fellowship, than by the authority of this Synod, or even of all the coordinate legislative powers of the church.

Our Lord recognized a distinction between the moral and municipal law, when in relation to divorces, he says, "For the hardness of your hearts he wrote you this precept, but from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female." Mark x. 4. Laws administered by men must of necessity be less extensive than the whole of human duty; so that something beyond all law, civil and ecclesiastical, must be left to conscience and to God, for the obvious reason, that to enforce the whole moral law is impossible, and the attempt would do more harm than good. The case before us is one which may safely be left where it has hitherto been by the best and wisest men, out of the code ecclesiastical.

There is nothing to hinder any, who may be so disposed, from following the course proposed in this resolution, so that no injury will be done to any member if the Synod should refuse to pass it into a law, unless it be considered that it is already the law of the church, in which case the passing of it again were superfluous.

This subject affords a proper occasion for the exercise of the Christian grace of forbearance. And happily, it is almost the only one which calls for the exercise of that grace. Having so many reasons for thankfulness, in the present uniformity of sentiment on the whole system of revealed truth, both as relates to doctrine and to practice, it would argue a great deficiency of gracious attainment, in the members of this Synod, if they cannot allow to each other a liberty of conscience on a subject that has so little to do with either ministerial usefulness and comfort, or the general prosperity of religion. The scheme of absolute uniformity is impracticable, even in the smallest societies, and whenever enforced, necessarily issues in division after division; and, in the ruin of practical godliness, the abandonment of all the great objects to which the united strength of the whole church is devoted by her Divine Master, and the indulgence of every hateful passion, illustrates the philosophical paradox of divisibility, ad infinitum. The Holy Scriptures are full of warnings on this subject. "The beginning of strife is like the letting out of water. Therefore let contention alone before it be meddled with." "For if ye bite and devour one another, take heed lest ye also be consumed one of another."

Here, the committee are of opinion, this subject might rest, regarding the resolution before them as an addition to existing laws: but as it may possibly be regarded by some as a mere explanation of the constitution as it already exists, it will be considered in that view. Even on the supposition that the resolution was meant to be, what does not appear, an explanation and enforcement of the existing law of the church, it ought not to be passed, inasmuch as the constitution cannot be explained on subjects of which it does not treat. The rule on Psalms is expressly confined to Associate Reformed churches. "Nor shall any compositions merely human be sung in any of the Associate Reformed churches."—(Const. B. 3, C. 3. Sec. 3.) That limitation means something; and it does not appear what it can be, unless that the rule laid down is binding only in Associate Reformed churches, or that, in relation to all other churches, the constitution says nothing. This view is confirmed by the overture prepared by Dr. Mason, the father of the late Professor, Robert

Annan and John Smith, the fathers of our church, and which was published and distributed among the churches by order of Synod, in 1787, and in which there is an express disclaimer of the condemnation in all cases of any thing but our own practice: "We could wish for a more finished poetical version of these (the Psalms of David, and other songs of Scripture) than any yet given to the churches. And we do not say that hymns of human composition may not be lawfully used in any case whatsoever. But we think it safest generally to adhere to the scriptural Psalmody." (Ch. 21, p. 98.)

The testimony of the Associate church allows of other inspired songs taken both from the Old Testament and the New, neither of which would accord with the resolution in question. (Test. p. 170.) Another overture published by our Synod in 1796, takes the same grounds. Neither the language of the constitution, nor collateral testimonies, nor the practice of the church would authorise this first attempt to establish a rule to operate out of our own church, and impose stricter terms than are imposed at home. It is said that the doctrine of the Confession, respecting the Psalms to be used in the worship of God, if true in Associate Reformed, is true in all churches, and vice versa. This is admitted: and what then? The Confession says nothing about the particular version: It lays down the principle which is to be carried out, in the best manner that circumstances will allow at home and abroad. And the most strenuous advocates of the resolution will not assert that there are no Psalms in the books used by other churches which could be used in accordance with that part of our Confession, or that our Confession pronounces it absolutely sinful to use any part of any version but our own. Upon the whole subject, the committee recommend for the adoption of Synod the following resolutions: 1st. That every member of this Synod be enjoined to study the things that make for peace, and the things whereby one may edify another, and be much in prayer for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit of wisdom and love upon themselves and the churches. 2d. That the principles adopted by this church be adhered to, and be carried out when ministering in other churches, in a manner as nearly resembling our own as the circumstances will allow.

JOSEPH M'CARROLL, Chairman.

Also a paper, on the same subject by the Rev. Mr. Blakie, a member of the committee, was read as follows:

The minority of the committee to whom was referred the preamble and resolutions, directing our ministers either to use our own Psalms or omit singing in public worship, when they officiate in the churches of other denominations, is constrained to differ from the other member of your committee on the subject, and conscientiously believes it to be his duty to present a few reasons why this resolution, or one of similar import, should be sustained.

I do not consider it at all necessary to propose this as an amendment to our constitution, nor particularly to view it in this light; but as it is opposed also, "*as an explanation and enforcement of the existing law.*" I now proceed to offer a few considerations why, in this light, this, or a resolution of a similar nature, should be passed.

Here it is objected that the existing law does not treat on this subject at all. To this I answer, that both in the Confession of Faith, (Chap. 21, sec. 1 and 5,) on the article of religious worship, set forth that "the acceptable way of worshipping the true God is instituted by himself, and so limited by his revealed will that he may not be worshipped according

to the imaginations and devices of men," and then they say, that a part of this religious worship, thus prescribed and appointed, is the worshipping of God, by "singing of psalms with grace in the heart." When this chapter of the Westminster Confession of Faith was written, the modern hymns and spiritual songs of the 18th and 19th centuries were unknown, while with the Psalms given by inspiration of God, the church was familiar, and to them only the allusion is here made in our standards.

Those also who arranged our "directory for public worship," have entertained the same views on this subject. In the most unequivocal manner they declare, that "it is the will of God, that the sacred songs contained in the Book of Psalms be sung in his worship, both public and private, to the end of the world."

Plain and conclusive as this part of our directory may appear, yet it is supposed to be at least limited, if not counteracted and destroyed, by a subsequent declaration that "nothing merely human shall be sung in any of the Associate Reformed churches." This is considered as only binding on Associate Reformed churches, and that, in relation to all other churches, the constitution says nothing. I admit, for the sake of argument, that it is only binding by our authority on Associate Reformed churches, yet if it be the will of God that the sacred songs contained in the Book of Psalms be sung in his worship, both public and private to the end of the world, where, I would ask, can our ministers go, and into what church can they enter, where it is the will of God that the sacred songs contained in the Book of Psalms *should not* be the matter of his praise? Go into whatever church they please, and lift any human substitute, still it will be found that according to our directory for worship, they are not worshipping God at all. If there be truth in this part of our directory for worship, "It is the will, &c." it is a moral precept that in worshipping God, either in our own churches or others, we must use only the sacred songs contained in the Book of Psalms; and so far from viewing it as a tacit permission to sing what we please elsewhere, when composes merely human are forbidden in our own church, there is only a doubling of diligence in pointing out the path of duty to the sentinels upon our walls and the sentry at our gates. If these sacred songs must be sung in the worship of God, both public and private, or in other words, at all times and in all places, where is the opportunity, without violating this part of our directory, to sing any thing else?

And to this, as well as the other parts of our directory for worship, in their vows at ordination, the ministers of the Associate Reformed church, ex animo, give their solemn approval, and resolve to maintain and observe it accordingly. That they should therefore be constrained to use only our own Psalmody, or omit singing altogether in other churches, cannot (in my humble opinion) appear unreasonable.

A great objection is also taken as to what version we should employ. Consistency replies, use that and that only, which conveys the idea of the Divine original most faithfully, the version authorised for use in our own church, until a more faithful one can be obtained. As I believe it cannot be shown that any other songs of praise but the sacred songs contained in the book of Psalms have been sung with acceptance before God on earth, from the period that our Saviour entered on his ministry, till the canon of Divine revelation was closed, or in other words, by the Saviour and his inspired Apostles, and, as in connexion with this, the only legacy, as matter of praise, left to the church by her living head, are the Psalms, which (not less than either Mo-

ses or the Prophets,) testify of him, and "as the rich variety and perfect purity of their matter, the blessing of God upon them in every age, and the edification of the church thence arising, set the propriety of singing them in a convincing light," so it is (in my humble opinion) the duty of our ministers to praise God, not indeed "in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth."

To some, however, it may appear to be a great invasion of present custom, either to ask to sing our own Psalms, or to omit singing where they cannot be used: and just in proportion to this alienation of regard for the *only spiritual songs*, is the necessity of passing this resolution.

Not a few would imagine that this was equivalent to saying that such churches were not christian; but this is a mere fallacy. What minister in our connexion when officiating in an Episcopal church, would read their Liturgy and their prayers; and which of us would pretend to say, that because we do not worship with their selections, we deny that they are christians? There is probably much more scriptural truth in their Litany, Liturgy and prayers, than in the average of all, or even the best human hymns at the present hour; and they have at least as much claim to a place in the worship of God, as human selections and composures have to supplant the "songs of Zion." If it be sinful to "teach for doctrines the commandments of men," let us take care lest we "go and do likewise," by encouraging the offering of "vain oblation upon his altar," instead of that sacred offering of eternal truth, which God, the spirit, hath sealed. In order that we may sing, in the song of degrees of David, "Behold how good, and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity," let us invariably make the sacred songs contained in the Book of Psalms the matter of our praise, and then we can rest assured that by so doing, while others may possibly be right, in employing imitations of the Divine Psalms, selections of other scriptures, or the rhapsodies of their own minds, that singing them with the spirit and understanding, we can never, never, never be wrong.

Omitting to mention other considerations, as "an explanation and enforcement of the existing law," in my humble opinion, it is both necessary and proper that this, or a similar resolution do pass.

All which is respectfully submitted by the minority of your committee.

ALEX. BLAIKIE.

After which, it was moved and seconded, that the subject be continued in the hands of the same committee until next meeting of Synod.

\* \* \* \* \*

Resumed the unfinished subject of Psalmody, and after considerable discussion, "Resolved, that the vote be now taken as follows: The roll be called, and the members be called to say which report and resolution be adopted, Dr. M'Carroll's or Mr. Blaikie's; upon counting, it was found that the vote stood as follows:

*For Dr. M'Carroll's.*—Dr. McJimsey, Wallace, J. Forsyth, Jr., M'Laury, D. L. Proudfit, Dr. A. Proudfit, Taylor, Forrest, Dr. R. Proudfit, Johnston, Howden, W. A. McKinney, J. Forsyth, Sen., Genung, Bull, John Beveridge, Niven, Amerman, Barber, Stevenson, Qua, Scott, and Low, 24.

*For Mr. Blaikie's.*—Connelly, D. C. McLaren, Blaikie, J. F. McLaren, Warden, P. McLaren, McKercher, Oakly, and McDougall, 9.

And M. N. McLaren, W. McLaren, G. Mairs, jr. Gordon, Caw, Currie, James Beveridge, A. McKinney, Robinson, and Telford declined voting.

*Decision on the subject of Communion.*

The subject of communion was called up and the reports of the committee and of the minority of the committee were read, and it was moved and seconded that the preamble and resolutions on the minutes of last year be adopted, as follows :

Whereas, it is the custom of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, to unite in dispensing and partaking of the Lord's Supper at their Stated annual meetings; and whereas, some of the members of that board are unsound in the faith, and their right, as a board, to dispense the Lord's Supper not well established in our own view, therefore

Resolved, that our ministers be, and they hereby are instructed in no case to join with them in that holy ordinance.

The ayes and noes being called for, the vote stood as follows :

*Aye.*—M. N. McLaren, Connelly, McLaury, W. McLaren, Wynkoop, Middlemas, Caw, Johnston, D. C. McLaren, Currie, J. F. McLaren, Howden, Blaikie, W. A. McKinney, A. McKinney, J. Forsyth, sen., Amerman, P. McLaren, Low, McKercher, Telford, Oakley, McDougall—23.

*No.*—Dr. McJimsey, Wallace, Dr. A. Proudfit, Gordon, Halley, Dr. R. Proudfit, Bull, John Beveridge, Niven, Scott—10

And J. Forsyth, Jr., Taylor, Forrest, James Beveridge, Robinson, Stevenson and Qua declined voting.

The following resolutions were proposed and seconded, viz.

Resolved, 1st, that this Synod disapprove of the principle and practice of open communion, or that scheme of communion which would obligate or allow the ministers or members of the Associate Reformed church to unite in sacramental communion with other churches, and the ministers and members of other churches to unite in communion with ours, on the ground merely of a general or partial agreement of opinion respecting the doctrines set forth in our Confession of Faith; and the Synod hereby enjoin all the ministers to conform to the constitutional doctrine of the Associate Reformed church.

Resolved, 2d, that occasional communion may be granted to members of other churches, only in extraordinary cases, on application made to the respective sessions where such cases may occur, and on the same terms on which applicants are received into stated communion.

A division of the question being called for, the vote was taken on the resolutions separately, and they were both carried.

---

ART. VI. *Precious Remedies against Satan's Devices.*

(Continued from page 232.)

CHAPTER VI. *The sixth device that Satan hath to keep souls from religious services, is, By presenting before them the examples of the greatest part of the world who walk in the ways of their own hearts, and who make light of, and slight the ways of the Lord. Saith Satan, Don't you see that the great and the rich, the noble and the honorable, the learned and the wise, even the greatest number of men, never trouble themselves about religious ways,\* and why then should you be singular ?*

---

\* John vii. 48, 49. 1 Cor. i. 26—28. Mic. vii. 2, 3, 4.

You had much better do as the generality of men do, &c.—Now the remedies against this device are these:

*Remedy 1.* Against this device of Satan, think upon those scriptures which make directly against following the sinful examples of men; as that in Exodus, 'Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil, neither shalt thou speak in a cause to decline after many to wrest judgment.' The multitude generally are ignorant, and know not the way of the Lord, therefore they speak evil of that they know not; they are envious, and maliciously bent against the service and ways of God; and therefore they cannot speak well of them. 'This way is every where spoken against,' say they.\* So in Num. xvi. 'Separate from them, and come out from among them.' So the apostle, 'Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness.' So Solomon, 'Enter not into the way of the wicked, forsake the foolish and live.' They who walk with the multitude shall perish with the multitude. They who live and act, as the greater part of men live and act, suffer and lie down in hell with them at last.† It is but a little flock, comparatively, to whom the kingdom of heaven is given. 'And I heard a voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues' Come out in affection, in action, and in habitation; for else the infection of sin will bring upon you the infliction of punishment. So saith the wise man, 'He that walketh with wise men shall be wise, but a companion of fools shall be destroyed,' or as the Hebrew hath it, 'Shall be broken in pieces.' Multitudes may help these into sin; yea, one may draw thee into it, but multitudes cannot help thee to escape punishments; as you may see in Moses and Aaron, who were provoked to sin by the multitude; but were shut out of the pleasant land, and fell by a hand of justice as well as others.

*Rem. 2.* Solemnly consider the worth and excellency of thy soul. Thy soul is a jewel worth more than heaven and earth. The loss of thy soul is incomparable, irreparable, and irrecoverable; if that be lost, all is lost, and thou art undone forever. Is it madness and folly in a man to kill himself for company? And is it not greater madness or folly to destroy thy soul, and damn it for company? Suspect that way wherein thou seest multitudes to walk, the multitude being a stream that thou must row hard against, or thou wilt be carried into the gulph, out of which angels cannot deliver thee. Is it not better to walk‡ in the straight way alone, than to wander into crooked ways with company? Sure it is better to go to heaven alone, than to hell with a multitude.

I might add other things, but these may suffice for the present, and I am afraid, if these arguments do not stir you, others will have but little effect on you.

**CHAPTER VII.** *The seventh device that Satan hath to keep souls from holy exercises and religious services, is, By casting in a multitude of vain thoughts, whilst the soul is seeking God, or waiting upon him; and by this device he hath cooled some men's spirits in heavenly services,*

\* The way to hell is broad, and well beaten; the way to be undone forever, is to do as the most do; "The multitude is the weakest and worst argument," saith Seneca, Prov. iv. 14, ix. 6.

† Sin and punishment are linked together with chains of adamant.

‡ What wise man would fetch gold out of a fiery crucible, or hazard his immortal soul, to gain the world, by following a multitude in those steps that lead to the chambers of death and darkness.

and taken off, at least for a time, many precious souls from religious performances. I have, say some, no heart to hear or pray, nor any delight in reading, nor in the society of the saints, &c. Satan doth so follow me, and is casting in such a multitude of vain thoughts concerning God, the world, my own soul, &c. that I even tremble to think of waiting upon God in any religious service. Oh! the vain thoughts that Satan cast in, do so grieve, vex, perplex, and distract my soul, that they even make me weary of holy duties, yea, of my very life: Oh! I cannot be so raised and ravished, so heated and melted, so quickened and enlarged, so comforted and refreshed, as I should be, as I might be, and as I would be in religious services, because of the multitude of vain thoughts, that Satan is injecting into my soul, &c.—Now the remedies against this device of Satan are these:

*Remedy 1.* Against this device of Satan, pray that your hearts may be strongly affected with the greatness, holiness, majesty, and glory, of that God before whom you stand \* and with whom your souls converse in religious services. A man would be afraid of playing with a feather, when he is speaking with a king: ah! when men have poor, low thoughts of God, in drawing near to him, they tempt the devil to bestir himself, and to cast in a multitude of vain thoughts to disturb and distract them in waiting upon God. There is nothing will contribute so much to keep out such thoughts, as to look upon God as an omniscient, an omnipresent, an omnipotent God, a God full of all glorious perfections, a God whose majesty, purity, and glory, will not suffer him to behold the least iniquity. The reasons why the blessed saints and glorious angels in heaven have not so much as one vain thought, is, because they are greatly affected with the greatness, holiness, majesty, and glory of God.

*Rem. 2.* Be peremptory in religious services, notwithstanding all those wandering thoughts your soul may be troubled with. This will be a sweet help to the soul in waiting upon God, whether it is troubled with vain thoughts or not.† So say, 'Well, I will pray, and hear, and meditate; and keep fellowship with the saints still; many precious souls can say from experience, that when their souls have been peremptory in waiting upon God, Satan hath left them.‡ and hath not been so busy in vexing their souls: when Satan perceives that all those trifling thoughts that he casts into the soul, do but make it more diligent, careful, and watchful, in holy and heavenly services, and that the soul loses nothing of its zeal, piety, and devotion, but doubles its care, diligence, and earnestness, he often ceases to interpose with his trifles: as he ceased to tempt Christ, when Christ was resolute in resisting his temptations.

*Rem. 3.* Consider, that those vain and trifling thoughts that are cast into our souls, when we are waiting upon God in any religious service, if they are not cherished and indulged, but abhorred, resisted, and disclaimed, they are not sins upon our souls: though they may be troubles to our minds, they shall not be charged upon our consciences, nor keep mercies and blessings from our enjoyment.§ When a soul in upright-

\* When Pompey could not keep his soldiers in the camp by persuasion, he cast himself all along in the narrow passage that led out of it, and then said, "Go if you will, but you must first trample upon your general;" and the thoughts of this overcame them. You are wise, and know how to apply it to the point in hand.

† It is a rule in civil law, "Nothing seems to be done, if there remains ought to be done."

‡ "If once thou sayest it is enough, thou art undone," saith Augustine.

§ It is not Satan's casting in vain thoughts that can keep mercy from the soul, or undo the soul, but the lodging and cherishing of vain thoughts; "O Jerusalem, how long shall vain thoughts lodge within thee?" Jer. iv. 14. Heb. "in the midst of thee." They pass through the best hearts, they are lodged and cherished only in the worst.

ness can look God in the face, and say, 'Lord, when I approach near unto thee, there is a world of vain thoughts crowd in upon me, which disturb my soul, and weaken my faith, lessen my comfort and spiritual strength; Oh! these are my clog, my burden, my torment, my trouble; Oh! do justice upon these, free me from them, that I may serve thee with more freedom, spirituality and sweetness of spirit.' These thoughts may vex that soul, but they shall not hurt it, nor keep a blessing from it. If vain thoughts resisted and lamented, could stop the current of mercy, and render a soul unhappy, there are none on earth who could ever taste of mercy, nor be everlastingly happy.

*Rem. 4.* Solemnly consider, that watching against, and resisting sinful thoughts, lamenting and weeping over them, carries with it the sweetest and strongest evidence of the truth and power of grace,\* and of the sincerity of your hearts, and is the readiest and surest way to be rid of them. Many low and carnal considerations may induce men to watch their words, their lives, their actions; as hope of gain, to please friends, or to get a name in the world, and many other such like considerations. Oh! but to watch our thoughts, to weep and lament over them, &c. This must needs be from some noble, spiritual, and internal principle; as love to God, holy fear, holy care and delight to please the Lord, &c. The schools do well observe, that outward sins are of *greater infamy*; but inward, heart sins are of *greater guilt*; as we see in the devils. There is nothing that so defines a man to be truly wrought upon, as his having his thoughts brought into obedience, as the apostle speaks, 2 Cor. x. 4, 5. When sinful thoughts arise, then think thus, the Lord takes notice of them, 'He knows them afar off,' as the Psalmist speaks. He knew Herod's bloody thoughts, and Judas's betraying thoughts, and the Pharisees' cruel and blasphemous thoughts, afar off.† Oh! think thus, all these sinful thoughts, they defile and pollute the soul, they deface and spoil much of the inward beauty and glory of it; if I commit this or that sin, to which my thoughts incline me, then either I must repent, or not repent; if I repent, it will cost me more grief, sorrow, shame, heart-breaking, and soul-bleeding,‡ before my conscience will be quieted, my comfort and joy restored, my evidences cleared, and my pardon in the court of conscience sealed, than the imagined profit, or seeming sensual pleasure, can be worth: 'What fruit had ye in those things whereof ye are now ashamed?'

If I never repent, Oh! then my sinful thoughts will be scorpions that will eternally sting me, rods that will eternally lash me, thorns that will everlastingly prick me, daggers that will be eternally stabbing me, the worm that will be for ever gnawing me:§ Oh! therefore, watch against them, be constant in resisting, lamenting, and praying over them, and then they shall not hurt thee, though they may for a time trouble thee; and remember, he that doth this, doth more than the most glittering and noisy hypocrite in the world.

*Rem. 5.* Labor more and more to be filled with 'the fulness of God,'|| and

\* Ps. cxxxix. 23. "Thoughts are the first-born, the blossoms of the soul, the beginning of our strength, whether for good or evil, and they are the greatest evidence for or against a man, that can be."

† Zeno, a wise heathen, affirmed, that God even beheld the thoughts.

‡ Tears instead of gems were the ornaments of David's bed, when he had sinned, and so they must be thine, or else thou must lie down in the bed of sorrow for ever.

§ Inward bleeding kills many a man; so will sinful thoughts, if not repented of.

|| Eph. iii. 10. The words are an Hebraism. The Hebrews, when they would set out many excellent things, they add the name of God to it; city of God, cedars of God, wrestlings with God; so here, "That ye may be filled with the fulness of God."

be enriched with all spiritual and heavenly things. What is the reason that the angels in heaven have not so much as an idle thought? It is because they are filled with the fullness of God. Take it for an experimental truth, the more the soul is filled with the fulness of God, and enriched with spiritual and heavenly things, the less room there is in that soul for vain thoughts. The fuller the vessel is of wine, the less room there is for water. Oh! then lay up much of God, of Christ, of precious promises, and choice experiences in your hearts, and then you will be less troubled with vain thoughts. 'A good man out of the good treasure of his heart, bringeth forth good things.'

*Rem. 6.* Keep up holy and spiritual affections; for such as your affections are, such will be your thoughts. 'O how I love thy law, it is my meditation all the day!' What we love most, we most muse upon: 'When I awake, I am still with thee.' That which we like much we shall mind much. They that are frequent in their love to God and his law, will be frequent in thinking of God and his law; a child will not forget his mother.

*Rem. 7.* Avoid multiplicity of worldly business.\* Oh! let not the world take up your hearts and thoughts at other times. Souls that are torn in pieces with the cares of the world, will be always vexed and tormented with vain thoughts, in all their approaches to God: vain thoughts will intrude themselves upon him that lives in a crowd of business. The stars which have the least circuit are nearest the pole; and men that are the least perplexed with business, are often nearest to God.

**CHAPTER VIII.** *The eighth Device that Satan hath to hinder souls from religious services and holy performances, is* By persuading them to rest in their performances. To rest in prayer, and to rest in hearing, reading, and the communion of saints, &c. And when Satan hath drawn the soul to rest upon the service done, then he will help it to reason thus: 'Why, it were as good never to pray, as to pray, and rest in prayer; as good never to hear, as to hear, and rest in hearing; as good never to be in the communion of saints, as to rest in the communion of saints. And by this device he stops many in their heavenly race, and takes them off from those services that should be their joy and delight.—Now the remedies against this device are these:

*Remedy 1.* Against this device of Satan, dwell much upon the imperfections and weaknesses that attend your choicest services.† O, the spots and blemishes that are to be seen upon the face of our fairest duties! When thou hast done all thou canst, thou hast need to close up all with this petition, 'O enter not into judgment with thy servant, O Lord, for the weakness that cleave to my best services! We may all say with the church, 'All our righteousness are as filthy rags,' (Is. lxiv. 6.) If God should be strict to mark what was done amiss in our best actions, we are undone. Oh! the water that is mingled with our wine, the dross that cleaves unto our gold.

*Rem. 2.* Consider the importance and inability of and of your best services, divinely to comfort, refresh, and bear your souls up from fainting, and sinking in the day of trouble, when darkness is round about you,

\* 2 Tim. ii. 4. *ΕΜΠΛΕΚΤΑΙ*, is entangled; it is a comparison which St. Paul borroweth from the custom of the Roman empire, wherein soldiers were forbidden to be proctors of other men's causes, to undertake husbandry or merchandise.

† Pride and high confidence are most apt to creep in upon duties well done, saith one.

when God shall say unto you as he did once to the Israelites, 'Go and cry unto the gods that you have chosen, let them save you in the time of your tribulation,' (Judg. x. 4.) So when God shall say in the day of your trouble, 'Go to your prayers, to your hearing and to your fasting,' &c. and see if they can help you, if they can support you, if they can deliver you. If God in that day doth but withhold the influence of his grace from thee, thy former services will be but poor cordials to comfort thee:\* and then thou must, and wilt cry out, 'Oh! none but Christ, none Christ.† Oh! my prayers are not Christ, my hearing is not Christ, my fasting is not Christ,' &c. Oh! one smile of Christ, one glimpse of Christ, one good word from Christ, one token of love from Christ in the day of trouble and darkness, will more revive and refresh the soul, than all former services in which your souls rested, as if they were the bosom of Christ, which should be the only centre of our souls. Christ is the crown of crowns, the glory of glories, and the heaven of heavens!

*Rem. 3.* Solemnly consider, that good things rested upon, will as certainly undo us, and everlastingly destroy us, as the greatest enormities that can be committed by us. Those souls who, after they have done all, do not look up as high as Christ, and rest, and centre alone in him, laying down their services at his footstool, must lie down in sorrow, their bed is prepared for them in hell, (Is. l. ult.) 'Behold all ye that kindle a fire, and compass yourselves with the sparks, walk in the light of your fire, and in the sparks that ye have kindled, this ye shall have at mine hands, ye shall lie down in sorrow.' Is it good dwelling with everlasting burnings, with a devouring fire? If it be, why then rest in your duties still; if otherwise, then see that you centre only in the bosom of Christ.

*Rem. 4.* Dwell much upon the necessity and excellency of that resting place that God hath provided for you, above all other resting places. Himself, his free mercy, and love, is your resting place; the pure, glorious, matchless, and spotless, righteousness of Christ, is your resting place. Ah! it is sad to think, that most men have forgotten their resting place, as the Lord complains, (Jer. l. 6.) 'My people have been as lost sheep, their shepherds have caused them to go astray, and have turned them away to the mountains. They have gone from mountain to hill, and forgotten their resting place.' So poor souls that see not the excellency of that resting place that God hath appointed for their souls to lie down in, they wander from mountain to hill, from one duty to another, and here they will rest, and there they will rest; but those who see the excellency of that resting place that God hath provided for them, will say, "Farewell prayer, farewell hearing, farewell fasting, &c. I will rest no more in you, but now I will rest only in the bosom of Christ, the love, the righteousness of Christ.

[To be continued ]

#### ART. VII. A Short Sermon.

MR. EDITOR:—If the following skeleton of a discourse on one of those passages of Scripture which at first sight seems to teach no im-

\* "All good is the chiefest good."

† "Neither Christ nor heaven, will bear an hyperbole."

mediate practical lesson, may serve to suggest such a lesson, it is at your disposal. It was taken, not literally or verbally, but in substance, from the mouth of a ministering brother, whose exhibitions of sacred truth to the New England churches have in former years been attended in a remarkable manner, with the power of the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. H.

EPistle of Jude : 9th verse—" Yet Michael the arch-angel, when contending with the devil, he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, 'The Lord rebuke thee.'"

[A similar text may be found in 2 Peter, ii. 11.]

The apostle is describing the character of some whose wickedness was peculiarly atrocious. After alluding to their vile practices, he states as an evidence of their hardihood and presumption, that they "despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities." They contemn and revile those governments, *ecclesiastical or civil*, which are ordained of God for the punishment of evil doers. A very natural trait of character. For

"None ever felt the halter draw,  
With good opinion of the law."

The apostle in exhorting his brethren to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints," in opposition to the influence and doctrine of those corrupt and lawless reprobates, (who seem to be the same mentioned by the apostle Peter, as having *crept* in unawares and assumed the office of teachers of the church, but were teachers of "damnable heresies;") presents before them the example of Michael the arch-angel, which engaged in a contest with the devil, as a pattern to them, in contending for the faith.

We shall not stop to inquire who *Michael* was or what particulars respecting the body of the prophet, the devil converted into a theme for controversy. All that concerns us at present, is the **MANNER** in which *Michael contended with him*. From the title given to Michael—the chief angel, we must naturally conclude that he sustains a very exalted rank as a leader among the armies of heaven. And perhaps his pre-eminence in dignity, induced Satan to make him the object of his attack. At any rate, the station that Michael held, did not permit him to fly from the arch apostate, nor shun the controversy. It was deemed necessary for some cause, it seems, that a matter of Scripture history or doctrine should be *contended* for, even by an archangel. And hence the apostle enjoins a similar duty on his christian brethren, when the doctrines delivered to them are impugned and corrupted. But they are to imitate Michael. It is stated that when he contended with the devil, he "durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee." What was this?

1. It could not be because Michael had less *physical strength* than the devil. The apostle Peter in mentioning this subject, says of the angels, that they "are great in power and might." They are always spoken of by the sacred writers and described as "excelling in strength," and "mighty angels." And the chief among them surely cannot be inferior to the rest.

2. It could not be because Michael had less *moral courage* than the devil. It is the wicked that are described throughout the Bible as cowardly, "fleeing when no man pursueth;" while "the righteous are bold as a lion." Surely the archangel whose voice shall awake the dead to judgment, and who with his blessed and powerful associates promptly execute every mandate from the throne of Heaven, cannot be inferior in moral courage to any of the intelligent creatures of God.

3. It could not be because Michael was not able to find any *sufficient ground for accusation* to bring against the devil. It is presumed his Satanic Majesty's most loyal subjects will hardly venture to maintain his *infallibility* or his *sinless perfection*. What then could be the reason why Michael "*durst not bring against him a railing accusation* ?

Permit me in conclusion to suggest a reason. It was doubtless because *he knew that the devil could outrail him*. He would have to become a greater devil than Satan himself, in order to be victorious. If Michael told the truth, he knew that the devil could lie faster than he could prove the falsehoods, "for he is a liar and the father of it." He therefore wisely relinquished the attempt, and left the matter of rebuke with him who came to destroy the works of the devil.

*Application.*—A word to the wise is sufficient for them."

---

#### ART. VIII. *Respect to Age.*

Although our correspondent who writes on this subject, may over estimate our influence, yet great or small, we are ready to employ it in promoting the objects of his communication. The evil he deplores, has often been remarked by us with the greatest pain. Accustomed, as we have been, to associate with old age, experience and wisdom, we have supposed that honor and veneration should be paid to it, and accordingly have felt indignant that it should be treated with indifference, much more, with positive disrespect and contempt. The very circumstances that the aged have weathered many of the storms of life, have outlived many of their dearest and earliest friends, and are now trembling on the verge of life, are calculated to create a melancholy interest in their favor, and excite the benevolent desire to help their infirmities, and to impart comfort to the last days of their toilsome pilgrimage. Such considerations may command a sorrowful and respectful sympathy even for old age when associated with irreligion and vice; but when the hoary head is found in the way of righteousness, it is a crown of glory which should be loved, honored, and venerated. It was a feeling which we imbibed in very early youth, that they who could dishonor the aged, or turn into ridicule those who were marked with personal deformity, were sinners of a high grade; and we still think that they are the indications of more than mere thoughtlessness and levity.

It is very certain that a veneration for old age, is proportioned to the moral refinement and religious sensibilities of an individual, and the absence of it is a sure indication of a bad state of feeling. As a duty, it is implied in the whole system of Gospel ethics, and the Almighty sufficiently evinced his indignation at the breach of it, by the signal judgment which he inflicted upon those who contemptuously mocked the bald head of his venerable prophet. It is God's express command, "Thou shalt rise up before the hoary head, and honor the face of the old man and fear thy God; I am the Lord."

In our own country it is a perversion of the republican principle, for young men to suppose that they endanger their independence by acknowledging the superiority of their elders. They judge it to be manly, to treat with indifference the experience and counsel of those who have grown gray in the pilgrimage which they have just commenced; and this is a disrespect shown not only to strangers, but even to parents.

The evil is one of great magnitude and prevalence; it infects not only the family, but the State, and the Church. Striplings in politics presume to scorn the opinions of the most experienced statesmen; and novices in theology, affect a pity for the ignorance of men venerable for years, for experience, and piety. The order of things is subverted, and hoary age must take the form to be schooled by beardless youth. It is a deplorable sign of the times, and it is easy to predict the consequence. God's order must be restored; the young must honor the face of the old man; age must always be respected, and when sanctified by wisdom and piety, it must receive profound homage. To effect this, parents must carefully instil the sentiment, and instructors must inculcate a due subordination in youth. The lesson should be early and deeply impressed, that youth never appears more amiable than when found ministering to the comfort of those who in the downhill of life, have many sorrows, and few enjoyments, and who are painfully sensitive to the neglect and disrespect of their juniors in age.—*Presbyterian.*

---

ART. IX. *State of Religion in Prussia.*

From the London Evangelical Magazine.

HACKNEY, July 7, 1838.

REV. SIR—Perhaps you may think the following account of the state of evangelical religion in Prussia, at the present moment, worthy of a place in your valuable periodical, as it will afford information to some, and gratification, it is thought, to many, who are aware of the general prevalence of irreligion on the European continent, and mere formality of the mass of those who pay any attention to religion. A few warm-hearted Christians, I was favored to meet with, both in Hamburg and Berlin, and Halle, especially, and a few other places; they ask and deserve the sympathy and prayers of British Christians, who are so privileged of God as to dwell in this land of gospel light and true religious liberty.

I am, respectfully yours,

GEORGE BENNET.

---

*State of Evangelical Religion in Berlin and Prussia, communicated to George Bennet, at Berlin, by the Rev. E. Kuntze, Minister of the Orphan House, in Berlin, June 14, 1838.*

1. "The Prussian Bible Society has sixty-eight branch societies in different parts of the country, distributes about thirty thousand copies of the Bible, and ten thousand copies of the New Testament annually. Besides the Prussian Bible Society, Dr. Pinkerton, as agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society, distributes about as many copies as the Prussian Bible Society does, and gives every support that is desirable; and most thankfully has been received the grant of the British and Foreign Bible Society, for printing and distributing the New Testament in the army. There would be more done in the country, if the committee of the Berlin Society would be prevailed upon to make use of some agents.

2. "The Missionary Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen has fifty-three branch societies, and an annual income of thirteen thousand dollars, about 2,000/. This society has sent out nine

missionaries to South Africa, and eleven are in the seminary; some members of the society are building a mission-house, the first building erected by public contributions, and attached to it is a large saloon for about six hundred persons to hold missionary meetings. This society is increasing very much, and would be still more so, if it should make use of agents in the country, as the missionary cause is not yet every where known.

3. "The Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews finds not so much support from the public as the success of this society claims. This society has only two missionaries, of whom one is now disabled by sickness. But since the death of the most famous Rabbi Akiba Egar, a great many Jews come from the different provinces to Berlin, to be baptised. There is no minister who has not at least baptised some Jews; one minister has received ninety-one into the church of Christ. If the English societies would send them assistance, they would have part in the joy to receive the children of Abraham into the covenant of Christ. There is plenty to do among the Jews of this country.

4. "The Society for Supporting Proselytes has done a great deal to assist Rabbis and other Jews that are under instruction, to have them apprenticed to a trade, and by this means furthered the object of Christianizing the Jewish nation. It gets but little support from the Christian public; but it is quite indispensable for propagating the gospel among the Jews, and is to be recommended to British liberality.

5. "The Prussian Religious Tract Society has published eighty different tracts, partly original, partly translations and reprints. This society is more active in later time than it was before, and gets some support now from North America to reprint some of the old tracts. There are many opportunities to distribute these tracts in the country if they could be given away gratuitously, but there are not so many that would buy some.

6. "Primary Schools, as well as higher schools, are in this country under government, and there are so many that we may dispense with the system of the British and Foreign School Society. Parents are under the obligation enforced by law to send their children to school, from the age of seven years till they are fourteen.

"In the primary schools every child must have a Bible, Luther's Short Catechism, and a reader; for the most part also a hymn-book.

7. "There is in later times a little more done by legislation to promote the observance of the Sabbath, but the practice does not yet correspond with the laws.

8. "There are eighteen ministers in Berlin that preach according to the Gospel of Christ; and salvation, justification and sanctification only by him. Several others may be called orthodox, without being lively with heart and hand in the work of the Lord; and even the wise men of this world, generally called rationalists, conform more and more to Biblical doctrine. The churches are best filled where the preachers hold forth the cross; the others are very thinly attended; some, where they preach nothing but dry morality, are almost empty.

(Signed)

E. KUNTZE.

Minister of the Orphan House in Berlin."

June 14, 1838.

ART. X. *Ecclesiastical Proceedings relative to the General Assemblies.*

We copy from the New-York Observer the following proceedings of the Synods of New-York and Albany, together with those of the Presbytery of Albany, in relation to the division which has taken place in the General Assembly. Our readers will be surprised at these proceedings, especially those of the Synod of New-York. That body entered into a solemn agreement to commit a great sin, viz: to divide the church—they *agreed* to make a *schism*, to *rend* the *body* of Christ. We have no idea that such absurd and anti-scriptural proceedings will ever receive the countenance and blessing of the Church's Head.

SYNOD OF NEW-YORK.—The Synod of New-York was opened on the 16th inst. at 3 o'clock P. M., in the First Presbyterian Church, Newburgh, with a sermon by the Moderator, Rev. Erskine Mason, D. D. from 2 Cor. iv. 5. "For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord." Immediately after calling the roll, a motion was made and carried to postpone the election of Moderator, for the purpose of introducing the following resolutions:

1. *Resolved*, That in the present state and relations of this Synod, a division into two bodies appears to be inevitable.

2. That submitting to what we thus deem an existing necessity, it is our common interest and duty, and we judge it also to be entirely practical as well as unspeakably desirable, that we conduct and consummate the measures amicably, remembering that "we are brethren."

3. That, in this view, the roll shall be called previously to the election of the Moderator, on this question, as a question mainly of a practical character—to which of the two bodies, claiming to be each the *General Assembly of our church*, do you for the present adhere? and the result being declared, each body shall proceed to constitute in its own way and place, without disorder or any demonstration of unkind or unfraternal feeling.

4. That each body, after their respective organization, shall appoint a committee of two ministers and two elders each, making jointly eight, to whom all subordinate questions shall be in the first instance referred, such as the disposition of the records, the course of business in any doubtful cases, and such other matters as either body shall refer to them; and on which they shall duly report, each committee to its proper body.

5. That the question of celebrating together the Lord's Supper according to the usage of the Synod, be referred to the above committees, jointly, with a recommendation that it be celebrated as usual in this church on Wednesday evening next, and that the said committees act as a committee of arrangements in respect to the performance of the service and the parts to be sustained, nominating those who shall officiate on the occasion.

The introduction of these resolutions elicited considerable discussion, during which Synod took a recess till evening. They were, however, severally read and adopted; and on the final vote for the adoption of the whole, the division stood, ayes 102, nays 64, and 5 *non liquet*.

The roll was then called, in accordance with the third resolution; and the question being put, "to which of the assemblies of our church do you adhere?" it appeared that eighty-seven adhered to the body which

held its sessions in the Seventh Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, in May last, of which Dr. Plumer was Moderator; and thirty-five to that held in the First Church, of which Dr. Fisher was Moderator; and forty-nine refused to declare their adhesion to either, many of whom denied the right of Synod to propose such a question. Notice was given by those who adhered to neither, that they should enter a protest against the proceedings, and a request was made that those wishing to enter their protest, should remain after the close of the evening session.

It was then agreed by *common consent*, that the body composing the eighty-seven should meet the next morning at nine o'clock, in the church, and those composing the thirty-five at the same time in the session room adjoining. The meeting was accordingly closed with prayer by Dr. Mason.

The protestants appointed a committee to draw up a protest and to submit the same for consideration at half-past eight o'clock the next morning, in the session room. They met accordingly, with Dr. McAuley as Moderator; but before finishing their business, the hour arrived when the room was to be taken by another body. The protestants then adjourned to meet forthwith in the High School room near by.

At nine o'clock the body of eighty-seven met in the church, and organized themselves by the appointment of Rev. J. M. Krebs, Moderator, and Rev. E. S. Crane and Rev. Jacob Green, Clerks.

At the same hour the body of thirty-five, with Dr. Mason as Moderator, met in the session room, and organized themselves as the Synod of New-York, a recess was then taken until ten o'clock, during which a committee consisting of Messrs. Cox, Peters and Timlo were appointed to wait on the body at the High School Room, and inform them of what they had done. This committee was received and heard, requesting that the body in the High School Room, on adjourning, would meet with them in the session room. This request was strenuously opposed on the ground that the acts of the body with Dr. Mason were "unconstitutional and suicidal." Dr. Peters admitted their unconstitutionality, but hoped the two bodies would meet as requested. This, however, was refused by the protestants, except on condition that the body with Dr. Mason were willing to come in and join with them—claiming that they alone remained on constitutional ground. The call was now made for the Moderator of the Synod of New-York. He being absent, connected with another body, was sent for, and on his arrival took the chair, and the meeting was opened by prayer.

The roll being called, the body proceeded to the choice of Moderator, Clerks, &c.. Rev. Dr. Skinner was chosen Moderator, and Rev. Dr. Patton and Rev. Mr. Rowland, Clerks.

The body meeting in the church, with Rev. Mr. Krebs as Moderator, numbered ninety-four on Wednesday, *p. m.* The other we could not ascertain definitely, but it was not far from 86.

The body under Rev. Mr. Krebs as Moderator, held public religious service on Wednesday evening, consisting of singing, prayers and addresses. They closed their session the same evening.

The body of which Dr. Skinner was Moderator, held a prayer meeting with the Second Presbyterian Church on Wednesday evening, and were expected to close their session on Thursday forenoon.

—  
**SYNOD OF ALBANY.**—Of the proceedings of this Synod we have re-

ceived no official account. The following notice appears in several of the Albany papers, and appears to have been furnished by a member of the Synod:

“The Synod of Albany met on Tuesday, the 9th inst. at Hudson. One hundred and eight members were enrolled. Some others afterwards appeared, making the whole number one hundred and twelve. Immediately after the roll was completed, a resolution was offered, expressing adherence to the Assembly that met in the Seventh Church, Philadelphia, (the Old School.) Another was made to lay this on the table, and the vote was,

Ayes, 75

Noes, 20

Non liquet, about 13

“The mover then stated that it was evident a division must take place, and that in anticipation of this, a room in the same church had been procured, and he requested the minority to withdraw to that room. The whole body then united in prayer. Those that withdrew, including those that subsequently enrolled their names with them, amounting to thirty-six, who organised as a Synod. Those that remained and acted with the old Synod, numbered upwards of sixty, and ten or fifteen declined acting at present. Some of these are waiting the result of the law-suits in November next. Nothing unkind was said or done. The division seemed the result of an honest difference of opinion.”

PRESBYTERY OF ALBANY.—*Sir*—I am directed by the Presbytery of Albany, to request you to publish in the New-York Observer the following resolutions, the first of which was adopted by that body at the stated meeting held in August last; and the others, at adjourned meetings, held during the present month.

1. *Resolved*, That this Presbytery, while they express no opinion of the doings of the General Assemblies of 1837 and 1838, under all the circumstances elect to be, and they hereby consider themselves, a component part of the Presbyterian Church, as represented by the General Assembly in which our Commissioners of the last year retained their seats.

2. *Resolved*, That while this Presbytery have thought proper to elect to be considered a constituent part of the Presbyterian Church, as represented by the General Assembly which held its sessions in May last, in the Seventh Presbyterian Church in the city of Philadelphia; and while this Presbytery are disposed, in case of a division of the Synod of Albany, to go with those who adhere to that Assembly; yet they hereby explicitly declare, that this course is not based on the ground that they are agreed as to the constitutionality or expediency of all the measures of the Assemblies of 1837 and 1838; it being understood that there exists in this body a diversity of opinions in relation to these points.

3. *Resolved*, That the Stated Clerk be directed to transmit copies of the foregoing resolutions to the editors of the Presbyterian and the New York Observer, and request their publication in those papers.

JOHN CLANCY, *Stated Clerk.*

Charlton, Oct. 12, 1838.

ART. XI. *Miscellany.*

CHOICE SAYINGS OF RICHARD CECIL.—Our troubles arise not from our living in the world, but from the world living in us.

Never expect much of the joy of the Holy Ghost if your heart and mind be occupied in the enjoyment of sense. The joy of the Spirit is a delicate, sacred deposit; and must be kept in a pure casket. An unholily breath will dim its lustre and fade its freshness. The joys of sense, even the most lawful of them, are agitating, tumultuous, and unsatisfactory. The joy of the Spirit is calming, modest, strengthening, elevating, and satisfying. The joys of sense, at the best, enervate, lower, and impoverish the soul. The joys of the Spirit ennoble and enrich it.

That error is the strongest which is built on some truth; *half* the truth is a lie.

Error is never solitary; it is always attended by a thousand others. Burnet says, while profaneness is the broad road to hell, error is the byepath.

Faith and hope give wings to the soul. We often call for the wings of a dove to fly away, because we want to be out of our place, to be somewhere else in order to be more happy. But this arises from impatience. True faith and hope will make us happy any where, and enable us, like Paul and Silas, to sing in a prison.

There is *experience* as well as doctrine to be taught in the school of Christ. We are to be brought out of nature and taught to walk with God; and this is effected not only by the gracious influences of the Holy Spirit, but also by wholesome corrections.

The joy of salvation is the joy of calm reflection. It will bear the examination of a dying bed; it is the joy of hope and expectation; it is the joy of acceptance and communion with God; it is everlasting.

The danger of too much solitude is, lest the mind, deeply and religiously impressed, should mistake the workings of the imagination for the teaching of the Spirit. See the mistakes concerning abstraction in some of the mystics.

We should consider, if we are under any painful dispensation, that it may be in answer to our own prayers; we have been asking of God that we may be pilgrims indeed, and he has answered us by giving us 'not so much as to set the sole of our foot upon!'

While there is a sentence of death on the one hand, the devil would bring a sentence of despair on the other; but the believer has still a lively hope in Jesus Christ; he has got the prison doors open and the king's hand signed to his pardon, and his trust is in God who raiseth the dead.

Man is born to trouble. There is either a wave over your head, or there is one coming. Where then is your resource? Is it the same as David's. Is your prayer like his, 'Lead me to the rock that is higher than I?'

We often play with our remedies and speculate upon them; affliction makes us *take* them. Thus our Bible lies on the shelf, affliction makes us take it down.

People in general are apt to affix gross ideas to idolatry. If a man goes to China, he is astonished at the horrid and absurd things that are the objects of their worship; he is not aware that his own idol is his *cargo*.

It is the Christian only that despises the world. Others may *pretend* to do it, but he has the secret; for the taper is only divested of its lustre by the rising of the sun.

**BETTER DAYS.**—"When persons have been, like myself, reduced in life and brought to a state of dependence, it is very common for one and another old friend and acquaintance to say, with a tone of pity, 'Ah, I knew her in her better days! I remember so and so in her better days!' Nor is there any impropriety in the expression, in their sense of it. But this I know by experience, that the days of ease and worldly prosperity are seldom to Christians, their *better days*. So far from it that to the praise and glory of God's holy name would I speak it, I have substantial reasons to call *these* my better days—these days and nights of pain—these days in which I am visited with an incurable disorder—these days of frequent anxiety from various quarters—these days of almost absolute confinement and solitude, are not only my *better*, but my *best days*; because the saviour condescends to be more present with me in them; to manifest himself as he does not to the world; to stand by my bed of affliction and speak kindly to my heart; because I am taught by affliction and enabled by grace to cultivate the life of faith; which is as superior to the life of sense as the heavens are higher than the earth; and that, even in so very small a measure as I have known it."—*Mrs. Hawkes*.

**HINDOO ABSURDITY.**—The Hindoos carry on a complete system of bargaining with their gods, or rather a compound system of flattering, cajoling, bargaining, and threatening. The most ordinary method is, the contracting. "If you will grant me so and so, I will give you so and so, such and such sweetmeats, fruits, flowers, &c.; or, I will worship you alone for so many days." If this is not successful, they say: "If you will not give me so and so, I will keep you without a drop of water; or, I will put a rope round your neck, and drag you round the house; or, the most disgraceful of all, I will beat you with a slipper." In times of drought, or of any great extremity, they will absolutely brick up the entrance to an image, and threaten to keep their god close prisoner, until he shall help them. This took place at Massuck a few years ago, when the poor god was bricked up, and kept without water, offerings, or adoration, until the rain began to fall, when they liberated their prisoner, and begged his pardon.

**MINISTERS WITHOUT CHARGE.**—The following judicious resolution was adopted at a late meeting of the Classis of Long Island:

"Resolved, That the ministers without charge be required to report semi-annually to Classis, what has been their occupation, how often and where they have preached, as well as any other duties of a ministerial character performed by them.

---

#### ART. XII. Notices.

In the present number of the Monitor will be found a very interesting Letter from the Synod of Original Sececers to the Associate Synod. We judged there could be no impropriety in laying it before our readers before its reception by our Synod; especially as our Synod cannot receive and act upon it for several months yet to come.

The communication signed Anti-Slavery, will be attended to in our next No., also the Sermon by the late Rev. T. Hamilton; the Obituary of Rev. S. Douthett; and "Bye-gone Times." We hope our Correspondents will not forget us; original communications are in great demand.

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,  
AND  
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

DECEMBER, 1838.

---

ART. I. *Historical Sketch of the United Brethren or Moravians.*

(Continued from page 201.)

Scarcely had the important work of organizing the congregation at Herrnhut been completed, when a storm gathered against it, which threatened its extirpation before it had taken root and gained strength. The old accusation against the Brethren, and especially against Count Zinzendorf, of inveigling people to emigrate from Bohemia and Moravia, was revived, and so strenuously supported by some of the Count's personal enemies, that the government was induced to interpose its authority. A mandate was issued by the king of Poland, who was also Elector of Saxony, ordering Count Zinzendorf to quit his majesty's dominions.

However unmerited the severity of this measure was, as it affected the Count himself, yet God enabled him to bear the stroke with christian meekness and fortitude, he made instant preparations for his departure.

In his conversations with David Nitsmann and other brethren, he avowed his firm belief that his exile was divinely appointed for his own good and that of the Brethren's Church. Some of his sentiments are quoted by his biographer. (Spangenberg.) On one occasion he said: "It is a proof of self-love when a person thinks 'I will die in my nest;' and such an idea may have a baneful influence on his whole future life, make him a slave to his own will and domestic enjoyments, and circumscribe his usefulness in the Lord's service. *That* place is our proper home, where we have the greatest opportunity of laboring for our Saviour." At another time he remarked:—"Nothing is of real importance but our salvation, and the blessing of this we may carry with us wherever we go."

The royal mandate arrived at Herrnhut during the Count's absence—when he had read it he said:—"At all events it will require ten years before I can permanently fix my residence in Herrnhut; for now we must collect a *Missionary* congregation, and train laborers to go forth into all the world and preach Christ and his salvation."

Viewing the Brethren's Church in no other light, than as an institution re-

vived by God for the special purpose of diffusing the knowledge of scriptural truth among christians and heathens, he considered himself solemnly pledged to see to it, that this its destination might be carefully attended to. Hence it was the constant practice of the Count to seek to discover the peculiar talents of each member of the congregation, and to pay more particular attention to those who appeared qualified for service in the Lord's vineyard at home or abroad. When, therefore, he was no longer allowed to remain in Saxony, he saw no other way of attaining the proposed end, than by having those persons constantly about him who were under preparation for service in the Brethren's Church. These persons constituted the **MISSIONARY CONGREGATION**. In whatever place the Missionary Congregation fixed its temporary abode, no regulation considered essential to the constitution of the Brethren's Church was set aside, but enforced with the same strictness as at Herrnhut. Special attention was paid to the design of this institution; and for this purpose whole days and even weeks, were sometimes occupied in *conferences*, for deliberating on subjects bearing on the enlargement of Christ's kingdom in the world. An extensive correspondence was carried on with gospel ministers in distant places; and numerous visiters arrived almost every day to see and hear for themselves. The sphere of the Brethren's labor was enlarging more and more, so that there was no lack of suitable work for the Missionary Congregation.

But this institution, however beneficial in its effects, bore within itself the seeds of its own dissolution. It was too expensive a scheme to be long supported by so poor a community. This inconvenience was not immediately felt, as Count Zinzendorf defrayed nearly the whole of the expense from his private purse, occasionally assisted by members of the Missionary Congregation themselves who possessed independent property, while others performed various menial services without recompense, which superseded the necessity of employing hired servants. The Countess also, who herself superintended the house-keeping, directed the whole with so much prudence, that every thing was conducted in that frugal manner which was adapted to the future destination of the members of the family. In a few years, however, the expense far exceeded the means; and a more serious evil threatened the institution. Persons became connected with it, who, on farther trial, were found unfit for service in the church; and others, when the first ardor had cooled, lost their zeal. This institution, therefore, terminated in a few years; and the benefit for a while derived from it to the cause of the Brethren, has been as successfully attained by other means.

The first Synod of the renewed church of the Brethren, was held in the year 1736, in the castle of Marienborn, with which Count Zinzendorf had been accommodated by his cousin, Count Ysenburg Meerholz. The assembly was not numerous, but was distinguished by brotherly union and concord.

Synods were afterwards convened every three or four years. During the life of Count Zinzendorf, it was left to him to fix the time and place of meeting; and he also presided.

At the second Synod, which assembled at Gotha, in the month of June, 1740, a third bishop was elected. The choice fell on the Rev. Polycarp Mueller, a Lutheran divine, who had formerly filled a professor's chair in the University of Leipzig. He was consecrated by bishop David Nitsmann and Count Zinzendorf. This measure was rendered necessary by the projected voyage of bishop Nitsmann to North America, where the Brethren were about to form some colonies.

At an early period, twelve elders were appointed to have the oversight of the congregation at Herrnhut, four of whom were chosen by lot to be chief elders. After making some immaterial changes in their designation and office, it was, in process of time, thought expedient to nominate one elder to have the general inspection, not only over Herrnhut, but over every institution which then was, or might hereafter become, connected with the Brethren's Church. The individual holding this office, and called General Elder, presided at all their meetings for consultation, and his decision was final. It was impossible that this office, in its original designation, could be permanently continued without manifest inconvenience and danger. It argued well for the future prosperity of the Brethren's Church, that these evil consequences were foreseen before they actually took place, and a remedy provided.

In 1740, Leonhard Dober, who had held the office of general elder since 1735, being pressed with the weight of his official duties and responsibilities, tendered his resignation. But the Synod would not accept of it, not knowing any other person possessed of equal qualifications for the office with Dober. Yet, as the inexpediency of continuing the office began to be more and more felt by many, it was resolved to resume the consideration of the subject with as little delay as possible.

A Synodal conference was held in Red Lion street, London, in 1741. The conference proceeded to the consideration of the best means of supplying the office of general elder; the resignation of Leonhard Dober having been previously accepted.

They at length unanimously resolved to abolish the office; and instead of investing any man, however pious and deserving of confidence, with the authority hitherto exercised by the general elder, to apply for direction to the Lord himself, by the use of the lot, in concerns connected with the government of the Brethren's Church, in all cases in which the Holy Scriptures, and the leadings of divine providence do not furnish a clear rule of action. The transaction now related, proved the occasion of the more general use of the lot, in the government of the Brethren's Church. As the use of the lot has been objected to by many worthy men, and is liable to be misunderstood, a few observations may be added which will show the Brethren's sentiments on the subject, as they are contained in the authentic publications of their church.

"Though the use of the lot is not commanded in the New Testament, it cannot be justly called *anti-scriptural*; and ought to be viewed as a divine decision, according to the words of Solomon, 'the lot is cast into the lap, but the whole disposing is of the Lord.' As God himself commanded the use of the lot to the Israelites, as it was frequently resorted to during the Jewish dispensation, and as it was used by the apostles after Christ's ascension; the Brethren believe that even now the lot may be made use of in the church of Christ."\*

It is a fundamental principle in the constitution of the Brethren's Church, that the lot ought not to be used in the following cases:

1. When the subject is clearly decided in Holy Writ.
2. When the will of God seems distinctly marked out by the leadings of Divine Providence: or, when the point in question is already determined by a fixed rule in the church. Its use, therefore, is restricted to those cases on which no decisive judgment can be formed by any of these rules, when much may be said for either side of the question. To

---

\* Exposition of Christian Doctrine.

these questions belong the appointment of persons to the episcopal and other offices, the formation of new settlements, the establishment of new missions, &c.

The right of using the lot is limited to those who bear rule in the church, that is, to Synods, to the elder's conference of the unity, and to the subordinate conferences in each congregation and missionary settlement. No bishop or minister is allowed to use it privately.

Before the year 1747, six or seven settlements similar to Herrnhut had been erected in Saxony and Sclisia.

At an early period after the renewal of their church, the Brethren formed acquaintances in England. To meet the wishes of some persons in London, who desired information of the establishment at Herrnhut, a deputation was sent thither in 1728, consisting of David Nitsmann, John Toelschig, and Wencelaus Neisser. This visit paved the way for many important consequences. The trustees of Georgia made an offer of a piece of land to the Brethren, for forming a settlement in Georgia, in the hope that its contiguity to the Indian country would facilitate their access to these savages, for the purpose of preaching the gospel to them. Unwilling to relinquish so promising a field of labor, a company of Brethren on their way to America, came to London, towards the end of the year 1734. They were recommended to the trustees of Georgia as Moravian exiles, who petitioned for liberty of conscience, and an opportunity of preaching the gospel to the Heathen.

In the year following, a second company of the Brethren, consisting of twenty-six persons, sailed for Georgia. Their christian deportment on the passage and on their arrival, gained them the esteem of the Rev. Messrs. John and Charles Wesley, who sailed in the same ship. Wesley's biographer observes, that "he" (Wesley) "began to learn the German, and the Moravian bishop, David Nitsmann, and some others, the English language, that they might enjoy the benefit of mutual conversation. It was here that his acquaintance with the Moravian Brethren commenced, which he cultivated for several years; and we must allow, that the knowledge he acquired by their means, laid the foundation for the great things which followed in the subsequent part of his life." The cheerfulness and tranquility shown by the Brethren during a heavy storm, and in the midst of danger, greatly astonished Mr. Wesley, as very different from what he and the other English passengers felt. "I had long before," says he, "observed the great seriousness of their behaviour; of their humility they had given continual proofs, by performing those servile offices for the other passengers, which none of the English would undertake; and for which they desired, and would receive no pay, remarking 'that it was profitable to have their pride humbled; that the Saviour had done more for them.' And every day had given them an occasion of showing a meekness which no injury could move. If they were pushed struck or thrown down, they arose again and went away; but no complaint was found in their mouths. There was now" (during the storm,) "an opportunity of trying whether they were delivered from the spirit of fear as well as from that of pride, anger, and revenge. In the midst of the psalm, wherewith their service began, the sea broke over, split the mainsail in pieces, covered the ship, and poured in between decks, as if the great deep had swallowed us up. A terrible screaming began among the English. The Germans calmly sung on. I asked one of them afterwards, 'Was you not afraid?' He answered: 'I thank God, No.' I asked, 'But were not your women and children afraid?' He replied

mildly, 'No; our women and children are not afraid to die.'" In another part of his journal, Mr. Wesley says of them: "They were always employed, always cheerful themselves, and in good humor with one another." The favorable opinion formed by Mr. Wesley and his associates, of the Brethren, they communicated to their friends in England, who were thereby induced to seek a nearer acquaintance with those of their community, who were still in London; and thus a door was opened to them for laboring in Great Britain, as well as in her Colonies.

At the joint solicitation of Wesley and his brother Charles, Peter Boehler accompanied them to Oxford, where he held meetings for edification, attended by members of the University and by citizens. He delivered discourses in Latin, and Mr. Gambold interpreted them for the benefit of the illiterate part of the audience. At the request of the friends of the Brethren in London, one of their ministers, Philip Henry Molther, was appointed to take the care of the society which had been formed in the metropolis. The persons composing this society were partly those who had been excited to greater zeal in religion by the labors of the two Wesleys, and partly such as ascribed their spiritual attainments to their acquaintance with the Brethren. For a while both parties walked together in love; but a difference soon rose between Molther and the Wesleys, respecting some points of doctrine on which they disagreed; the latter also disapproved of some rules which the Brethren deemed essential to the spiritual welfare of the society; so that a complete separation took place.

That Wesley's good opinion of the Brethren afterwards underwent a considerable change, all must be aware who have read his journals. More causes than one served to produce this change. Among these may be reckoned the zeal with which Count Zinzendorf and Mr. Spangenberg opposed the doctrine of sinless perfection, which Mr. Wesley strenuously supported.

The Brethren, were, in 1740, obliged to vacate the settlement they had formed in Savannah, on account of difficulties between the Spanish and English. They retired to Pennsylvania, and purchased a piece of land from Rev. George Whitefield, which he had called Nazareth. While these negotiations were pending, Count Zinzendorf arrived in America. He landed at New-York in 1741, and proceeded to Philadelphia. His principal object in undertaking this journey, was, to render assistance to the Lutherans, many of whom resided in the State of Pennsylvania, but were, with regard to religion, in a very deplorable condition, having few ordained ministers—and the christian instruction of their children being wholly neglected. He was gladly received by them, and the Lutheran congregation in Philadelphia gave him a regular call to be their minister, which he accepted. He likewise provided several congregations in the country with ordained ministers and school-masters, and with the concurrence of some of the most approved clergymen, established a consistory for the superintendance of the Lutheran Church in Pennsylvania, of which he had the presidency during his stay in America.

Soon after his arrival in America, Count Zinzendorf became acquainted with Mr. Henry Antes, a German by birth, and a member of the Reformed Church;—his intercourse with bishop Spangenberg, who, on his return from a visitation in the West Indies, remained some years in North America, had been the means of confirming his faith in the Lord Jesus, and of rousing his attention to the unhappy consequences of the mutual jealousies among christians of different denominations. As a

means of healing this breach in the church of God, Mr. Antes sent a circular letter to all the German religious sects in Pennsylvania, inviting them to elect deputies to attend a general convention, proposed to be holden in Germantown, on the 1st of January, 1742. The object of the convention is stated in the circular to be: "Not to dispute and wrangle, but converse in love on the essential articles of faith, in order to discover how nearly all true christians approximate in their views of the fundamentals of religion; to come to a mutual agreement respecting all such opinions as do not affect the ground of salvation."

The proposed convention met at the time and place appointed, and continued its deliberations by several adjournments, in different towns, till the fourth of June, holding two or three sessions each month. Deputies from all the religious parties in Pennsylvania attended; two or three Brethren also attended, but rather as guests than active members. Count Zinzendorf was unanimously chosen speaker or president. This distinction he accepted, in his capacity as Lutheran minister in Philadelphia, and not as a bishop of the Brethren's Church. In order to obviate any misconception which might arise, from the official relation in which he stood to the Brethren and the Lutherans, he roundly declared to the assembly, that, "in coming forward on this occasion, he had not the most distant idea of uniting the different religious sects in Pennsylvania into one visible body, or of introducing among them the Moravian ecclesiastical constitution, but that his only wish was to be instrumental in grounding all parties on the alone saving doctrine of faith in the Lamb of God, as the Creator, Preserver, Redeemer and Sanctifier of mankind."

At the third session, the deputies, with the exception of two or three, bore a decided testimony in favor of the doctrine of the atonement. The few dissentients withdrew from the Convention; these and their congregations hated and even persecuted the Brethren; while those who agreed in the main with them, became more warmly attached to them and their cause. Some formed a union with their church—among whom were Mr. Antes and his family.

(To be continued.)

## ART. II. *The Gospel hid to them that are lost.*

Mr. Editor: The following discourse is transcribed from a manuscript of a father in the Secession Church, the late Rev. Thos. Hamilton of N. York. The introduction and some part of the improvement is lost, but it is hoped these deficiencies will be no barrier in the way of the godly deriving instruction—edification from its perusal. TRANSCRIBER.

"But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not lest the light of the gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine into them." 2d Cor. iv. 3. 4.

I. It is proposed to make some observations about the gospel. And

1. By the gospel several things are intended in scripture.

(1.) Most generally it denotes an exhibition of the covenant of grace to sinners; a declaration of peace on earth and good will toward men; an offer and grant of Christ Jesus, and eternal life through him, to sinners even the chief. (Mark xvi. 15.)

In this view of it the gospel differs widely from the law;—the law demands something from us; the gospel gives something to us. The law addresses us with the language of authority, the gospel is the language of promise and invitation. The law declares our duty, the gospel our privilege. In a word, whatever the law demands both as to its precepts and as to its penalty, the gospel exhibits to our acceptance Christ Jesus, who is the *sum* of the gospel and is “the *end* of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.” He magnified the law, and made it honorable.

To represent the gospel as a new law, requiring faith, repentance and sincere obedience as the condition of an interest in its blessings, is corrupting its simplicity. It is expunging all the grace of the gospel, no matter what is made the condition of a right to the blessings of the gospel, if it is something out of our power to perform. And is it not as impossible for us to perform the condition in question, as to obey the whole law? No man can believe, repent, or perform sincere obedience, unless he be renewed in the spirit of his mind. Faith and repentance are operations of the new man. But is it in any man’s power to renew himself? No, he is not born of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man; but of God. If the gospel be a new law, it is not a whit easier than the old law. Nay it is harder for a sinner, who is without strength to perform this condition, which is considered by some, mild and gracious, than it was for Adam to perform the condition of the covenant of works; for his strength was proportionate to the extent of his duty, whereas there is no proportion between a sinner’s strength and the condition in question.

(2.) The whole of divine revelation, including at once the precepts and promises of God’s word, is called the gospel. Hence we are required to obey as well as believe the gospel. (2 Thess. i. 8.) However the whole word of God is denominated the gospel, because it is the centre in which all the lines of revealed truth meet.

(3.) The preaching of the gospel is called the gospel. Hence ministers are said to live of the gospel. (Cor. ix.)

(4.) The word of God which is contained in the New Testament, is called the gospel. (2 Tim. i. 10.)

(5.) That part of the New Testament, which contains the history of our Lord’s incarnation, life, death and exaltation, is called the gospel. (Mark i. 1.)

2. The gospel receives a number of designations which are designed to illustrate its nature and excellence. It is called the gospel of the grace of God, the gospel of peace; the gospel of the kingdom. But there is an epithet in the text which embraces all the other properties which are given to it in scripture. It is called the *glorious gospel*. This denotes two things—

(1.) The quality of the gospel. It is *light*. Light is implied in the idea of glory. The God of glory is called light. “God is light.” The gospel is called light to denote the discoveries which it makes; for “whatsoever doth make manifest is light.” To denote the purity of its doctrines; for what is purer than light? To denote the pleasantness and sweetness of the impression, which the belief of it produces in the mind, for “light is sweet and a pleasant thing it is for the eyes to behold the sun.” When the gospel is called light, it is opposed to two things, to *darkness* and to *dimness*; to the darkness of night, and to the dimness of twilight. Hence the gospel is a light in opposition to Pagan darkness, and to

the dimness of the legal dispensation, which, though light in opposition to heathen darkness, was dimness compared with the superior light of the gospel.

(2.) The excellency of the gospel. If it be light, it is a *glorious* light. This denotes that the gospel contains glorious mysteries. The epithet denotes their multiplicity, excellency and harmony—

1st. Their multiplicity. There is light in a ray, but in glorious light there must be a collection of rays. If the sun emitted but one ray, he could not be called a glorious luminary; but when he pours forth a flood of rays, he is justly entitled to that name. And what numerous rays of truth does the gospel emit? It is a revelation of the perfections and Persons of the Godhead. It describes the natures, offices and relations of Christ Jesus.

2d. The excellency of these mysteries. The light of the sun is more excellent than the light of a single ray. Now the excellence of the mysteries of the gospel appears from their author, nature and effects. They are divine. They are from God. They could never have been discovered by men or angels. "The world by wisdom knew not God." They produce the most important and glorious effects, &c.

3d. Their harmony and agreement. In glorious light there must not only be a multiplicity, but a mingling of rays. Accordingly all the doctrines of the gospel agree. They all centre in the person and mediation of Christ. They are called the "truth in Jesus."

4th. The grace of the gospel. The glory of the gospel is the grace of the gospel. The whole system of gospel truth is to the "praise of his glorious grace." The glory of the sun is too dazzling and powerful to be contemplated by the naked eye; but is yet pleasant, cheering, enlivening.

What glorious privileges does the gospel confer? The true believer is called to *glory* and virtue. The spirit of *glory* and of God rests upon him. Christ is formed in him, the hope of *glory*. Hence he justly rejoices in the hope of the *glory* of God. Accordingly the New Jerusalem is represented as "having the glory of God;" clothed with light like unto a stone most precious, even like a jasper stone, clear as crystal, (Rev. xxi. 11.) So the gospel dispensation\* is styled glorious. (2 Cor. ii. 7, 8.)

3. The gospel is here called the gospel of Christ. "The glorious gospel of Christ."

Sometimes it is called the gospel of God, to denote that it originated in the wisdom and goodness of God; that it was published by his authority and designed to promote the interests of his glory. It is here called "the gospel of Christ," to intimate (1.) That he is the author and publisher of the gospel. "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." He "is the Apostle of our profession." "He is the author and finisher of our faith." The gospel is not of men, neither by men, but of Jesus Christ. Hence he is called the "Sun of righteousness." The source of all that light which the church or her ministry enjoys. (2.) That he is the confirmer of the gospel. "All the promises

\* This phrase *gospel dispensation* seems to be used by the author in contradistinction to the legal dispensation as appears from the passage to which reference is made. Viewing it in this way, with some latitude of interpretation, it may embrace the whole period of time from the beginning of the old dispensation, as it thus places the two dispensations, the gospel and the legal, in contrast. But if we consider the expression *gospel dispensation* as distinguishing the new from the old, and restricting the gospel to the former, it is not the "form of sound speech that cannot be condemned." (Heb. iv. 2.)

are in him, yea and in him amen, to the glory of God by us." (2. Cor. i. 20. He is called "the minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers." (Rom. xv. 8.) He is called the *surety* of a better testament. (Heb. vii. 22.) He is the testator of it, who by his death confirmed it. (Heb. ix. 16.) Hence it is called the New Testament in his blood. He confirmed the New Testament by his death, not as a martyr, but as the *surety* of it. (3.) That he is the subject of the gospel. It is called by the apostle Paul, who was separated unto it, (Rom. i. 1, 3.) "the gospel of God concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who was made of the seed of David according to the flesh." The mystery of godliness, which is the mystery of the gospel, relates wholly to the incarnation and death, &c. of Christ. (1 Tim. iii. 16.) Hence the glory of the gospel is derived from the relation it has to Christ, who is the image of the invisible God. That which treats of the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of his person, must be glorious. The subject of the gospel is glorious, and so must be the gospel itself.

4. It is also represented as the gospel of the Apostles. "If our gospel be hid," &c. see Rom. ii. 16. This is not inconsistent with its being also the gospel of Christ. He (the Apostle) asserts his interest in the gospel, to denote the following things:

(1.) That it was a trust committed to him. He tells the Corinthians in another place (2 Ep. v. 18) that the word and ministry of reconciliation was committed unto him. He informs his beloved Timothy that the glorious gospel of the blessed God was committed unto his trust. (1 Tim. i. 11.) He urges Timothy to keep the trust which was also committed to him, (2 Tim. i. 14.) "That good thing which was committed unto thee, keep by the Holy Ghost, which dwelleth in us." "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust." 1 Tim. vi. 20. "This charge I commit unto thee son Timothy according to the prophecies, which went before on thee," &c. Which shows us that all the ministers of the gospel, are bound to keep it as a precious trust, &c.

(2.) His confidence in the truth of the gospel. He knew he was under the influences of the spirit of God. His call to the ministry was miraculous. The sanctions of his doctrine and mission were miraculous. "Truly," says he to the Corinthians, (2 Ep. xii. 12,) "the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs and wonders and mighty deeds." His ministry was attended by the seal of success. His preaching was in demonstration of the spirit and in power.—And in regard to his personal faith, "he knew in whom he had believed, and that he was able to keep that which was committed unto him against that day."

(3.) His resolution to keep the trust committed unto him. His confidence that a precious trust was committed unto him, created a determination through grace to keep it in opposition to all the enemies of it. He did not give place to them, no not for an hour. He earnestly contended for the faith, which had been delivered unto the saints and to him as an apostle. In no instance did he betray his trust. All the trials and sufferings and persecutions, which he met with, had no influence in shaking his attachment to the cause in which he had embarked. And when he came to die, he could say, "I have fought a good fight, I have kept the faith, &c."

(4.) His love for the gospel; his gloriation in it. His language is the language of appropriation and consequently the language of love. Hence afterwards he calls it the *glorious* gospel. The longer he speaks about it, the greater was his estimation of it. Notwithstanding the god of this

world and his blinded votaries, opposed and rejected the gospel, he gloried in it. There were three subjects about which the apostle never speaks, but with ardent affection and admiration. *Christ*, whose name was to him as "ointment poured forth." Hence often when his name is incidently introduced, he never leaves it until he has described many of its excellencies. The *grace* of God. He was an extraordinary example of the power and sovereignty of divine grace. "In him first, Jesus Christ had shown forth all long-suffering for a pattern to them, who should afterward believe in him unto life everlasting." He had taste! in a high degree that the Lord is gracious, and therefore was constrained to celebrate his grace. He speaks of the riches of his grace; the exceeding riches of his grace; of the glory of his grace,—the gospel in which Christ and his grace are revealed. Before his conversion, he hated it. He breathed out blasphemies against it. But now it was the subject of his preaching, his meditation and conversation. He counted all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus his Lord. To the Romans, (ch. i. 16.) he says, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ," &c. To the Galatians he says, "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me and I unto the world." "He did not count his life dear to him, so that he might finish his course with joy, and the ministry which he had received of the Lord Jesus to testify the gospel of the grace of God" (Acts xx. 24.)

Hence he was ready both to suffer and to die for the gospel. To the Philipians he says, "Yea and if I be offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy and rejoice with you all." (Phil. ii. 17.)

5. The interest which the Corinthian believers, had in the gospel, may be also intimated in the term "*our gospel*." Though the apostle was a Jew, yet he often identifies himself with the Gentiles to whom he wrote. This was calculated to conciliate the affections of the Gentiles, whose apostle he was.

All christians have a most intimate concern in the gospel. By the gospel they were at first brought to believe; "faith comes by hearing the word of God." It is the means of their regeneration, "of his own will begat he us by the word of truth." It is the means of their sanctification. "They are sanctified and cleansed through the washing of water by the word." It is their charter for the heavenly inheritance. It is the foundation of their faith, the source of their joys. It is a trust committed to them for the keeping and improving of which they are accountable. (Jude 3.) With propriety therefore it is called their gospel.

II. It is proposed to speak of the persons to whom this glorious gospel is hidden. They are described from their unbelief; their devotedness to Satan as their God; their blindness and their lost condition.

1. From their unbelief, "They believe not." To all unbelievers the gospel is hidden. Faith is the eye by which the glory of the gospel is perceived. But those who have no faith, have as little knowledge of the mysteries of the gospel as a blind man has of colors, or a deaf man of music. Unbelief is a plague of the heart, which hearers of the gospel should be solicitous to be delivered from, for while it predominates they will derive no benefit from the gospel, however pure or abundant the dispensation of it may be. "The word preached did not profit them not being mixed with faith in them that heard it." That you may understand its nature and be excited to strive against it, I will make the following observations. And

(1.) It is a natural plague. We are naturally disposed to call in question the veracity of God. There is not one doctrine contained in the Bible, which we are disposed fully to credit. We are especially inclined to disbelieve the gospel, on the following accounts, (1.) The sublimity of its doctrines. The gospel is the wisdom of God in a mystery. "Great is the mystery of godliness." It is beyond the comprehension of carnal reason; "the natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God; they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them for they are spiritually discerned." Mankind have naturally a pride of understanding. They are unwilling to believe those things which they cannot understand. Hence the many attacks which have been made upon divine revelation itself, by its avowed enemies; and upon some of its most glorious mysteries, by its pretended friends. But they are equally as incapable of understanding the least as the greatest mysteries. When our Lord discoursed with Nicodemus concerning regeneration, he answered, "How can these things be?" His conceptions were very gross and absurd. He apprehended that regeneration was a second natural birth; "how can a man be born when he is old, can he enter the second time into his mother's womb and be born?" (2.) The natural improbability of some of its doctrines. As there are some things in the gospel too high for the comprehension of the carnal mind, so there are some things which it conceives too low to merit its regard. It cannot reach to some doctrines, and will not stoop to others. Hence the cross of Christ was a stumbling block to the Jews, and to the Greeks foolishness. It offended the carnal faith of the former, and the carnal reason of the latter. The Jews did not look for the redemption of their nation by the death of their Messiah. And as little apprehensive had the Gentiles been that their world could be redeemed by the same means, which they considered as highly foolish and absurd. And the offence of the cross is not yet ceased. Many still view the incarnation and death of God's Son as improbable, nay absurd; consequently they view all the ordinances of the gospel as trifling and insignificant institutions, &c. (3.) A sense of guilt prompts to the rejection of the gospel. What proves the necessity of the gospel, creates disbelief in it. Guilt excites men to desire to have no intercourse with God. It was this which made Cain go out from the presence of the Lord. It was this which made the publican stand afar off. It was this which made even Peter say, "Depart from me for I am a sinful man, O Lord." A guilty conscience assures the sinner that God is his enemy. And when God comes to him, even though in the way of revealing and offering mercy, he is disposed to say, "hast thou found me, O mine enemy?"

(2.) Unbelief is a plague very hard to be cured. There are two circumstances which prove that the cure of it is difficult. It is a disease of the *understanding*; and it seems to be *reasonable*. Reason condemns some sins, such as drunkenness, licentiousness, &c., and aids in resisting them. But reason pleads for unbelief, what! shall a man believe a thing he cannot comprehend—what he never saw? It is a disease of *long continuance*. That person who was possessed from childhood, was hardly cured. The disciples could not eject the unclean spirit. Our Lord informs them, when they inquired why they could not, that "this kind go not out but by fasting and prayer." Unbelief is deeply rooted in our nature. We are born unbelievers, and unbelief grows with our growth and strengthens with our strength. It is only removed by an influence which is almighty and irresistible. It yields not to the most persuasive eloquence or con-

vincing arguments. How few believed in Him, who spoke as never man did? It was not overcome by the force of miracles. Though Christ wrought the most splendid miracles, yet but few believed in him. Even those who should have yielded the most ready assent to the report of the gospel, were most unbelieving, viz. the ecclesiastical rulers of the Jews, and Christ's own kinsfolk. The former gloried in their ability to resist his doctrine and miracles. "Do any of the rulers believe in him?"—And of the latter it is said, "none of his brethren believed in him."

And after the cure is begun, how slowly does it progress? How frequently do we find the people of God staggering through unbelief. Our Lord frequently reproved, and sometimes upbraided his disciples for their unbelief and hardness of heart.

(3.) As the cure is difficult, so the disease is DANGEROUS. It is seated in the vital part. It will undoubtedly issue in eternal death, unless cured. And often it comes to a sudden and fatal crisis. Unbelief is a fundamental error in religion, and therefore damning. It is a departing from the living God. It is ignorance of him, whom to know is life eternal.

It is a sin peculiarly aggravated, and therefore marked with the peculiar displeasure of heaven. It is a calling the truth, the faithfulness, the goodness and power of God into question. It is a direct denial of the truth of his word. It gives him the lie. No wonder, then, if God have evinced his displeasure against it, in a peculiar manner. From unbelief the Prince of Samaria was trodden to death in the gate of Samaria. For unbelief, the carcasses of several hundred thousand persons fell in the wilderness. For unbelief, the Jews were finally rejected, their country invaded, their city and temple laid in ruins; above a million of themselves destroyed, and the rest carried into captivity. In a word, wrath has come upon them unto the uttermost.

Let these and other considerations excite us all to take heed lest there be in any of us "an evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God."

2. Those to whom the gospel is hid are described from their devotedness to Satan, the God of this world. Here we may enquire, what we are to understand by the world, and what by Satan's being the God of this world?

1st. What are we to understand by the world? Sometimes the world means the earth upon which men reside. (Ps. xxiv. 1.) Sometimes mankind. (Rom. v. 12.) Sometimes the wicked and unbelieving part of mankind. (John xv. 18.) Sometimes the Gentiles. (Rom. xi. 12.) It is taken here in the last two senses.—The wicked are called the world 1) to denote their multiplicity. There are but few chosen: there are few that will be saved. (2) Their attachment to the enjoyments of this life. In speaking of them, the Psalmist calls them, "The men of this world, whose portion is in this life." (3) That this world is their residence—They are the inhabitants of this world; not like the children of God, who are strangers and pilgrims on the earth.

2nd. In what sense is Satan the God of this world? Satan has no claim to the persons, affections and service of the men of this world. He is called their God:—(1) Because he has usurped authority over them. He rules in them as the children of disobedience. (2) Because God in just judgment has given mankind into his power as a punishment for their apostacy from himself, their only sovereign. In this sense, all mankind, when born, are the subjects of Satan. But there is a peculiar sense in which God gives individuals over to Satan in this life. When his patience

and grace are abused; when for a great while he entreats sinners to know and acknowledge him to be the true God and their God, and to worship—glorify him accordingly—and they refuse, he often gives them over and up to Satan. Agreeably to the imprecations of the 109th Psalm, “He lets Satan stand at their right hand.” (3) Because wicked men voluntarily devote themselves to Satan. Sometimes Satan is represented as their master. (Rom. vi. 16.) Sometimes as their father. (John viii. 44; 1 John iii. 10.) Sometimes as their king. Hence he is called the prince of this world. (John xii. 31.) But here he is called their God. They not only render him service as a master; obedience as a father; subjection as a sovereign, but worship and honor as a God.

But you may ask, who worships Satan as his God?

It is answered:—(1) There are some nations that worship Satan, &c. &c. (2.) The idolatrous and superstitious worshipping of the true God, is the worship of Satan. The Jews offered their children in sacrifice, in imitation, as they pretended of Abraham, who had offered Isaac. But God declares that the sacrifice was to devils. (Ps. cvi. 37.) The apostle declares, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, though it was not their intention to offer them to devils, but to their gods. (1 Cor. x. 20.) The worship, which was paid to the true God, through the idols of Dan and Bethel, was in God’s estimation, the worship of devils. The priests, who were ordained by Jeroboam for the high places, are said to be for the devils. (2 Chron. xi. 15.)

Paul declares that christians, in partaking of the sacrifice of the heathen, had no fellowship with God. (1 Cor. x. 20.) A false religion is a device of the devil; and those who are votaries of it, are the worshippers of the devil.

(3.) The love and practice of sin are acts of devotion to Satan as a God. When a christian performs a good action, he worships God. He expresses his devotion to Him; for God has enjoined the action; he takes delight in it: he moves the person to perform it. His kingdom is advanced by it, and he confers a reward for it. Accordingly, when a man commits a sinful action, he expresses the same devotion to Satan, and for the same reasons. Satan requires his servants to perform sinful actions. Hence they are called works of the devil. He delights in them. He prompts to them. His kingdom is advanced by them. And he will pay all his servants their full wages. He will be the instrument as well as the companion of their torments.

3. They are described from their blindness. (1) We are by nature children of darkness. The natural man has no spiritual discernment. He may have strong intellectual powers of perception, but he is destitute of moral perception. (2.) There is a wilful blindness. Men are sometimes chargeable with shutting their eyes against the light. The wise man represents them as loving simplicity, hating knowledge, setting at nought God’s counsel, &c. (Prov. i. 22.) Isaiah brings the same charge against them. (Is. xxvi. 10, 11) “Let favor be showed to the wicked, yet will he not learn righteousness: in the land of uprightness will he deal unjustly and will not behold the majesty of the Lord. Lord, when thy hand is lifted up, they will not see,” &c. Job describes them as saying to God, “Depart from us, for we desire not the knowledge of thy way.” Peter represents them as willingly ignorant. (2 Pet. iii. 5.) “Of this they are willingly ignorant.” (3.) There is a penal or judicial blindness. This follows wilful blindness. And it is blindness, with which God strikes sinners. When they will not see, he says they shall not see.

When they wilfully close their eyes, he declares they shall not open them again. (John xii. 39, 40.) This blindness is to be considered as a sin, and as the punishment of sin. In the former view of it, it is to be ascribed to the sinner and to Satan; in the latter, to God, who is the author of all judicial strokes. God blinds men's eyes in a way fully consistent with the holiness and purity of his nature. (1.) By withholding light. He does not make them blind. When he offers them the means of illumination, and they refuse to improve them, he often, as a punishment of their unbelief, refuses to give them an heart to perceive and eyes to see, and ears to hear. He blinds them not by creating darkness in their minds; but by withholding light. He counsels them to buy of him eyesalve, that they may see. But setting at nought his counsels, he refuses to repeat and enforce it, and therefore they remain in darkness. (2.) By taking away that light which he affords them, and which they neglected or abused. God often affords sinners a considerable degree of the common light of the spirit. He opens their understandings speculatively to understand the scriptures. Now when persons thus enlightened do not improve their light, God often takes it away from them. When they do not receive the love of the truth, when they hold the truth in unrighteousness by acting contrary to light, he quenches their light, permits them to fall into errors and into the practice of sins, which tend to increase the blindness and madness of their minds. Consequently, they must err and stumble in judgment. For none but those who are taught by the spirit have just conceptions concerning sin and duty, virtue and vice.

(4.) Satan employs the world to blind their mind. This is intimated in the text, where he is called the God of this world. He knows full well that the love of the world and the love of God are incompatible. "*He that loveth the world, the love of the Father is not in him.*" When the world engrosses our confidence and our affections in an inordinate degree, the light of the glorious gospel is eclipsed. The interposition of the world between us and the Son of righteousness produces the same effect in the moral world, that the intervention of the moon between us and the sun produces in the natural world—an eclipse. That the love of the world creates a blindness in the mind, with regard to divine things, has been too extensively exemplified to admit of a doubt. How did the love of the wages of unrighteousness influence the mind of Balaam, notwithstanding the clear intimations which God gave of his mind to him? The ass upon which he rode reproved his stupidity and madness. Was it not covetousness which made the Pharisees reject, nay, deride the doctrines of Christ? (Luke xvi. 14.) Was it not the love of the world which blinded the eyes of the rich man, so that he could not get them opened, until in hell he lifted them up, being in torment? Was it not the same principle, which prevented the young man who came to Jesus, from taking up the cross of Christ? He could not think of abandoning his great possessions and taking up the cross. Was it not the love of money which prevented Judas from deriving any saving advantage from the instructions of Christ, and finally, prompted him to betray his Lord and forfeit his salvation for thirty pieces of silver? Was it not worldly-mindedness, which made Demas forsake the society of the apostles and abandon the work of an evangelist? In a word, was it not the riches and cares of this world, which choked the word in those who are denoted by the seed sown among thorns?

Satan employs the world with more effect in blinding the mind, than any other means. (1.) The enjoyments of the world are sensible things,

and consequently have greater influence upon the mind, than the enjoyments of religion which are matters of faith, and to a worldly man, matters of uncertainty. (2.) They are present enjoyments; whereas, those which the gospel exhibits are future. (3.) They are lawful in themselves; and their evil consists only in the abuse of them. Hence, mankind are less apprised of their danger in blinding their minds. It is highly probable that more are lost through the abuse of lawful enjoyments, than in the pursuit of unlawful gratifications, (4.) The worldling and the covetous make the world their God. "Covetousness is idolatry." (Coloss. iii. 5.) It is true the voluptuary makes his belly his God. (Phill. iii. 18.) But the world, in a peculiar sense, is the God of the covetous man.

There are three things, which make any thing or person our God, esteem, trust and service. Esteem—that which we esteem the chief good and source of our happiness, we make our God. Now a covetous man views the world as his chief good. The temporary transport of passion no man ever yet pronounced his *summum bonum*, chief good. His reason upon calm reflection, declares them to be vanity and vexation of spirit. But the worldling views the world in a very different light. *Confidence or trust*—This is what the true God claims from us, but the covetous man gives it to mammon, his god. He makes gold his confidence. The rich man's wealth is his strong city. He "makes a mock at the counsel of the poor, because he puts his trust in the Lord. *Service*—our God is entitled to our service. "Ye cannot serve God and mammon." And is not the votary of mammon assiduous and diligent in serving the object of his supreme affections and confidence?

That we are in danger of being enamored and destroyed by the world, appears from the many cautions and warnings which are directed to us concerning its influence. (Read 1 Tim. vi. 8-10-17.)

Having stated the ways in which spiritual blindness is produced, it may be proper to exhibit the evil and danger of it. And

1. It is an evil which affects our better part, our soul. To have a deformed mind, is a greater evil than to have a deformed body. To have the eyes of the understanding blinded, is infinitely worse than to be totally deprived of bodily sight. To have the soul diseased in the slightest degree, is a greater malady than to have the body covered from the sole of the foot, even unto the head, with wounds and bruises, and putrifying sores. In a word, the greatest external beauty cannot make up for the smallest degree of deformity of mind. Of this, however, but few are convinced. Hence, every attention is bestowed upon the body, to the neglect of the improvement and cultivation of the mind. Every means is used to remove a disease which threatens the body, but the diseases of the mind are suffered to commit ravages upon its faculties, without any attempt to check their progress. No efforts are made to subdue the pride, vanity, selfishness, malevolence, ambition, &c., and to nurture the "fruits of the Spirit, which are love, peace, joy, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, against which there is no law." But this inattention to the moral improvement of the mind, is an evidence of the blindness of it. If men perceived the value and excellence of their souls, they would not neglect their interests. They would be convinced that it would profit them nothing, though "they were to gain the whole world and lose their own souls."

2. It is an evil which affects the best power of our better part—the understanding. The depravation of the best thing, is necessarily the worst of evils. It is the understanding, which distinguishes us from the

inferior parts of God's creation. The want of it cannot be supplied by a title to a kingdom or the possession of the whole world. Nebuchadnezzar's loss of his kingdom was great, but not half so great as the loss of his understanding. But the whole mind, blinded by the god of this world, is without an understanding. "The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God." "Thou fool, this night shall thy soul be required of thee." He is declared to be the most egregious and stupid of fools. "Vain man would be wise, though he is born like a wild ass's colt." He is like an ass, which is possessed of less sagacity than any other beast of the field; to a wild ass, which has received no improvement from domestication: to a wild ass's colt, whose stupidity is still greater than that of its dam. In a word, he is reduced by blindness of mind to a condition more degraded than that of the inhabitants of the stable or of the forest. This is the situation of all mankind (by nature.) Hence we are exhorted to seek the wisdom which is from above; and with all our acquisitions, to get understanding. And to stimulate our search for this inestimable treasure, we are told that the Son of God came into the world "to give us an understanding that we might know him that is true," even the only true God and his Son Jesus Christ, whom to know is life eternal.

3. Spiritual blindness is an evil which, though it primarily and principally affects the understanding, yet it also produces an influence upon all the powers of the soul. This follows, from the influence which the understanding has upon those powers. The dictates of the understanding have a commanding influence over the will and affections: when the former are depraved the latter cannot be otherwise. When persons become vain in their imagination and their foolish heart is darkened, they are also given up to vile affections. When they become brutish in their knowledge, they also become brutish in their desires. When Nebuchadnezzar was deprived of his understanding, the heart of a beast was given unto him. This is just the case with regard to every blinded man. He is set upon sensual gratification. He is after the flesh, and therefore minds the things of the flesh. He minds earthly things.

But the affections of the blind man are not only earthly and sensual, but devilish. His heart is filled with passions, whose operations are often pernicious to others, and always to himself. He is under the dominion of hatred to God and man; he is filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness, envies; being without understanding—he is also without natural affections, implacable, unmerciful. Hence he is pronounced mad as well as foolish; "The heart of the children of men is full of madness, while they live," Hence he is not only an object of pity and contempt for his folly, but of horror and dread for his madness; which renders him not only the enemy of God, but of man. He is full of murder, debate, deceit. He murders his fellow-creature in his heart and sometimes lifts his hand against his life.

4. Spiritual blindness is an evil which increases in proportion to the time it is suffered to prevail. The mind is not blinded at once. As the natural darkness approaches by degrees, so does moral darkness. "Evil men and seducers wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived."

5. What renders the evil of spiritual blindness so great, is, that it is judicial. God smites sinners with penal blindness for their misimprovement of the light, which he affords them. This is a judgment, than which none can be heavier. Natural blindness is no certain evidence of

the divine displeasure. To that question, "Who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind." Jesus answered, "neither this man sinned nor his parents, but that the works of God should be made manifest in him." But when a man is struck with spiritual blindness, it may certainly be inferred that he has sinned, and that the end of his blindness is, that the *wrath* of God might be made *manifest in him*. When God smites the ministers of the word with dumbness, or the hearers of it with deafness; (that is to say) when there is either a veil upon the word or upon the heart;—he inflicts one of the most dreadful judgments. How awful is the case of those, who, for their not receiving the truth in the love of it are given over to strong delusions, that they might believe lies and be damned. (2 Thess. ii. 10) Woe be to that person of whom God says: "He is joined to his idols, let him alone." "He that is unjust let him be unjust still." Woe be to him, to whom God says "Drink and be drunken, and spue and fall, and rise no more." (Jere. xxv. 27.)

But though an *heavy* it is a *just* judgment. When persons will not understand, it is just that God say and swear, they shall not understand. When they will not believe, that they shall not believe. When persons shut their eyes against the light, it is proper that they should be punished with the loss of the powers and the medium of spiritual perception. The hand and the foot which the idle and slothful servant refused to employ were justly bound, and he cast into a place where he would have no opportunity to use them. As God rewards the improvement of grace with the increase of it, so he punishes the neglect of it with the loss of it. "To him that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance; but from him that hath not shall be taken away that which he hath."

God severely threatens children for their contempt of and disobedience to parents. "The eye that mocks at his father and despises to obey his mother, the ravens of the valley shall pick it out and the young eagles shall eat it." (Prov. xxx. 17.) And will God let the person that mocks at his instruction go unpunished? God denounces an awful judgment on unfaithful preachers of the word. (Zach. xi. 17.) "Woe to the idol shepherd, that leaveth the flock; the sword shall be upon his arm and upon his right eye; his arm shall be clear dried up and his eye shall be utterly darkened." The same vengeance awaits those who do not learn and improve the word.

4. Those to whom the gospel is hid are represented as in a *lost condition*. All mankind are by nature in a lost condition. They are children of wrath, heirs of hell, without God and without hope in the world. This is not the lost condition intended in the text. The Son of Man came to seek and to save them who are lost by nature. But those to whom his gospel is judicially hid are lost without any possibility of recovery. Their being lost implies these things. (1.) That they are lost in the purposes of God from all eternity. The influence which the gospel has upon man, is but the fulfilment of the divine decree. As many as are ordained to eternal life believe the gospel. But to those who are not ordained to eternal life the gospel is hid; "The election hath obtained it, but the rest are blinded." According as it is written, "God hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear, unto this day." (Rom. xi. 7, 8.) They are vessels of wrath fitted for destruction. (2.) They are lost with regard to their present state. The "wrath of God abideth on them, and

they are condemned already." The gospel is to them the savour of death unto death. What softens and enlightens others, tends only to harden and blind them. To them as well as to others the gospel is preached, but as its glory is hid from them, they receive no advantage from it.

(3.) They are lost eventually with regard to their state in eternity. Thus their portion is complete. In this life they enjoy some privileges and comforts, but in hell they will be punished, not only with everlasting but complete destruction, from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power.

Oh! how great is the loss which they sustain. It is an *incalculable* loss. Were they to lose the whole world, it could not be so great a loss. The soul is precious beyond all other things. "What would it profit a man though he were to gain the whole world and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" It is an *irreparable* and *eternal* loss. Never will the light of the gospel shine into their minds. They will be filled and surrounded with darkness. Never, never will they regain what they have lost. They once had the offer of salvation and despised it, and therefore they never shall have another tender of it.

#### IMPROVEMENT.

1. Hence we see the sin and misery of those who reject the gospel. Their *Sin*. They are unbelievers. They neglect and despise the great salvation. They are devoted to Satan as their God. They give that to Satan which is due only to God. Their *misery*. They are blind. They are possessed. They are lost, &c.

2. Ignorance is a damning sin. Many suppose that their ignorance will be their apology in judgment. But instead of this, it will be the ground of their condemnation. Many perish for lack of knowledge. God says concerning them, "'Tis a people of no knowledge, therefore he that made them will have no mercy upon them, and he that formed them will show them no favor." It is life eternal to know the only true God. All Christ's sheep know his voice. In order to salvation, persons must first come to the knowledge of the truth, &c.

3. We may see that persons may have a great deal of religious knowledge and yet have no saving knowledge. It is supposed that those to whom the gospel is hid, may have a speculative knowledge of its mysteries. Hence we read of some who possessed the knowledge of Christ and finally fell away. (2 Pet. ii. 20.) And the Apostle Paul declares it possible for persons to be once enlightened and to taste the good word of God and yet fall away irrecoverably. (Heb. vi. 4-6.)

#### ART. III. *Recollections of a Sermon.*

Mr. EDITOR.—It used to be a custom of the serious people in Scotland to repeat, as they went home, and after they were there, what they could remember of the minister's discourses. Some who were good at the pen took notes as the minister proceeded. Perhaps this latter method might be liable to some objection as a general practice; but the diligence used to retain the matter for the purpose of edifying conversation was commendable. It may be, that sometimes, they made words

to the speaker's *thoughts*, or even some little criticisms upon his discourse, still it was a profitable practice, and incomparably more like the Sabbath than that which has come in its stead. If you listen to conversation now on the Sabbath day, you will hear almost every matter touched but *one*, viz: the matter of the discourse. As to that they are as dumb as a stone. But if the *weather* is mentioned, the *news* of the day, the prices, the crops, the making of appointments, &c. &c., their heart is instantly full of thoughts, and they speak with readiness and ease, and their loud talk and smiling faces would lead one to infer that their wanton profanation of the Sabbath did not give them any compunction. When I was in Scotland, I used to follow the good practice a little myself, although by no means so good at it as many. I am loath to think of it being entirely given up. And with your leave, sir, I will tell you a bit of a sermon which I heard, that still continues fresh in my mind. I may, perhaps, put in some words, but I can safely say I will not do the sermon or the preacher any intentional injustice.

The text was Matth. xxvi. 21, "*And as they did eat, he said, verily I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me.*" Christ had sat down with his disciples to eat the Passover for the last time, and their hearts were full of sorrow at the thought of his leaving them. How startling must these words have been to them! They could not well bear the thought of such an event befalling him at all; how piercing, then, to the heart must this have been to be informed that *one of themselves* would do this awful deed! The prediction was infallibly certain, it fell immediately from the lips of *eternal truth*, and the event was just at hand. Jealous of their own hearts, none of them durst trust himself, and they said one by one, "Lord, is it I?" and Judas with the rest said, "Master, is it I?" to whom the searcher of hearts replied, "thou hast said" as much as "thou art the man." It would not be easy to describe the mingled feelings that now filled the hearts of the rest to find that it was not themselves—but he who had outstripped them all in professions of love to their Lord.

What an horrible crime was this! Look first at the place and advantage of the man. Not *one* of my avowed enemies, but one of *you*, my professed friends, with whom I have been on the most intimate terms and on whom I was fully warranted to rely. Not one of my less favored followers, but one of *you*, my own children, my own household, who sit at my table and eat my bread; who have heard all my familiar discourses; have seen all my miracles—witnessed my innocence of the things laid against me. *One* of you whom I have ordained to be my special and honored messengers of my kingdom, and who have wrought miracles in my name. Look at the cool-blooded determination with which he did it! Although the design was formed in the darkness of hell, yet was it in the full view of the Omniscient One, and in the same moment in which his heart closed on the purpose our Lord announced the fact. (John xiii. 18–21.) I speak not of you all, I know whom I have chosen; but that the scripture might be fulfilled: "He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up the heel against me." When Jesus had thus said, he was troubled in spirit, and testified and said, "verily, verily I say unto you that one of you shall betray me." Here was enough to have terrified any one who had not determined to go on at every hazard—here was the ancient prediction applied to one of them present—and to leave his mind without a doubt, the very deed which he had thought of is named in his presence by the Lord, who he perfectly well knew, un-

derstood the secret that was in his heart—"One of you shall betray me." Nothing daunted by this, he rises from the table to go to the priests, but before going, the Saviour hints to him still more pointedly that he knew what he was about, saying, "that thou doest do quickly:" but still he proceeded with his purpose. After two days reflection on the matter he continues to adhere to it, and at this time, just before going to perpetrate the awful deed, the Lord again warns him as in the text, and to add to the weight of it, he opens to his view the awful doom that awaited him: "good were it for that man he had never been born." But he, nothing terrified, boldly challenges Omniscience itself to speak, saying, "Master, is it I?" He was now made as sure as it was possible for him to be, that the ancient prediction—the solemn and repeated warning of the Lord, and the awful doom announced was meant for him, and would take place, but he was not to be arrested. The powers of hell were in his purpose, and he went and betrayed what he knew to be "the innocent blood."

Look at the contempt that was in the deed. It was a "lifting up his heel" against the Son of God for thirty pieces of silver. Look at the cruelty of it; he handed over *Him* who was the just one, the innocent and the holy Jesus, who never did any thing to mankind but deeds of mercy and love, into the hands of those that were thirsting for his blood. And look at the deceit and hypocrisy of it—he, too, would be deemed to be as full of sorrow at the idea of the deed as the rest, and said, "Master, is it I?" And to crown the whole, that expression, which more than all others is sacred to the purest warmest love in the heart, *the kiss*, is chosen as the signal to point out his victim:—"whomsoever I shall kiss that same is he, hold him fast!"

Words are wholly inadequate to express the fearful amount of crime that is here.

While I was musing on this awful deed, the preacher announced, as the next proposition which he intended to prove—That this awful crime may be *still* committed. What! thought I, how can that be? The sufferings of our Saviour are ended, and he is as far above the reach of his enemies as the third heavens are above the earth. But, says the speaker, (as if he had known the very thought that was in my mind.)—Christ has a *cause* on the earth still, and the man that will betray that cause would betray himself, if it were in his power—and Christ will doubtless reckon with him that "inasmuch as he did it to his *cause* he did it to himself."

The cause of Christ (says he,) is every thing in the church to which he has set his name, be it the doctrines of salvation by sovereign grace, or any of the ordinances for government and order or worship. These cannot be betrayed without betraying his name, and his name is himself. It stands for all that he is, God-man, Mediator. But that particular of his cause which is for the time contested and opposed by his enemies, (for some particular of it always is so) may be considered as in an especial manner his cause, as his whole cause stands or falls with it. Is the question at issue whether Jesus is the Christ? then that is his cause; or is it whether He is God as well as man? that is it. The betraying of his cause as it is involved in the truth presently contested, is peculiarly aggravated. It was this that made the act of Judas so aggravated. He betrayed the present truth. So far as he could, he overthrew the Messiahship and gave his testimony in favor of the assertion that he "deceiveth the people." This was to strike a blow at the very existence

of his cause in the world. Besides, Christ has a people in the world that are dear to him. They are given to him of his Father and purchased by his precious blood. They are united to him vitally by his spirit dwelling in their hearts. They are his body. They are himself. He that touches them touches the apple of his eye. He that persecutes them persecutes him. He that betrays them betrays him. These remarks will show that he *may* still be betrayed in as many points as there are points of attack by his foes, in all the doctrines of truth taught in his word:—in all ordinances for worship, and in every point of order and government which may be drawn into litigation he may be betrayed. Neither are you to think that “thirty pieces of silver” must always be his price. That is but the representative of innumerable considerations for which it is done. The prophet, in bitter irony, calls it “a goodly price,” but truly it is often for less than this, yea, for nothing at all, or to gratify one proud revengeful feeling. But pride, honor or emolument, is the most common price for which His cause is sold.

But it is not every one that can be a Judas. The ignorant may be as willing and wicked, they may bind and blindfold him, they may scourge and crucify him but they cannot reach to this crime; it requires *knowledge*. Judas knew who it was that he sold. He knew his purity and his power as the Son of God. Neither is it every one that has knowledge that can contract guilt of this character. They may show as much malice. They may impute his mighty works to a connivance with the Devil as the Pharisees did. They may ascribe every horrible vice to the influence of his doctrine, as Persecutors have done—may call it popery, &c., as deceivers and false teachers have done, but their knowledge and their malice combined cannot carry them this far, they must in some way be put in trust with the cause of Christ. But then they may. If a prince at his coronation should swear to defend the protestant religion and then do his utmost to favor popery, he would be a traitor. Charles II. did this in a most striking manner. And men in different situations may do it likewise.

But it is church members, elders and ministers that are most frequently left to fall into this dreadful sin. It is not to be looked for in the world. That private members have a weighty trust committed to them, I need not say in this place. Their hearts are the temple of God and they promise to keep it for him. They are intrusted with the cause of Christ in his truth and ordinances and laws, and especially with the *present truth*—to hold it fast—to witness for it, especially in their lives conformed to it and to support and spread it. If they shall open their hearts to some base lust, or give some idol Christ's place,—or abandon their profession for pieces of silver or acres of land or other earthly object,—or make of it a cloak to a carnal, ungodly life; or leave it unsupported and untaught, how can it be they are not traitors? Or if they shall join the rabble that follow some Judas to aid him in his dark designs, their conduct is no better, and they are accomplices in his deeds besides. Consider my hearers, as you value Christ, what you hear as his gospel; search the scriptures to see if it is so, and what is laid down to you as the law of his house. Look to it brethren. Judas cannot act his hellish tragedy alone. There must be false people in the pews as well as false teachers in the pulpit; and think not that the judgments of God will pass you over as blameless because *they* pretend to be God's servants, and *you* pretend to hear them as such. The lion that tore in

pieces the man of God that came from Judah, paid no regard to the fact that he was deceived by the prophet that lied to him. It is often said among the people that apostacy and betraying Christ has been begun and carried on by false teachers. I need not question the truth of it; but I call you to consider how short a way they could go in their mischief and treachery, if you the people were neither culpably ignorant of the scriptures and your duty, nor *willing* to be deceived by them.— Were it not for *you*, no system of false worship could ever go into operation, nor Judas dare to approach with treacherous kiss his Master.— Had not you, the people, wandered after antichrist, he never could have reared his head. Think I beseech you how much of the sin of false and deceitful teachers lies at your door.

Elders also may betray Christ in many ways. They have a great trust committed to them, even the right administration of the ordinances of Christ in his church, and the preservation of her purity. And they make very solemn and express engagements to be true and faithful to the same. They are generally the most intelligent and experienced in the congregation, so that they cannot be supposed ignorant of what is entrusted to them, or of their accountability for it. Their station is at the door of Christ's house as porters, and their duty is to watch. If they should but fall asleep at their station it would be accounted by men a high crime, and is generally punished with death. But how *much* greater a crime would it be in them to open the door and let Judas in, or the motly rabble that follow at his back? Though they do not themselves in this case either give the kiss to Christ, or help to bind and lead him away, will any man in sober judgment say that they have not made the deed their own?

There are not a few that think they are clear because they sit silent in the court of Christ's house, while the plot is executing, or stay at home, with abundance of loud complaining of the evil done. But they are very far from it. If it were but their enemy's ox or ass that needed their assistance, they could not be clear. But who can tell the amount of their guilt when it is their Redeemer? Let not your false excuses blind your eye and sear your conscience. If ever there is a time to *forsake all for Christ*, and cleave to him with purpose of heart, it is when he is about to be betrayed by his professed friends, who eat of his bread. As you wish Christ to own you when he comes in his glory, "come forth *now* to the help of his people and cause, against the mighty."— Awaken up your souls to a sense of all the interests which depend on the vigilant and faithful discharge of your office.

Ministers of the gospel may betray Christ. And when they do, they come nearest to Judas of all others. To explain this, I would offer the following things. *First*, they give up worldly pursuits and give themselves to a long course of preparatory studies for the service of Christ. This is, in itself, a strong declaration to all, that their mind and heart are strongly with Christ. By this, they warrant all men to expect that they will, on all occasions, be clearly for him. *Second*, They have more knowledge of the cause of Christ, than other men. They know its worth. They know where it lies, and of course how it may be betrayed. Like Judas, they know the place (the point of truth or order, doctrine or discipline) where Christ is. Their mind has been often with him there. Their advantage for this is very great. For it is their calling, and their main business to be with him every day—to hear the words that he speaks, to see the works of grace and mercy that he does,

and the travel and the suffering that he undergoes. *Third*, Their office lies entirely in faithfulness to Christ. The call and occasion to be faithful to him is not a rare occurrence,—or given a few times only in their life or on some great emergency, that they may through infirmity be in danger of *forgetting* it. It is daily. It is always—on all occasions, and in all places—they cannot take a single step in their duty, understandingly, without being reminded of it. Are they in the pulpit or in the court, in the family or in the community, in their study or wherever else, the cause of Christ is standing in full view, and calling on them to be faithful. *Fourth*, Their vows of faithfulness are solemn, express, and often repeated. In common with others, they have at their admission to the church, and the Lord's table, and in public Religious Covenanting, solemnly engaged to be true and faithful. When they enter on the theological course, they substantially declare that this is their great and leading motive. When they are licensed, they do formally vow to the Lord Jesus Christ, as may be seen in the questions that are then put to them; and finally when they are ordained, they again vow to him, and with more particularity. If then, after all this, they shall prove false, words would fail to speak their guilt. *Lastly*, They know that the flock of Christ look to them as safe and trusty guides, who will not lead them astray. And if in this confidence, the people transcend the measure due to mere servants, ministers are the more bound not to betray them, and the more guilty if they do it.

To the question, How may a minister turn traitor to the cause and people of Christ? I will say a few things. The ways in which he may do this, are many; and the points of truth and duty, which may for the time be in an especial manner that cause, are innumerable. But in particular, when a minister seeks chiefly himself and not Christ, he is a traitor.—He has promised to seek the honor of Christ, as the chief end of his office. For this end it was given to him; but he turns it to his own account; he makes it a step to popularity. He courts applause, and is not content unless he is half worshipped by the people. To reach his ends, he scruples not to soothe their consciences and allay their fears, by flattering their vanity and sparing their faults. And what is this to the truth of Christ, and the souls of men, but betraying them unto their worst enemies? “a sacrificing to his own net and burning incense to his own drag.”

Again, a minister who lives an ungodly life, has a vain or filthy conversation, indulges his children in vanity, and reproves them not for sin; or is a worldly man, and ever upon the watch to increase his wealth, is a Judas; while in the pulpit he gives the kiss, and emphatically cries, “hail, Master;” but when out of it, he gives him over into the power of the wicked, to speak reproachfully and blaspheme his holy cause. His practice gives the lie to all the solemn truths which he utters with his lips. His office and his sound preaching, are turned into a cloak for covetousness, and a veil for the vilest of hypocrites. The more soundly and abundantly such a man preaches the doctrine of Christ, so much the more he wounds him in the house of his friends. He holds out the strongest temptation to his people to cast away their profession, as a thing of no value; and to crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame.” If his testimony, taken as a whole, is to be believed, the Infidel is right who rejects Revelation as a fable.—When a minister uses his office and talents to supplant the true doctrine of the gospel, by that which is only a doctrine of men, he is a traitor.

Or which amounts to the same, when he goes over to another profession in which he knows errors and corruptions are contained—without warning to those who confided in him as faithful to his solemn vows—for the sake of popularity or wealth, he cruelly betrays the cause that was trusted to him. He causes agonies and unspeakable grief to the mystical body of Christ now, but soon or late it will return upon himself. He will come to say, “I have sinned, in that I have betrayed innocent truth.” When a minister prostrates the authority and order of Christ to his own self-will, when he had promised and it was expected of him that he would do just the reverse, and make his self-will bow to the laws of Christ,—when he tramples on it with his feet, as if it were a vile thing,—and to enlist men against it, calls it persecution, oppression, popery, despotism, and the like, what can he be but a rebel and a traitor both. He vowed most solemnly to maintain this order in the church, and to submit to it himself; but when it claims from him, in the name of Christ, the obedience of faith; he calls it a devil and a Samaritan, one that would rob the people of dear liberty, that he may arouse popular vengeance against it, and win the day. This is to betray the Son of Man with great professions of love.

So it appears evident that none in the visible church are secure against this awful sin. Private members are not, by their humble station or small attainments, below the danger, nor are ministers, by their high place and great talents, above it. All ought to be afraid.

The next proposition of his discourse was something like this:—This is sinning at so high a rate and so much beyond the common road of transgressors, that God frequently goes out of the ordinary way of his dealing with sinners, to visit the betrayer in a manner equal to his conduct. He mentioned in the illustration of this, several things that God does, chiefly taken from the fearful case of Judas, as,

*First*, He frequently causes them to be in one way or other turned from their place in the church, that his people may be deceived by them no more. Are they private members? he either casts them out of the church by a due course of discipline, or leaves them, and then they do it themselves. Are they ministers? they are in a similar way turned out of office. Judas cast himself from the apostleship. He fell from it by transgression.

*Second*, He sometimes lets fall a drop of his wrath in their conscience, which kindles a fire in it that cannot be quenched. Then the poor wretched man can take no rest. Instead of comfort from Christ, the very thought of him pierces his soul through. His thirty pieces of silver, or whatsoever else it was, yields him no satisfaction now. It turns round and becomes king's evidence. Yea, he must either turn evidence against himself, and say, “I have sinned, I have betrayed innocent blood,” or be consumed by an insupportable horror within.

*Third*, He said, the betrayer of his profession seldom got much respect paid him by his new friends. They know that he is a traitor, and they dare not trust him. As to his trouble for what he has done, they say, “what is that to us.” Just as the chief priests and scribes of old. They had no common feeling of sympathy with Judas after their end was accomplished. They had not a single word of comfort for him, but rather implied by what they said, that he must stand alone under the infamy of his own conduct. And it is frequently the case with those that betray Christ to please men, or become popular with a great party.

*Fourth*, God sometimes sets a mark of awful import upon traitors in

their end. Judas was an instance of this. Ahithophel his type was another. For a more full and particular account of the Divine judgments which are executed upon traitors, the minister referred us to the six. Ps. from verse 6th to 19th inclusive, which he recommended us to read at home.

I thought within myself, at the time, of Bishop Sharp's death, who vilely betrayed the cause of Christ. But perhaps it would not do so well for the minister to have spoken of that in the pulpit. The case was shortly this. The Presbyterians entrusted him with their interest at the court in London, in persecuting times, but he, instead of faithfully acting his part in their behalf, turned Episcopalian himself, and came down to Scotland a bishop. It was not long after, till he was way-laid and shot in his carriage.

There were a great many more instances that could be mentioned. There are some of them recorded by Mr. Fleming, in the "Fulfilling of the Scripture," that are very remarkable. Mr. William Couper, a minister in Perth, and one who witnessed with much zeal against Prelacy, both by preaching and writing is one instance. To one who had gone over to the Bishops, and was entreating his charity, he writes as follows:—"Sir, For yourself I never hated you, but the course you are in, I never loved. How dangerous is their estate who cannot rise but with the fall of many, who in Christ have entered the right way to the ministry—closing these fountains which God had opened—doing in a matter of conscience with doubting turns men's light to darkness—whence follows induration. Therefore I cannot stand with you except to witness to God in my heart against you. Consider yourself where you was, and where you now are, and how very small the thing is for which you have left us." But the very man who thus speaks so well, shortly after turns Bishop himself, and was loathed by the godly in his turn. Some of his old friends brought to him some of his own Sermons and desired him to reconcile them with his after actings, which did visibly affright and disquiet him. One day being at pastime near Leith, he was suddenly terrified with the apprehension that he saw armed men coming upon him. Those about him told him it was no such thing, it was only a dream. Upon which he became silent and fell a trembling. After he went home he took bed and died in much anguish of spirit—often pointing to the earth crying, a fallen star, a fallen star.

Mr. Andrew Foster, minister of Dumfermline, was another. He was sent as commissioner to the Assembly of 1610, and solemnly adjured by his brethren as he should answer to Jesus Christ not to consent to any alteration in the government of the Church. Yet he voted for Prelacy, having got 50 marks from the Earl of Dumbbar, (who made use of that argument to break some of those wretches,) a small sum indeed for the cause of Christ, and by him very dear bought. For after his return he fell sick, and being recovered he was seized with horror of conscience in the pulpit while preaching and ran out of it saying he had sold Christ for money, became distracted, and died in infamy and debt.

But to proceed with what more of the sermon I remember. The minister said that every one of us ought to take the alarm as the disciples did and say, "Lord is it I"—that there was enough of deceit in our heart to carry us all the length that Judas had gone. And if we had not done it, it was owing to the restraining grace of God—that we ought to distrust our hearts at all times—and keep a watchful eye upon all their emotions, motives and purposes—and bring them to the test of

God's word—and that we ought not to rest in our own examinations, but ought to engage Christ himself, who knows all that is in them, to search and try them until they are sanctified perfectly. In a word, that we would find that our greatest safety was in much, frequent, fervent, humble prayer to God that he would take the keeping of our spirits into his own hand.

Mr. Editor, if you think it fit for your Monitor, you are welcome to it. I remain your hearty friend, as long as you are a friend to the good old ways of

BY-GONE TIMES.

#### ART. IV. *Obituary of the Rev. Samuel Douthat.*

MR. EDITOR:—The present is a time of so lamentable a prostitution of the pulpit and press in regard to obituary notices, that the otherwise pleasing and edifying duty has greatly ceased to be interesting. Owing either to a vitiated tone of public sentiment, or a disposition in funeral orators to administer an anodyne to the wounded feelings of the relations of the deceased, even at the sacrifice of truth, the generality of our funeral sermons, &c. are little else than elaborate eulogies on the life and happy death of the deceased. What renders it particularly painful is, that the panegyrist is often not only destitute of proper evidences that the subject of his remarks lived and died in Christ, but a mournful array of facts to the contrary; and yet, regardless of the deleterious influence such a course must exert on the morals of the community, he ceases not to pour forth his unmerited encomiums. But still, where we see a faithful picture of a christian's life, and view the cheering evidences of his triumph over death, we cannot but admire it, and feel a holy joy in adding such to the number of those worthies, whom the apostle describes as having "all died in faith." A faithful picture, exhibiting the graces and cheering hopes of a dying believer, exerts a happy influence on the beholder, disposing him to live the virtuous life of such, that he may "die the death of the righteous." Perhaps something may be found in the sequel, which, by the blessing of God, may have this happy tendency. Some may think this notice out of season, a considerable time having elapsed since the event; but as it is not so much our purpose to bring the *person* before the view of the public, as some of those ennobling graces which characterize the life and death of Christ's followers, which were in some measure happily illustrated in the history of this individual, it is hoped the subject cannot yet be out of season for spiritual edification.

Respecting the birth and parentage of Mr. Douthat, it is deemed unnecessary to say any thing more than that he was favored with godly parents, who, like the parents of Samuel, devoted him to the Lord. This was a greater favor and an honor more desirable, than to have a royal ancestry, and to be born and raised up in the splendor of earthly courts, an heir to a perishable crown. At an early age, he felt the binding obligations of his baptismal vows, which in all their solemnity devolved upon himself, on his arrival at the age of moral responsibility. Of this he gave evidence by setting 'his heart to the house of the Lord,' and expressing a desire to serve him in the sacred office of the ministry.—

With a view to this, and as preparatory, he engaged in literary pursuits in the University at Pittsburgh; and under the superintendance of the Rev. Dr. Bruce, and other teachers of celebrity, he made such commendable progress, and conducted himself with so much sobriety and modesty, as entitled him to the respect of his class and preceptors.— The solemn appeal, “who is on the Lord’s side, who?” was nobly met by his public profession, “Thine are we, David, and on thy side, thou son of Jesse,” having united with a few despised witnesses in the testimony of Jesus, displaying a banner because of his truth. Having finished his literary course, and looking abroad on Zion’s desolate condition, on hearing the urgent call to “come to the help of the Lord, against the mighty” in the arduous warfare waging against the kingdom of darkness, he was heard to say, “Here am I, send me.” Accordingly, in the winter of 1831, he entered upon his theological studies, at the Associate Seminary, located at Cannonsburgh, Pa.

During the long term of which Mr. Douthat was a student, he found it necessary more than once to engage in the arduous task of teaching school, in which station, the suavity of his manners, and his facility for imparting instruction, gained for him a high reputation among his pupils, and patrons. But the burden of the task, and the necessary confinement, proved unfavorable to his health. It is to be regretted that so many of our young men, who have an ardent wish to serve Christ in the ministry, being generally the “poor of the earth whom Christ hath chosen,” have to spend the primrose of their youth, and waste their youthful energies, cloistered up in a secluded schoolroom, with a few children, in order to obtain the means necessary for completing their education. It is specially painful to witness many families professing the love of Christ, who roll in wealth and luxury at home, and whose fortunes flow out in an abundant stream for personal aggrandizement, or vain gratifications; but when that God, who bestowed on them their wealth as his free gift, makes a call in his providence upon them, for a pittance to help forward some virtuous, indigent youth, pursuing an expensive course of studies, this abundant source is dried up; and if it ever flows to charitable purposes, it is in very scanty rills. How many, deterred by the expenses of such a course, might, by a little pecuniary favor conferred without any injury being sustained, be encouraged by them to devote themselves to this important service of Christ; and how easily could they relieve many, struggling with such difficulties, to the great injury of their health? But by a shameful and sinful negligence on the part of such as have wealth, many young men are either wholly deterred, or are permitted to waste all their useful vigor, and injure their constitutions, by the confining, arduous occupation of teaching; in consequence of which, they are incapacitated for pursuing their theological studies with that improvement desirable; and, when licensed to preach, they have not that bodily health requisite to usefulness in their office. Mr. Douthat enjoyed but delicate health during most of his term at the Divinity Hall; in consequence of which, he was induced to decline attendance on the Lectures that season, in which his regular course of studies would have terminated; but the ensuing winter he returned, and completed his course.

Being recommended by the Board, he, by order of Synod, together with Mr. J. McGill, delivered the usual trials before the Presbytery of Ohio, in the summer of 1836; and was by them licensed to preach the gospel of life to the perishing. He labored with great acceptance in the

several Presbyteries in the bounds of which he was appointed; and a good evidence of his usefulness as a minister of Christ, was given by an inviting call which he received from the congregation of Belmont and McMahon's Creek, Ohio. Being ordered by Synod on the Western Mission, during the fall and winter of 1836, he rendered useful services in watering this interesting but destitute portion of God's vineyard.—His zeal and dilligence proved greater than his bodily strength, in prosecuting this arduous work. He had to encounter difficulties of such character and magnitude, as can be apprehended by none but a missionary. Towards spring he found his health beginning to decline, in consequence of exposures, and frequent preaching in unpleasant circumstances. Though his friends might regret to see him laboring with greater ardor than his delicate health warranted, yet the reader will rejoice to see manifest in him that devotedness and zeal, which is the distinguishing character of a true Ambassador of Christ, rendering him willing to "spend and be spent"—to labor "in season and out of season," and to give up himself, his time, talents, health and life, a sacrifice in the service of the Saviour, of whose great salvation he was the herald.

At St. Louis he embarked for Pittsburgh, where the Associate Synod was to meet May 24th, 1837, anticipating the pleasure of meeting with his brethren, and listening to their counsels. But God was, by disease, fast preparing him for meeting with "the general assembly" of saints and angels, perfected in bliss around the Father's throne, where Zion appears in her "beautiful garments," freed from the many defects and blemishes which stain her purest courts on earth. After landing in the city, he found himself able to attend Synod but about one day, till he was confined in his room. The Presbytery of Muskingum, wishing to present to him a call, had to repair to his own private apartment; and yet, hoping that he might be longer spared for usefulness, he accepted the call, purposing to enter immediately on the pastoral duties. But the Shepherd of Israel had purposed to take him to himself, and to feed him, and lead him beside fountains of celestial bliss.

He bore his sickness, and suffered his youthful prospects to sink in the gloom of a long night with a christian magnanimity. The writer had the pleasure of being with him during some part of his illness, and of witnessing him resigned, cheerful, pleasant, buoyant. Christ can make a sick bed a bed of pleasure, the hour of suffering an hour of rejoicing, the time when surrounding friends are weeping, the time when the soul in fellowship with God is cheered with the sweetest delight, with heavenly joys. When the man of the world, the devotee of pleasure, the worshipper of riches or fame, is prostrated by disease, he finds that he has made vanities and lies his refuge, that his streams of comfort are dried up, that all the resources of earth cannot administer the least anodyne for a moment to his poignant sufferings, and that a gloom of thick darkness hangs over the awful future, where death lives and hope dies, and remorse and despair his prospective portion. It is otherwise with him whose refuge is God, who in life by faith unlocked the fountain of living waters and drank the streams of spiritual consolation; having based himself on the rock of ages, he can with the utmost calmness and serenity of mind look down on the sea of this world's troubles, and though afflictions and Jordan's billows may beat sore against him, yet unmoved on this rock he is cheered with the delightful prospect of Canaan, and welcomes the messengers of death, which announce to him that within a few days he "must pass over Jordan." There was

evidence that Mr. Douthat was happily favored with that comforting and supporting influence which the religion of Christ gives to his true followers in the hour of trial. He was removed to a short distance from the city, where he lay till he was called home by death, which happened about two months after the meeting of Synod, the writer not being in possession of the precise date. He died resting on the arm of his beloved, leaning his head on his bosom, and expressing a confident assurance that he would live and reign with him who is "The resurrection and the life." He died lamented by his friends, beloved by his fellow-students, and respected by the christian community. His bud was just beginning to open on earth, and it was plucked by death to bloom a fair heavenly flower in Paradise above. Those who are candidates for the ministry, and they who have just entered on the discharge of the duties of this sacred office, are by this providence taught the value of time and the importance of embracing every opportunity of rendering some service to Christ. God has seen proper to call him, as he did Rev. Messrs. Wallace, McClelland, and several others, still dear in the memory of the church, just when they were making their first appearance on the stage of public usefulness; and thus at once blasted their own flattering prospects, and deprived the armies of Israel of such as promised to be efficient, honored leaders in fighting the battles of the Lord. Let all be instructed by such providences to improve the present time for doing good, and for preparing to meet with God in a dying hour and at the judgment, so that death may come not as a "king of terrors," but a welcomed friend, the key of life, the dawn of a bright day of eternal glories.

LA MORT UN AMI.

DEATH DESIRABLE.

- 1 Since Christ has vanquished death, his sting  
 Extracted, spoiled of all his power,  
 He comes a friend, not terror's king,  
 His visit welcomed, wished for hour,  
 The porter, key of life and bliss,  
 And sent in love,  
 By God above,  
 To bring us into Paradise.
- 2 The captive pris'ner who long bound  
 In loathsome dungeon dark has lain,  
 With longing waits, till time rolls round,  
 His wished release from gloom and pain;  
 So do I long till death shall come,  
 My prison ope,  
 And give me hope  
 Of freedom, life, in heaven my home.
- 3 As hireling waits with anxious thought  
 For his reward on the pay-day,  
 Or as the joy which tidings brought  
 Of life to victim doomed to die;  
 So waits my soul, such joy it gives  
 When I regard  
 My sure reward  
 At death, when God my soul receives.

- 4 As he who long despised, oppressed,  
Groaning in chains of slavery,  
Welcomed the day, and fondly blessed  
The hand which gave him liberty ;  
So welcome I death's friendship too,  
Which gives to me  
A jubilee  
From sin's vile slavery and woe.
- 5 Such joy as he who finds great weal,  
Or pearls, or a rich legacy ;  
Such transports as great warriors feel  
Gaining triumphant victory ;  
Such joys I feel when death shall bring  
Riches to me  
And victory  
O'er death and sin, through Christ my king
- 6 Delightful pleasures must him cheer,  
A husband, when from long exile  
Sweet home he sees, his wife most dear  
Embraces him with welcome smile ;  
More pleasant still to me is death,  
Which kindly lands  
Me 'mong blest friends  
In heav'n my home, exile on earth.
- 7 The crew long tossed on stormy seas,  
With vessel wrecked, would gladly see  
That longed-for hour when by some breeze  
On shore safe wafted soon they'll be ;  
More gladly still my dying hour  
Shall be to me,  
When I shall be  
Safe landed Jordan's swellings o'er.
- 8 On tiptoe hope the virgin bride,  
In raptures waits her wedding-day,  
When crown'd her wishes, by his side  
She loves, in bliss she seems so gay ;  
My raptures more, purer my bliss  
When dying I  
Shall happily  
Be wedded and with Christ always.
- 9 With anxious wish the royal heir  
Awaits his coronation day,  
When crowned, his earthly joys appear  
Complete, so splendid his array ;  
More splendid, joyous still is mine  
When death shall crown  
Me with renown,  
A king with Christ, my bliss divine.
- 10 Suppose some beggar chanced at once,  
Possessed of all earth's riches, fame,

Sov'reign of kings, and still advance  
 His pomp; his joys deserve no name,  
 Compared with those enjoyed by me,  
 When death shall make  
 Me once partake  
 Of life, bliss, immortality.—*La Mort un Ami.*

#### ART. V. *Slavery essentially Immoral.*

MR. EDITOR—We live in a very important era of the world. The signs of the times strongly indicate, that God is about to overturn, overturn, overturn, every obstacle that stands in the way of His reigning, whose right it is to reign. "He will scatter the people who delight in war," beating their swords into plowshares. "Princes shall come out of Egypt." "Ethiopia shall soon stretch out her hands unto God," redeemed from temporal and spiritual bondage. It is therefore no time for us to fold our hands in indolence, at so important a crisis—every christian at least should be at his post, having on the whole armor of God, "that he may please him, who hath chosen him to be a soldier." That we may not be liable to the charge of standing all the day idle, when there is important work assigned us, and that we may avoid the error on the other hand, of using unlawful means to bring about God's promises, as did the father of the faithful, or that we may not be found fighting against God by striving to obstruct his purposes, thus "rushing on the thick bosses of Jehovah's buckler;" it behoves us to ponder our path, and to take good heed to the sure word of God, "which is as a lamp unto the feet, and a light unto the path." Of the many obstacles which stand in the way of Christ's blessed reign, in this professed christian nation, we consider none of greater magnitude than the holding the sixth part of our population "as goods and chattels."

Man claiming the right of property in man, we consider to be the corrupt tree, which bears all the pernicious fruit that can be attributed to domestic slavery; and as long as *man* is considered *property*, no regulation of either church or state can remedy the flagrant evil. This depredator is unblushingly lifting its hideous, gigantic head, and corrupting both church and state with its noxious, pestiferous breath, in the very face of our free institutions, branding us as a nation of hypocrites.

That we have to grapple with this relict of barbarism under the noon-day sunbeams of the gospel dispensation, is truly deplorable. And that we are such "fools and slow of heart to believe" all that the prophets have so clearly revealed, directing our intercourse with our brethren of mankind, is equally so. The doctrine that all men receive from nature an equal right to freedom, is an unquestionable truth. Its antagonist, *many being made for one*, has not the most distant shadow of proof, in the charter of our rights, given by our Creator. If there is, who is to be the master? and who the slave? would be very important questions to be decided. We are surprised to see a writer in the September No. of the Monitor denying these self-evident truths. We

are sorry that so good a writer as A. R. should not have clearer conceptions on moral subjects. We think, if he would take a more minute view, through the glass that God has provided in his word, it would enlighten his moral vision. We are very anxious that so eloquent a writer as A. R. should use his pen for the advocacy of sound principles; for sound principles eloquently advocated, are like apples of gold, in pictures of silver.

In making a few passing remarks on the sentiments advanced by A. R., we may be rude in speech, but we hope we will not darken counsel, with words without knowledge. We consider it our duty to cast in our mite into the treasury of the Lord, for the promotion of the object for which Christ made his advent in the flesh—"glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace and good-will toward men." We do not profess to be qualified to "wield the pen of a controversialist;" but we consider it no time to roll up our talent in a napkin.

The weak things of this world, are often chosen to confound the things which are mighty. We hope that our few remarks will not be a means of preventing "An Abolitionist," from again taking the field, as he is much better equipped for this warfare, than ourselves; we hope we shall hear from him frequently. We account for the mystification of our brother A. R., on this principle, that familiarity with evil, blinds the eyes, and blunts the moral sensibilities; even Christians are not exempt from its contamination. He stated in a former communication, that appeared in the last March number of the Monitor, that he spent the most of his days amongst the slaveholders, and bore an honorable testimony to their hospitality, which we do not feel disposed to deny.

We think it is proper here to say a few words to correct a false impression, which is entertained by the votaries of slavery; viz: arguments given to show the iniquity of the system, manifest an implacable hatred against Southern men; and that it is equivalent to saying, that there is no good trait in their character; and that it is "consigning them en masse, to the regions of eternal woe." Against this perversion, we would enter our most solemn protest. That slavery has a most pernicious corrupting influence, on the morals of the community, where it is practised, we suppose slave-holders themselves, will not pretend to deny. We have no desire to hold up our Southern brethren as monsters of iniquity, more than any other portion of the human family, were they placed in the same circumstances; we do believe and are sure, many of them possess amiable qualities. It is not because we do not love them, "God knoweth," that we endeavor to impress them with the evils of slavery. We sincerely believe, that it is for their interest, both in time and eternity, to abolish slavery. Are we "become their enemy because we tell them the truth?" We hope we will not be found bringing any railing accusation against slaveholders; but hope to be enabled to speak the truth, with love; notwithstanding, we must be permitted to use such language, as will convey the truth.

To return from this digression—we were speaking of the honorable testimony, which was borne to the character of slaveholders, respecting their hospitality. Hospitality is certainly a very commendable virtue, when conducted on christian principles. Though bad as mankind are, it is not peculiar to christian communities; as there are many savages, who hold sacred the rules of hospitality; and we might confide in their protection for the safety of our persons, even supposing our mission to them were to root out their long established institutions—were

not this the case, an end would be put to all hopes of planting the standard of the cross in the heathen world. We would not, however, take upon us to vouch for the safety of a northern abolitionist, if he was known to be such, even while "sitting at the hospitable fire-sides" of slaveholders. But it must be remembered, that we do not speak of them, *en masse*. We hope, nay, we are sure, many of them are "lovers of hospitality, lovers of good men." This slavery is a "Delilah sin," it is very alluring. We must take care, that it does not beguile us with its wiles. It is attended with elegance and fashionable politeness. It adds very much to our ease. The sentence pronounced by our Creator, is amongst slave-holders revoked, "in the sweat of thy face, shalt thou eat bread," and the injunction of the Apostle, "he that does not work, should not eat." The slave-holder is perfectly at leisure to entertain company, which adds very much to the comfort of a visitor; and the lordly mistress thinks it beneath her dignity to "lay her hands to the spindle, or her hands to take hold of the distaff;" she has others to look to the ways of her household; she is at liberty "to eat the bread of idleness." Hence, with a retinue of servants to administer to our necessities, and faring sumptuously every day, in society with those who are clothed in purple and fine linnen, we certainly would "feel ourselves at home, when seated at their comfortable firesides." It is no wonder under those agreeable circumstances, that it would be recoiling to our feelings, to think that slavery was essentially in its nature immoral. But alas! let us examine the other side of the picture. All these enjoyments are purchased at the expense of the blood and sweat of our fellow men, wrested from them by cruel oppression, and are, in a majority of cases, the means of preventing us from entering into heaven ourselves, and hindering those that would. We have previously said, that hospitality is a commendable virtue, if conducted on christian principles. But "he that *oppresseth the poor* to increase his riches, and he that *giveth to the rich*, shall surely come to want."

We believe that holding property in man, is a flagrant violation of morality. In the first place, it is robbing God of the services of his creatures; and secondly, it is robbing man of one of his dearest rights, the right he has to his own faculties, both bodily and mental, for the promotion of the glory of God and his own happiness, both for time and eternity. What, not immoral to rob God? When did God relinquish his claim to the right of property in man? He says, "behold all souls are mine, as the soul of the Father, so also the soul of the Son is mine." And when did he relinquish this claim to the services of man? "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter, fear God, and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man." What, not immoral to rob a man of his natural rights? That he has natural rights, is self-evident. That a just and holy God, might have withheld those rights, is not the question. God seeing proper to continue us in existence, those rights are essential to the nature of our existence, and he has instituted civil government for the protection of those rights, that the strong may not wrest them from the weak. God does not require of us to make brick without straw: natural inequalities are insurmountable. These rights are essentially necessary, to qualify man to answer the end for which he was created. And is it not the essence of man-stealing, to extort these rights from him? What has the slave done to forfeit his rights? Why are they wrested from him? Is it because a vertical sun looked on his ancestors, and left its indelible impress? Is it because he is black? From whence, we say, *did* you get the right of property in

him ? Not from God ; and he is the sole proprietor. Or is he your property, because he or his ancestors were flagitiously torn from their country, by as fiendish a banditti of depredators, as ever disgraced the human family, and you have the power to perpetuate the wrong ? You know he or his ancestors were *stolen* ; well, “ he that stealeth a man or selleth him, or if he *be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death.*” Let our beloved professing christian brethren, who are slave-holders, if any such will favor us with a perusal of this essay, consider this matter.— This slave, man, woman or child, as the case may be, is found in your hand—you paid your money for him, or obtained him by paternal inheritance ; so did the Ishmaelites pay money for Joseph, and his brethren had as good a right to sell him, as any other individuals can have to sell an unoffending man. Yet Joseph says, “ indeed I was *STOLEN* away from the land of the Hebrews.” The statute against man-stealing, was not confined to the Jewish dispensation, as the Apostle recognizes its authority as binding. How long will it be necessary to retain stolen property, before the holder can have a just claim to it ? Every person knows, that a defect in the original title to a piece of property, according to civil law, invalidates the title arising out of every subsequent transfer. Now it is not in this case as it might be in some other cases of property, where the proper owner is not known, for we know that every man has a right to himself, subject always to the Great Proprietor. The very fact of this statute being given by God, shows conclusively, that man was never accounted *property*, as death was not the penalty for stealing *property*. They that stole property, were only to restore four-fold, but he that stole a human being *must die*. May we not most justly give as one reason ? “ because in the image of God made he man.” It was a direct insult to the Great Creator, in whose image man was created, to *tear him from his seat, where he sat with dominion, to thrust him down on a level with the brute, whose lord he was constituted.* A second reason is, because there has been an inestimable ransom paid for man. God said of the Jews, “ they are my servants, which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt, they shall not be sold as bondmen”—because they were God’s servants, whom he had redeemed from Egyptian bondage, in token of a more glorious redemption from sin. This word of salvation is to be preached, to every human being. A third reason is, because to “ fear God and keep his commandments is the whole duty of man.” It would be an anomaly in the moral system, to make him depend on the will of his fellow *worm*, for the performance of these duties. It would be robbing him of his sacred rights, which were as dear to him as life. So much for the system itself.

As to the practical working, of this unnatural relation of master and slave ; we will select only one case by way of illustration ; in order to show that God’s precepts and this system are antagonistical : “ Search the scriptures.” To obey this precept, persons must first be taught to *read*. Now, we know that slaves are prohibited from being learned to read, because the necessity of the case requires it. We have no idea, that slave-holders exclude education from their slaves, out of a pure love of keeping them in ignorance ; as well-informed slaves would certainly add to their usefulness ; but the safety of the whole system requires such a course ; Sampson’s eyes must be put out, before it is safe to put him to grind in the prison house. If their minds were illuminated, it would be impossible to hold them as slaves, they would break their chains, as did Sampson the green withs, wherewith he was bound, as a thread of tow

is broken when it touches the fire. Every thing about them in this Republican country, is calculated to kindle into a conflagration the latent spark of liberty, which is implanted in every human breast. There has indeed been individual slaves, partially educated, particularly where they are not numerous, without such disastrous consequences to the system. But it would not do to diffuse education where they are numerous.— Knowledge being power, the slave-holder is under the necessity, to remove the key of knowledge, as it would unlock his treasures. “Woe unto you, for ye have taken away the key of knowledge, ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in, ye hindered.” Appalling sentence! Now it is manifest, that the very existence of the system itself, cannot be maintained without coming in collision, with the precepts of God’s word. Why find fault with the slave-holder for not educating his slaves, if it is a lawful system? Is he under any obligation to give propelling power to a machinery, which would blow his superstructure to atoms? Every avenue must as much as possible be closed, where light might enter, to illuminate the mind of the slave. For “oppression would make a wise man mad.” A man void of wisdom does not know when he is oppressed. If a slave is lawful property—“for him knowledge must never open her treasures—nature never unfold her beauties,”—but his mind must be forever shrouded in darkness—shut out from the privilege of “searching the Scriptures,” and from the comfort of their consolatory promises for the oppressed and afflicted; and of all the human family, they stand in the most need of the consolations of the Gospel. “Behold the tears of the oppressed, but they have no comforter.”

We will now endeavor to answer some arguments, which are given in justification of slavery. It is said that slavery, having existed from an early period of the world, until the cannon of scripture was completed, and receiving no reproof, it cannot be immoral in itself. But it is not true that it was never reproved. The great moral principles of God’s law utterly condemn it. It was formally reproved. What was the land of Egypt left in an utter desolation for, but for slave-holding? And it was not of so aggravated a character as our American slavery; and they surely came by their slaves as honestly as we did by ours. Did not God teach us a lesson by his judgments on Pharaoh, that he will have the services of his rational creatures, and *they* incur his judgments, who will place any obstacles in the way of his receiving them? His command to Pharaoh was, “Let my people go, that they may serve me.” Indeed there is no other sin rebuked in scripture, oftener than “oppression.”— We think it scarcely necessary to offer arguments, to show that slavery is oppression. Were not the Jews most awfully rebuked for the sin of slave-holding? (Jeremiah xxxiv. 17,) but it may be said that it was for holding their *brethren* in slavery. Are not all mankind brethren under the gospel dispensation? Would you suppose that the Jews would have such severe penalties inflicted on them for enslaving a brother Jew, and that christians would be licensed depredators on their brethren? Is the standard of moral obligation of love to our neighbor, any lower under the Christian dispensation, than under the Jewish? Was not the penal statute against man-stealing, a complete interdiction to slavery, as it dried up the fountain from whence it flowed; as God never gave any individual the right of property to his fellow man, he could not sell a right he never had: therefore no man could be made a slave but by stealing him, and that is the very way slaves are obtained at the present day. We will not stop to enquire, how far it might have been morally right, to enslave cap-

tives taken in war, in certain cases ; but it is evident it would be morally wrong to enslave their *children*.

The servitude of the heathen that was sanctioned under the Jewish dispensation was evidently a voluntary contract for an equivalent, and was conceived in love, and consummated in mercy, and the fiftieth year Jubilee was instituted for the release of such as stood out in their heathen state : had not this been the case, it would have been superfluous to have appointed the fiftieth year ; as the Jews went out every seventh year. It need not be said that it was for the release of property, for the words of the statute are definite, " and ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and *proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof.*" On the day of atonement, when they were fasting and afflicting their souls, the great Jubilee trumpet was blown ; this was the fast which the Lord did choose to undo the heavy burdens and let the oppressed go free. Scripture does not say in precise language, you shall not make a *slave* of your brother man, or in other words, you shall not hold him, as you do the brute, viz. as your *property*. Does scripture say, that you may hold him as your *slave*, and that he is your *property* ? the burden of proof devolves on our opponents. Nothing less than a clear deed of grant, from the *great Proprietor*, will do in a case which is so repugnant to every sense of moral justice. What unparalleled arrogance must it be, for any human being to think, that for his sole use, his brother man lives, moves and has his being, and that it was for his pleasure, that he was and is created. What " proud boasters and lovers of their own selves " must such persons be !

It would make a bad code of moral ethics, to say that every thing which was practised in scripture history was right, if God did not immediately reprove it. Did God approve of Noah's and Lot's drunkenness, because he did not reprove them ? Did he approve of a most abhorrent deed of incest, which was perpetrated in Lot's family ? Did he approve of Jacob's deception to obtain the blessing ? Or did he approve of Rahab's telling lies ? with numerous other cases, where there is not a word of reproof administered. God has spread out great principles of rectitude in his law, which is our rule of duty, and not the example of every transgressor of these precepts spoken of in scripture, without getting a formal rebuke.

On approaching the New Testament, the supporters and apologists of slavery find most convincing arguments for their side of the question, which prove slavery right to a mathematical demonstration ; at least that it is so innocent and harmless, that Christianity and it can shake hands and live very amicably together ! Slavery, they say, existed in the days of Christ and his Apostles in its worst form, and neither Christ nor his apostles gave it a word of rebuke ; and the Apostles in writing to the different churches, gave directions to master and servant, in reference to the discharge of their reciprocal duties, which they consider equivalent to a recognition of the lawfulness of slavery. What a slanderous libel on Christ and his Apostles in the house of his friends ?

Our pro-slavery friends are rather *fast*. It remains yet to be proved, that the Roman Christians held servants by the same tenure which slaves were held in the Roman empire, and that it was actually to such *masters* and *slaves*, that the Apostle gave directions. We have previously said that nothing but positive testimony will do in such a case as this. When an institution claims its origin from God, so antagonistical to all his other institutions, nothing but positive testimony can give it credence. Can it

be supposed, that God authorised a system by which all his laws would be nullified? We thought, that God's laws were absolute and inflexible. There is nothing more than a bare possibility, to say the most of it, that even slavery was ever tolerated by the Apostles in the Christian Church. Possibilities will not do for evidence in any case, particularly when there is a weight of testimony against them.

[To be continued ]

---

**ART. VII. *Atheism or the personal existence of God denied.***

The prevalence of Transcendental philosophy in and around Boston is producing strange effects on Unitarianism. With such a basis, it can no longer be what it formerly was. The new forms which it is taking are various. Some of the Transcendentalists show a considerable amount of religious feeling, and appear to be almost orthodox: while others embrace various new modifications of error. Of late, quite a sensation has been produced among them by a discourse of Mr. Emerson, in which he is understood to deny the personal existence of God.

Mr. Emerson was formerly pastor of a Unitarian church in Boston, where he became conspicuous by advocating the disuse of the Lord's Supper, which he considered an antiquated ordinance, needed only in the first ages of Christianity. For several years past, he has been engaged in various literary pursuits. Notwithstanding something of mysticism in his style of thought, he is an exceedingly elegant writer. He was selected by the last graduating class of the Theological Department of Harvard College, to deliver an address before them. That address, which has been published, is said to contain the startling doctrine to which we have alluded. We have not seen the address, but we gather from the notices of it that we have seen, and from our own knowledge of his train of thought for some years past, that he considers God to be merely those principles, or eternal, immutable truths, which govern the universe; the laws, for example, of gravitation, electricity, and the like, in the world of matter, and the laws which connect happiness with virtue and pain with crime in the moral world. The idea of a **LIVING GOD**, a being conscious of his own existence, who enforces these laws and produces the effects that take place according to them, he would consider as a fiction of the human mind for its own convenience, useful in its day as a means of enabling men to conceive clearly of the existence of those laws, and to depend on the certainty of their execution; but which may be laid aside by the cultivated intellect in this age of light. The Bible and Christianity, we presume, he does not profess to reject, but considers them as containing the true system of the universe, exhibited in the best form of which the human mind, in those dark ages, was capable.

The appearance of this doctrine among them has caused not a little alarm and anxiety in the Unitarian ranks. Is Unitarianism coming to this? Does it lead to this? Shall it have the reputation of leading men to this? And all our Transcendental brethren, whose numbers and talents, especially among the younger, are far from contemptible,—are they coming to this? And if so, what will become of Unitarianism itself? If Atheism,—for such they consider it—is to be advocated by our pastors, what will become of the flocks? These are very serious questions: and

the apprehensions which they imply have caused some discussion. A sermon has been published in reply to Mr. Emerson's address, and several articles have appeared in the papers.

In one respect, this is the most plausible, and therefore the most dangerous form of infidelity, that we have yet seen. At first view, it *appears* to leave the whole code of morals unimpaired. The laws of morality, inward and outward, instead of being nullified or changed by it, are defied. And their sanctions have quite an imposing appearance. God,—that is, the unchangeable laws of the universe,—is omnipotent and omnipresent, and will certainly make the virtuous happy and the vicious miserable. But for this good appearance, we are sure that a gentleman of Mr. Emerson's taste, feelings and moral habits could not have adopted it. We have thought it might be useful, therefore, to examine its claims in respect to this very point: especially as we believe that the opposite doctrine, the personal existence of the **LIVING GOD**, is not realized as it needs to be, by vast multitudes, and even by many really pious persons.

Are then the moral laws which should govern us, unaffected by Mr. Emerson's doctrine? Far from it. Our whole duty to God is changed, if not annihilated. If he is not the **LIVING GOD**; if he does not *know* what he is doing and *intend* our welfare when he does us good, he certainly has no claim upon our *gratitude*. No man feels thankful to the principles of arithmetic, for the answers which he procures by means of them. They do not intend his benefit, and therefore have no claim upon his gratitude. Nor can we feel thankful to the laws of planetary motion, for the regular succession of "seed time and harvest, summer and winter, day and night." Why should we? The laws of planetary motion do not foresee our wants, feel compassion or kindness for us, and turn the world about as our necessities require, with the intention of doing us good.

It is no answer to say, that the God to whom we should be thankful is not one particular law, but the sum-total of the laws of the universe. There is nothing to build gratitude upon in that total, which is not equally found in all its parts. The laws of the universe are as destitute of consciousness, of knowledge, of kind intention, as the particular laws of planetary motion.

We *cannot* be thankful to the principles of the universe for our existence even; for those principles, when they brought us into existence, were not even aware of their own existence, and could not intend to make us, or know that they were *doing* it. Gratitude implies the recognition of kind intentions in our benefactor; and therefore it cannot be felt, where we know that no kindness was intended. On Mr. Emerson's principles, it would be absurd to thank God for any thing.

This doctrine, too, annihilates all that *confidence in God*, which is founded on a belief that he is kindly disposed towards us. We cannot trust in him as a God of mercy. We cannot believe that, "like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him." His mercy can be nothing but a blind, unconscious rule, by which the connexion between crime and pain is sometimes severed. He has no *feeling* of mercy towards us, for he has no feeling at all, of any kind. The principles of the universe are at work, carrying all things on, straight forward; and our destiny must be just what this vast machinery necessarily grinds out for us. We may rely, as much as our knowledge will enable us to do, on the stability of the laws by which all events are govern-

ed; but we may not feel that a superior intelligence watches over events, with a kind regard for our welfare.

*Prayer*, according to this doctrine, is absurd. What traveller, apprehending danger from the explosion of a boiler, prays to the laws which regulate the expansive force of steam? Who, when he eats, prays to the principles of physiology, that the food may be digested and made to strengthen him? What manufacturer humbly entreats the principles of gravitation to act on the water and turn the wheels of his machinery? Especially, prayer for pardon can have no place. He who detects himself in an arithmetical error, *cannot*, seriously and honestly, confess his sin to the principles of arithmetic, and implore their forgiveness. Such confessions and petitions, from their very nature, can be made in earnest only to some *person*, supposed to be capable of hearing, unnerstanding and pardoning.

Nor can the believer in this doctrine possibly feel any *reverence* for God. He cannot feel that God is voluntarily wise and good, and therefore worthy of veneration. Indeed, he cannot feel that God is, in strictness of speech, either wise or good at all; as wisdom and goodness are, strictly, attributes of some intelligent being. The believer in this doctrine cannot *look up* to a being of a higher and holier nature than his own. His God, to be sure, operates incessantly, accurately, and irresistibly; but blindly, without intention, and without knowing what he does. The believer is conscious of his own existence, and perceives and understands the things around him; and therein is superior to his imagined God. He must, therefore, be destitute of that humility, which a contrasting of himself with the **LIVING GOD** would inspire.

A believer in this doctrine cannot regard himself as *morally accountable to God*. He may perceive the *advantage* of doing as God prescribes. He may see the necessity of avoiding crime, if he would escape pain. He may see the mighty wheels of the universe rolling on, according to fixed and unalterable laws; and may be aware that he must conform his movements to theirs, or be crushed. But his feeling must be the same in kind with that of a man standing upon a rail-road, when he sees the engine approaching—a mere sense of the necessity of moving out of the way, to avoid being crushed. He cannot feel that God has any *claims* upon him which it would be not only dangerous, but wrong, to disregard. He cannot feel that God *cares* how he conducts, is *pleased* when he obeys, or *displeased* when he sins. He may believe that his own is a sort of self-registering thermometer, on which all its own acts are recorded, so that their legitimate effects on his future pleasures and pains are inevitable; but he cannot feel that God literally *observes* his action, or *intends* to call him to account for them.

Whether this doctrine makes equal havoc of the laws which should govern our conduct towards men, we have not time now to enquire; but we are sure that it seriously affects the probability of their observance. For this, there are two obvious reasons. Man needs the ideas and feelings which, as we have shown, this belief excludes, to tame his proud and wayward spirit, to give him humble and submissive emotions, and to subject his heart to the dominion of law. Without a God to love, revere and trust, the heart of man cannot be made the home of virtuous emotions. And man needs to feel, also, that his fellow men are dear to God; that if he injures them, God sees it and is displeased; that if good is done to them, God rejoices in their happiness. He needs to feel that, in caring for their happiness, he sympathises with God; and that in promoting it,

he is working together with God. He who feels nothing of this, will not feel towards his fellow men as he ought. And as to the laws of the universe,—he may think that Moses and the prophets did not calculate their operation correctly, and that, though those laws will certainly be executed, he may do many things which the Bible forbids, and yet receive no injury from them.

Mr. Emerson's doctrine, therefore, does not meet the wants of our moral nature ; it does not enable us to fulfil the demands of conscience : it deprives us of many ideas, without which we cannot be what we know we ought to be ; and, therefore, according to an important principle of the Transcendental philosophy, it must be false.—*N. Y. Observer.*

---

**ART. VII. *Family Government, by Dr. Humphrey.***

From the New-York Observer.

The *importance* of family government will scarcely be questioned by any one, and we of this generation are quite ready to flatter ourselves that we understand it better than our fathers did. Whether we do or not, will, in the lapse of time, be submitted to a more impartial judgment. I am sure, that could those who have been gone a hundred years return to the "places which knew them," they would be at a loss to guess how we expect to substantiate such a claim in the eyes of posterity.

Although, as I have already remarked, the state has no right to interfere with the domestic arrangements of families, except in extreme cases, it is nevertheless true, that in order to become good citizens in after life, children must be accustomed to cheerful subordination in the family, from their earliest recollection. I know that those who grow up without restraint by the fire-side, and whose youth is consequently as wild as the winds, *can* be governed afterwards by absolute power. The bayonet of the Czar and the scimiter of the Sultan can tame them and keep them in subjection. But it may well be doubted, whether any thing like a free constitutional government can ever be maintained over a people who have not been taught the fifth commandment in their childhood. I do not believe it can. Children must be prepared to reverence the majesty of the laws, and to yield a prompt obedience to the civil magistrate, by habitual subjection to their parents. If they are not governed in the family, they will be restive under the wholesome and necessary restraints of after life ; and the freer the form of government is, in any state, the more necessary is it that parents should fit their children "to lead quiet and peaceable lives in all godliness and honesty" under it, by a proper course of domestic training. We cannot, in this country, hope to preserve and hand down our free and glorious institutions in any other way. To remain free, the mass of the people must be virtuous and enlightened ; and to this end, domestic education, including all suitable restraints and discipline, must engage the earnest attention of heads of families throughout the land. It has been said a thousand times, that the practicability of maintaining a highly republican form of government has been *tried* and *settled* in the United States, however it may have failed everywhere else. I wish it were so : but I am afraid the question is settled, so far *only* as we have gone. What the future may disclose, who can certainly tell ? It is yet a grand desideratum, whether we

have religion, virtue, and intelligence enough to sustain our blessed institutions. The danger is, that our liberties will degenerate into licentiousness, and that the growing laxity of family government will hasten on the fearful crisis. There is, if I am not deceived, a reaction in our unparalleled political freedom, upon our domestic relations. It is more difficult than it was, half, or even a quarter of a century ago, for parents to "command their household after them." Our children hear so much about liberty and equality, and are so often told how glorious it is to be "born free and equal," that it is hard to make them understand for what good reason their liberties are abridged in the family; and I have no doubt this accounts, in multitudes of instances, for the reluctance with which they submit to parental authority. The boy wants to be "his own man," long before his wisdom teeth are cut; and the danger lies in conceding the point to him, under the notion, that our fathers were quite too rigid, and that a more indulgent domestic policy, corresponding with the "spirit of the age," is better. This may be the way to make *rulers* enough for a hundred republics; but not to make a single good *subject*. I repeat, therefore, that if it is important to secure a prompt obedience to the wholesome laws of the state, then is family government indispensably necessary, and the father who takes no care to control his own sons, is not himself a patriot, if he is a good citizen.

Moreover, without family government there will be very little *self-government* in any community. If you do not restrain the waywardness of your child, in its early developments, and thus assist him to get the mastery of it while yet the conquest is comparatively easy, it will be in vain for you to expect him ever to gain that self-control which is so essential to his happiness and safety. Nothing is better settled by the experience of all ages, than that the will grows stubborn—that evil passions become impetuous by indulgence; and that indulged they will be, by the child, if they are not held in check by parental authority. In this view, a greater misfortune can hardly befall a young person, than to be left to himself. The consequence is, that before reason and conscience can assert their supremacy, bad habits are formed, and his depraved inclinations have time to ripen into such maturity, that to bring them into subjection is infinitely more difficult than if the work had been commenced in the nursery. One in a hundred, perhaps, may, without aid, learn to "rule his own spirit;" but it will cost him many a hard struggle; while the ninety and nine will never have resolution and perseverance enough to achieve any tolerable degree of self-control. How many slaves to an irascible temper have lamented to their dying day that their fathers did so little to check its early growth! But what individual, in after life, was ever sorry for the aid which he received from his parents in mastering his own bad passions!

There is one thought more, which may not perhaps so readily occur, but which is too important to be overlooked in this connection. The judicious and faithful exercise of family government puts children in the way of receiving spiritual blessings. I am not one of those who believe that any human agency or moral suasion can convert the soul to God. Bringing up a child under perfect subjection to parental authority, is a very different thing from the bringing him to the foot of the cross. Still, there may be a connexion between them; and I cannot entertain a doubt, that the child who is well governed in his father's house, is more likely to be brought to a willing submission to God, than if he had been left to "walk in the way of his own heart, and after the sight of his own

eyes." I know the best governed son in the world *may* hold out in rebellion against his Heavenly Father till he dies; but there is a great deal more reason to hope he will "throw down his arms," than in the case of one who has never been taught the first lessons of submission in the family. Let me guard, with all possible care, against being misunderstood. No power on earth can conquer the stubborn will of the sinner, however young. But there is a divine constitution, by which means and ends are sometimes remotely, and sometimes more immediately connected together; and why may not parental fidelity in the government of a family be made a principal means of bringing them to the "obedience of Christ?"

It is thought by some, that the government of children must be a very easy if not even a delightful task. I do not recollect, however, that I ever heard this sentiment expressed by a parent who had been placed in circumstances to make the trial, and who had succeeded in any tolerable degree. As a general rule, persons know how to manage families much better before they have them, than afterwards. Those who are most astonished at the failure of their friends in this important matter, and see no difficulty at all in holding the reins, have no children to govern. The bachelor who boards in his brother's family, or goes to spend a few weeks with a married sister, understands the thing perfectly; and can discourse most eloquently upon family government by the hour together. He has it all at his fingers ends, from A to Z, and knows exactly what to do from sunrise till bed time. O how he wishes he could have the management of these lawless little urchins for a month. He would stop their crying and romping, or he would quit the premises. How parents can have so little tact, and be so indulgent, is entirely beyond his comprehension. But it is often exceedingly amusing to see how the tables are turned, when he comes to have a family of his own. Poor man! the children spoil his beautiful theories a great deal faster than he ever made them. What the matter is, he cannot tell; but it is infinitely more difficult to govern them than it used to be.

Heads of families, in like manner, who have no children of their own, are very apt to think that their friends who have, are very unfortunate or very much to blame, in not keeping them under better subjection. O, if they had the management of them they should be governed to a charm! It should always be sunshine. Every look should be a law, and it should be obeyed. Or if it should sometimes be necessary to go a little further, every word of reproof should be treasured up and remembered to the end of life. But how does the matter stand, when these same persons come to adopt a child, and bring their theories to the test of experience? In nine instances out of ten, they find the task incomparably more difficult than they expected. It is one thing to build castles in the air, and another to garrison them. They are sure the child is uncommonly perverse, or that if it was their own child, they could manage it a great deal better. But the sober truth is, that whatever else may be easy, the bringing up of a family is a great undertaking. To govern one's own house, just as he should, is exceedingly difficult, and the parent who has the talent, and who is enabled to use it as he ought, can never be thankful enough to God for so invaluable a gift.

(To be continued )

**ART. VIII.** *Proceedings of the Convention of Reformed Churches at its Sessions in the City of Pittsburgh, Oct. 17, 1838.*

The above is the title of a pamphlet which has just come into our hands. The character and object of the Convention whose proceedings it contains, may in a good measure be learned from the following extract taken from the first page :

The Convention of such Reformed Churches as had previously concurred in the measure, and appointed their Delegates, which had been invited for the purpose of devising measures for the promotion of the unity of the Church of God, upon scriptural principles, met in the Second Associate Reformed Church, in the city of Pittsburgh, Oct. 17, 1838, at 7 o'clock P. M., and was opened by a sermon from the Rev. John Black, D. D., from John xvii. 21, "*That they all may be one ; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us : that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.*" After the religious exercises of the evening were over, the Rev. Dr. Black was called to the chair, *pro tem.*, in order that the Delegates might be ascertained, and the Convention permanently organized.

It was then ascertained that Delegates were in attendance, whose appointment was duly certified, from three of the ecclesiastical Bodies of our country, as follows, viz :

*From the Associate Reformed Synod of the West :*

Rev. JOHN T. PRESSLY, D. D. Alleghenytown ; Rev. JOSEPH R. KERR, Pittsburgh ; Rev. WILLIAM WALLACE, Wheeling, Va.

*From the Associate Reformed Synod of New-York :*

Rev. JOHN M'JIMSEY, D. D. Montgomery, N. Y. ; Rev. DONALD C. M'LAREN, Caledonia, N. Y. ; Mr. WILLIAM M'KEE, Ruling Elder, Philadelphia.

*From the General Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church :*

Rev. JOHN BLACK, D. D. Pittsburgh ; Rev. WILLIAM WILSON, New-York ; Mr. DANIEL M'MILLAN, Ruling Elder, Xenia, Ohio.

*On motion,* The Rev. Dr. PRESSLY was unanimously chosen President, and the Rev. WM. WILSON, Secretary of the Convention.

The Associate Reformed Church originated in a union, which was effected in 1782, between some members of the Associate and some of the Reformed Presbyterian Church. This union only created an additional denomination in the Christian Church, as the Associate and Reformed Presbyterian churches still maintained their distinct and separate existence. In process of time the Union Church became divided into three different and independent bodies ; and the Reformed Presbyterian Church has also of late been rent in twain. The delegates composing the above mentioned Convention, it will be seen, belong to two of the Union or Associate Reformed Bodies, and to one branch (the lesser) of the Reformed Presbyterians. And the object, to which the labors of the Convention were particularly directed, was, it appears, to consummate a union between these three bodies. Union is very desirable ; and all

lawful endeavors to promote it must be laudable. And for our own part we do not see but these three bodies (as they are not *over-much* strict) might come together and be united into one, without making any particular compromise of principle.

The most important matter transacted by this Convention, was the adoption of the following Report on the subject of inter-communion :

The Committee to whom was recommended the report on "the nearer approximation of the several Churches represented in this Convention," were called upon to report, which they accordingly did. The whole report was then unanimously adopted. It is as follows :

The Committee appointed to consider in what "the nearer approximation of the several Churches represented in this Convention, with a view to their ultimate union into one body," shall consist ; would respectfully submit the following

**REPORT :—**Your Committee are persuaded, that this subject is highly important, not only in its ultimate result—the contemplated and hoped for union of the Reformed Churches in one ecclesiastical body, but also in all the steps leading thereto. The object before this Committee is a "nearer approximation" of these Churches, while yet in a divided state, with a view to organical union, before that union has actually taken place. Such an approximation, if rightly conducted, is greatly to be desired, and would gladden the hearts of all who love the unity, the peace, and the prosperity of Zion. The Church is the mother of all true believers, and every dutiful and loving son, will grieve at heart when the bowels of his mother are rent and torn by divisions among her children. And it is a lamentable fact, that the spouse of the Redeemer, like her Lord, has been wounded in the house of her friends. To endeavor to heal her wounds, and bind up the broken hearted, is alike the duty, the privilege and the delight, of all who love her and seek her good. Yet we must be careful not to attempt to "heal the hurt of the daughter of his people slightly," or to "say peace, peace, when there is no peace." Are we called to build up the broken wall of Jerusalem, let us beware of "daubing it with untempered mortar," lest the Lord pronounce its doom, and "bring it down to the ground," and it be said unto us, "Where is the daubing where with ye have daubed it?" Let us take warning from past experience upon this subject. In every association among men there is some kind of communion. How far may communion consistently extend in the contemplated "nearer approximation?" Men enjoy a social and friendly communion in conversing together—in walking or riding in company, and in a thousand things relating to the transactions and courtesies of life. In all these there is something common, in which men have a fellowship or communion with one another. It is mere civil communion, and is not sinful. Again, there is a religious communion which all Christians may lawfully hold with one another, upon the ground of their common faith as disciples of Christ, their common Lord, and as partakers of the common salvation. Union, in every case, is the basis of communion. And all Christians are agreed and united in the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, as the only Saviour. They may, therefore, hold Christian communion together, which will include all religious exercises which do not embrace ecclesiastical fellowship, such as joining together in reading, hearing, praying, praising God, &c. In all these, all Christians may walk together, because they are agreed. Further,

there is a communion, which may be called ministerial, which adds to mere Christian fellowship that which is official, and yet not ecclesiastical communion. The organization and government of the Church is more than ministerial. It is Presbyterian. Ministerial communion is, therefore, not organical. Ministers, therefore, though belonging to different denominations, may, nevertheless, have intercourse with each other in all those official duties not embracing ecclesiastical communion.

*Therefore Resolved,* As the judgment of this Convention, that the ministers of the Churches here represented, may interchange pulpits, and it is recommended to both ministers and people to unite as often as opportunity offers in meetings for prayer or religious exercises—and in all such as may be engaged in works intended to advance the cause of Christianity, by spreading the word of God and the gospel of Jesus Christ; thereby cultivating a spirit of harmony and brotherhood, calculated to lead to a more perfect unity—and this without violating any of the laws of their respective organizations.

It will be seen from the above Report that the Convention adopted Dr. Mason's scheme of Catholic Communion in its widest latitude. They lay it down as a principle that all professing christians may commune together at the Lord's table who agree in the belief that Jesus Christ is the *only Saviour*. This is doubtless their meaning, although it be somewhat clouded by the use of *ambiguous* phrases and technical terms. For the communion, which christians, holding the above truth, may have with each other, "includes," say they, "all religious exercises which do not embrace ecclesiastical fellowship, such as joining together in reading, hearing, praying, praising God, &c." *Eating the Lord's supper* is not here mentioned but is included in the expressive, "&c.;" and perhaps it would have shown more plainness and candor had this "religious exercise" been mentioned, instead of using in its place a very ambiguous *character*. If we understand the Convention, and we think we do, by "ecclesiastical communion" they simply mean a communion in church *government* and *discipline*. Hence, ministers and members of different denominations may commune together in every thing excepting in the government and discipline of the church, which is more than *christian* fellowship, and more than *ministerial*—it is *organical*.

Whether the ministers and members of the churches represented in this Convention, will be generally disposed to favor this unlimited scheme of Catholic Communion, remains to be seen. We cannot disguise it, however, that we felt some surprise that the delegates from the Associate Reformed Synod of New-York should have voted in favor of this scheme, since that Synod had, a few weeks before, passed a Resolution "disapproving of the principle and practice of open communion." (See Monitor for Nov. p. 274.) But it may be said that the *second* resolution which the Synod passed nullified the *first*, as it permits the practice of

“occasional communion.” However that may be, one thing is certain, that the second resolution nullifies itself; it is more than *ambiguous*, it is flatly contradictory, as the reader may see by turning to it.—But we have not time for any further comments.

---

ART. IX. *Miscellaneous Items.*

SYNOD OF CINCINNATI.—At the late meeting of this Judicatory, a separation took place. After the separation, the New School Synod passed some strong *Abolition* Resolutions. And according to the *EMANCIPATOR*, the Old School Synod adopted the following Preamble and Resolution; but according to the *PRESBYTERIAN*, they were passed by the New School Synod. Will the *PRESBYTERIAN* explain?

“Whereas, the General Assembly of 1818, expressed its strong opposition to slavery, and declared it to be “manifestly the duty of all Christians who enjoy the light of the present day, when the inconsistency of slavery, both with the dictates of humanity and religion, has been demonstrated and is generally seen and acknowledged, to use their honest, earnest, and unwearied endeavors to correct the errors of former times, and as speedily as possible to efface the blot on our holy religion, and to obtain the complete abolition of slavery throughout Christendom, and, if possible, throughout the world”—therefore,

“*Resolved*, That the next General Assembly be respectfully entreated to institute an inquiry into this matter in all our Presbyteries, in order to ascertain whether this duty has been neglected; and if so, to take such order on the subject as will tend to hasten the emancipation of the oppressed.”

---

A “*LAMB*.”—We find it stated in the Glasgow Scottish Guardian, that “The Archbishop of Paris had made a splendid offering to the church of Notre Dame de Deliverance, in Normandy, in fulfilment of a vow he had made conditionally on the conversion of Talleyrand. The offering, which is an image of a lamb, has inscribed on its pedestal words to this effect: ‘Offered to the Holy Virgin, the mother of God, in grateful commemoration of her Divine grace, in bringing back a *stray lamb* to the fold of God’s church.’” If Talleyrand were still alive, this would doubtless make him cry “bah!” By the way, how did the archbishop ascertain that it was the grace of the *Virgin Mary*, that converted the great diplomatist? Is he sure that he has not presented his offering to the wrong saint?—*N. Y. Observer*.

---

BETTING ON ELECTIONS.—“The Legislature of this State have gone one step towards preserving the purity of our elections, by making it a misdemeanor, for any person to attempt bribery; menace, or other corrupt means or device whatsoever, to influence any elector in giving his vote, or to deter him from giving the same. There are, doubtless, individuals

of all parties, who are base enough at every election to violate this provision of the statute ; but we think the Legislature ought to go still farther, and to prevent as much as possible, one of the prominent causes which leads to its violation. If a man has money bet on the result of an election, he will often resort to the most foul means to procure votes, and when all others fail, he will directly purchase them, or employ other individuals to do so and run the risk of punishment. Those who bet their money become more interested in the hazard of the wager than in the success of the candidate, and doubtless expend a portion of the stake to win the other portion. It is a species of gambling which ought to be prohibited by fine and imprisonment. It is dangerous to the free right of suffrage. The man who bets on the throw of the die, or the turn of the wheel, is denounced as a gambler and blackleg, and why should not the same epithet be applied to him who bets on the events of an election? The latter leads to more fatal consequences than the former. Even the inspectors of elections, those who are appointed to receive and canvass the votes often become deeply interested in a pecuniary measure in the success of a particular ticket or candidate, and can we have the same confidence in their fairness and integrity, when perhaps, by a single vote they may gain or lose large sums of money? In every view which can be taken of the practice of betting on elections, it is not only demoralizing and pernicious, but it is dangerous to the freedom and purity of our elections, and we trust the next Legislature will pass severe laws against this system of gambling."

This we copy from the *Saratoga Sentinel*, a Van Buren paper. During the electioneering campaign, we saw several articles against the practice, in papers on the other side. We judge, therefore, that men of all parties were getting their eyes open to the abominable nature and tendencies of this species of gambling, and that there is some reason to hope it may be put down by law.—*N. Y. Obs.*

**IMPORTANT CONCESSION.**—We lately received through the Post Office a small Pamphlet containing a defence of slavery, which the author, Tho. M. Rice, calls "God's own institution." The following is the concluding paragraph, which concedes that slavery may be abolished on its own soil :

"These facts I present to a thinking community; and I would they could be received in the same humble, conscientious spirit in which they have been written. I am no slave-holder; I am a little Methodist preacher, and teacher in an obscure little village. I have never aspired to honor or preferment. But if I did not conscientiously believe what I have written, I would not remain in a slave-holding State one month.—For he who is in heart an abolitionist, and believes slavery to be as offensive to God as they profess to do, is unworthy the confidence or respect of any candid man, while he continues to live among those whose hands are defiled with its blood. It is vain to reply they cannot get away. If they have slaves they can liberate them here or take them into the boasted land of freedom with themselves; and if the free States (as they are called) will not let the negroes come among them, they will be convicted at once of falsehood and hypocrisy, in not permitting the Africans to settle in their territory, while they permit many more aban-

doned and debauched from Europe and Asia. And if they have no slaves they can pack up and go.

*Ballardsville, February 4th, 1838.*"

I, AND I, AND I, AND I, AND I.—*Ministers* are not very notorious for their *egotism*, but we find occasionally one, to whom the epithet *vain*, may properly apply.

"Great men are not always wise." *Ministers* are not always so. It is supremely disgusting to hear a man, and especially a Minister, talk for hours, in company, about himself. I gained such and such distinctions in College—in the Seminary. I have had such and such honorable offices. I have had such and such calls from New York or Boston, to occupy some station of important trust. Such egotists ought to know that even "*silly women*" are sometimes disgusted with their vanity, when they are compelled, for politeness sake to feign an interest in the declamations of self-praise.

When a man is settled over a large society, and has an affectionate people, lavish in their testimonials of affection, of interest in his preaching, conversation, &c. he has great occasion for watchfulness. "Let another praise thee, and not thine own mouth; a stranger, and not thine own lips." Vanity, pride, self-conceit, and the whole train of such loathsome passions tempt the violation of this wise precept. And herein *good people are not always wise*. They should remember there is much truth in the old adage, "Praise to the face is an open disgrace." The best of people are sufficiently prone to think of the little pronoun I, without being reminded of its importance. Suppose every Minister write a sermon on Spiritual Pride, and illustrate its evils by the experience of I!—*Boston Recorder*.

#### ART. X. Notices.

The "Short Sermon," which appeared in the last Monitor, should have been credited to the *Northern Watchman*.

A. R. is received and will be attended to as soon as practicable.

Mr. W. Y. Hamilton of the Western Mission is requested to forward to us the names of the individuals, with their respective Post Offices, who, as he formerly hinted, had paid in advance for the 14th vol. that they may be supplied with the present vol. Will he also please inform us, whether "Columbus" and "Shannon's Store," (Randolph Co. Ill.) designate one and the same P. O.?

We have just cause for complaint at the backwardness of those subscribers, who are in arrears, in forwarding to us their dues.

As we find that the "PRECIOUS REMEDIES" is not so scarce a work as we had at first supposed, we shall probably indulge our readers with but one more insertion from it.

Another insertion will finish the "Historical Sketch of the United Brethren." We hope that the pen of the author will soon find employment on some other interesting subject, wherewith to enrich our pages.

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,  
AND  
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

JANUARY, 1839.

---

**ART. I. *Historical Sketch of the United Brethren or Moravians.***

(Concluded from page 294.)

During the last session of this convention, a large company of Brethren arrived in Philadelphia, and were cordially welcomed by the convention. A gentleman offered to sell them a piece of land in the Forks of Delaware; this offer they accepted, and began to build a regular settlement, which was afterwards called BETHLEHEM. Thither the newly arrived Colony went in June, 1742, and, with those already settled there, composed a congregation of one hundred and twenty persons.

The original design in building Bethlehem, was, that it should be placed on the same footing with the Missionary congregation in Europe, and that its members should consider it their peculiar calling to diffuse the knowledge of the gospel throughout the whole of North America, wherever a door of utterance should be opened to them. To facilitate this, the inhabitants agreed to institute a community of goods, to regulate their house-keeping in the most frugal manner, and apply the surplus of their gains to the education of children, the support of ministers and school-masters in the country, who received no regular salary, and the establishment of missions among the Indians. This regulation continued for several years, but, as might be expected, was found untenable, when the settlement increased in the number and diversity of character of its inhabitants.

The building of Nazareth, which is nine miles North of Bethlehem, was somewhat retarded in consequence of the hostility of the Indian occupiers of the land, who resisted the order of their great national council to quit it. The Brethren, not wishing to irritate these savages, whose instruction in Christianity was a principal object of their settling in the country, purchased the produce of their fields at their own price, after the Indians relinquished their claims to hold possession, and offered peaceably to remove. After this, Nazareth, as well as Bethlehem, rapidly increased in external prosperity. They were the two first settle-

ments formed by the Brethren in North America, and received their regular constitution as such. These two settlements soon attracted the notice of the surrounding country. The neatness and regularity which distinguished these settlements from other colonies, the peaceable deportment and industry of the inhabitants, their fairness in dealing,\* and their institutions for education, gained them the respect and admiration of many who had not sufficient penetration to discover, that, whatever was truly excellent in the establishments of the Brethren, was the effect of the religious principles which governed all their proceedings.

Among their visitors, however, there were not a few whose esteem and love for the Brethren had a better foundation than the mere admiration of their civil economy. Many were disposed to join them, but to this various objections presented themselves, both to the applicants and the Brethren. In order to meet the wishes of both parties, the same measures were adopted in America which had been introduced in England. Instead of multiplying regular settlements, congregations in union with the Brethren's church were gradually formed in several towns and villages.

Congregations of this description were established between the years 1741 and 1760, in New-York, Philadelphia, Newport in Rhode Island, Bethel on the Swatara, in Lancaster, Yorktown and Graceham.

The Brethren in America, in common with the other white inhabitants, were exposed to great danger, in consequence of the war with the Indians, which broke out in 1755. On the evening of November 24th 1755, the Mission-house at Gradenhuetten, on the Mahony, was attacked by a party of Indians, who set fire to the premises, and destroyed them. Of the missionary family, eleven persons were either burnt or murdered, and only four escaped with their lives.

The Brethren, besides their regularly organized congregations, have, in almost every Protestant State in Europe, a number of friends, united in larger or smaller societies, for spiritual education in a more private way. In order to give a distinct idea of the difference between a settlement or congregation, and a society—It is necessary to remark: That the name of *society* is exclusively given to those religious associations in connection with the Brethren's Church, the members of which still attend the public ministry and the sacraments of the parish church, but have private meetings for edification among themselves, and who adopt such parts of the Brethren's constitution as are suited to their circumstances. They bear a near resemblance to the Methodist Societies, as they were founded by Wesley. In some towns, the Brethren have regular chapels, and an ordained minister of their own church serving the society. In other places the meetings are held in a private licensed house. The superintendence of these societies is committed to the elders' conference of the Unity, or to the elders of the settlement in whose vicinity they lie.

The office of superintendent of the Brethren's congregation in North America was always committed to their bishops; David Nittsman, the first bishop of the renewed church of the Brethren, Peter Boehler, John Frederic Cammerhof, Matthew Hehl, Nathaniel Seidel, and August Gotheb Spangenberg, discharged the duties of this office, either conjointly

\* During a scarcity which prevailed in 1754, God so blessed their industry, that they were enabled to sell bread to their neighbors considerably below the current price.

[B. Hist. p. 401.]

or in succession, till 1762. Their official duties consisted in holding frequent visitations in all congregations and schools, in providing them with properly qualified ministers and other laborers, in maintaining the observance of the constitution of their church, and in keeping up a regular correspondence with their brethren in Europe and in the country.

For many years after the commencement of the Brethren's labor in America, the spiritual instruction of the members of their church and other friends, could not be duly attended to without great personal inconvenience and even danger. Except setting before them, in the spirit of primitive hospitality, such things as they had, the people could afford little or no aid to their ministers, who were often obliged to make many a long and toilsome journey on foot. Students, however, were raised up in the Brethren's Theological Seminary in Germany, who had the requisite zeal and self-denial, who sacrificed the temporal comforts to which they had hitherto been accustomed, and entered on a mode of life, the trials of which, nothing could sweeten but the divine blessing which accompanied their exertions. They considered themselves in the light of missionaries to the world, wherever God should open for them a door for preaching the gospel. This persuasion rendered their difficulties easy; under this conviction, even those whose station in the church, (to say nothing of their respectability as men of learning) entitled them to exemption from manual labors, did not think it derogatory to themselves, to take a part in other necessary works, whenever their ministerial duties allowed them a day of leisure.

It is related of Peter Boehler, a man of great learning, and afterward a bishop of the Brethren's Church, that he used to go with a wagon once a week to fetch flour. Cammerhof, Spangenberg, and other Brethren, acted in the same spirit, and besides the discharge of their clerical duties, willingly lent their aid in clearing the land, or following the plough, &c.

Many anecdotes might be given, which would set the character of the Moravian Missionaries in a very interesting point of view, but we are admonished, by the great length to which this article has already been drawn, to bring it to a close.

We cannot refrain, however, from relating a most tragical event, connected with the early history of this country, which occurred at a Moravian Indian village, on the Tuscarawas river, in what is now the State of Ohio, named Gradenhutzen.

These simple sons of the forest had become docile as children, under the gentle guidance of the Moravian teachers; a large number appeared truly pious, and were members of the church. Seated on the frontiers, between the contending savages and the whites, and taking sides with neither, they had become obnoxious to both, and were cruelly murdered in cold blood, to the number of ninety-four, in April, 1762, by Colonels Williamson and Crawford, and party. The Indians, thinking of no evil, were busily engaged about their domestic concerns, and, offering no resistance, suffered themselves to be all taken prisoners, to the number of ninety-four. More than half of these were women and children. In the morning, when told what was to be their fate, they mutually prayed, and exhorted each other to be resigned, and asking reciprocal forgiveness, prepared for death.

Before the order for massacre was finally issued, some of the more humane men made application to Colonel Williamson for liberty to take a child apiece to their homes, and save their lives, there being

no less than thirty or forty. Williamson, after considering a minute, answered that there were not children enough for all to have one, and lest there might be any complaining, he thought it better to let them remain on the spot with their parents and relatives; accordingly they were all massacred in cool blood, and after a night's rest for reflection. In the heat of battle, and at the sacking of a town, there may be some excuse for the indiscriminate slaughter that sometimes takes place; but in the whole annals of American warfare, no scene of deliberate murder can be found that equals this in atrocity. It is remarkable that the larger number of the men engaged in this murderous business, either came to an untimely end, or suffered losses of property and other calamities, too striking not to be noticed as marks of the retributive justice of Heaven. Williamson died poor and miserable, in the debtors prison in Washington, Pennsylvania. Crawford was taken prisoner by the Indians shortly afterwards, and burnt to death, and most of his men killed, at the defeat which bears his name on the Sandusky Plains.

Gradenhutzen was first settled by the Moravian Missionaries in the year 1772. Another Missionary station was formed a few miles below, at Salem, by Mr. Heckwelder, in the spring of 1780. Here he resided with his wife Sarah, in confident security, amongst their Indian converts. The sixteenth of April, 1781, was the birth-day of their daughter, Maria, who, it is believed, was the first white child born within the present limits of the State of Ohio. In the autumn of that year, the Indians and Missionaries were forcibly removed to Detroit by the Sandusky Indians, leaving all their crops of corn standing in the fields. Having suffered much from a want of food during the winter, a part of the Indians returned in March to save what was yet left, at which time the massacre above mentioned took place.

Mr. Heckwelder had a singular trait in his character, that of believing in the power of foretelling future events. He had lived so many years secluded in the deep forests, and had, in the eye of his mind, seen the Indians so often at their labors, and his visions had been so often verified, that he had imbibed the belief that the human mind may become so deeply impressed with the approach of future events, as to predict their arrival with certainty; and from certain occurrences, he was led to believe that he himself possessed this faculty. The following singular fact is related by an ocular and still living witness. During the early years of the settlement of the Ohio company at Marietta, Mr. Heckwelder was a frequent and welcome guest. He there found men of learning and taste, whose society was congenial, and where he could again enjoy the comforts and enjoyments of social life. From his thorough knowledge of the Indian languages, he had been employed by General Rufus Putnum as an interpreter, at the treaty which he held with the Indian tribes at Vincennes, on the Wabash, in September, 1792. This duty had been accomplished, and the General had returned as far as the Falls of Ohio, where he was detained by an attack of autumnal fever, then common on the Wabash. Mr. Heckwelder had in the meantime returned by land to Marietta, in company with some of the Delaware Indians.

As the fever of the General had somewhat abated before Mr. Heckwelder left him, and the season was now advanced in November, his family at Marietta were daily expecting him, and were with great anxiety waiting for news. No news, however, could be obtained.

Mrs. Putnam, with whom Mr. Heckwelder lodged, had become very

uneasy and alarmed at the long delay of her husband, and it had been the subject of conversation before retiring to rest. In the morning, when Mr. Heckwelder appeared at the breakfast table, he told Mrs. Putnam, with a smiling countenance, that he had good news for her of the General; and proceeded to state, that in the course of the night he had had one of those mysterious communications in relation to coming events that had often been made to him in the course of his life. He said the General would return in safety on the eighteenth day of that month; and lest he should forget the day, he had in the night marked on the white-washed chimney, by the side of the bed, the number, with a piece of cut money he had in his pocket. The person who related this, and who was then a boy, immediately ran up stairs and found the figures 18 plainly marked on the chimney. This was eight or ten days before the prophetic time. The days were carefully counted, and as the time approached, many an anxious look was cast down the placid stream in search of the coming barge, when lo! on the precise day, early in the morning, the boat reached the stockaded Fort at Marietta, with the General and all the party in safety. Such is the account as given in the *American Journal*.

Ever since the year 1711, there have been annually published, under the title of "Daily Words and Texts of the Congregation of the Brethren," select texts of the Old and New Testament, containing promises, examples, &c., each of which is illustrated or applied by a verse subjoined. The Daily Words are drawn for all the days in the year, in a session of the elders conference of the Unity, from a collection of several thousand scripture pages. This manual is always printed in time, so as to be used from the commencement of every year in all the congregations and missionary establishments of the Brethren. These Daily Words and doctrinal texts furnish subjects for the discourses addressed to the congregations of their church. For a more explicit account of the origin and use of these Daily Words, see the preface to "The Daily Words for the year 1831."

The Church of the Brethren celebrate many festival and memorial days, which refer to those events in her history, to which she ascribes her origin, revival and preservation.

The Martyrdom of John Huss, July 6th, 1415; the commencement of the Ancient Church of the Brethren, on the 1st of March, 1457; the beginning of the building of Herrnhut, June 12th, 1722; the building of the first meeting-house and academy there, May 12th, 1724; the agreement to the first statutes or rules of the congregation, May 12th, 1727; the great sealing communication of the congregation of Herrnhut, in the church at Bertholdsdorf, August 13th, 1729; the departure of the first Missionaries from Herrnhut for St. Thomas, August 21st, 1732, and for Greenland, January 19th, 1733; the blessed experience in the Unity of the Brethren, that Jesus is the Chief Shepherd and Head of his Church, on the 16th of September and 13th of November, 1741, are the events which are commemorated annually on the above mentioned days in the church of the Brethren. (The circumstantial narrative of these events is to be found in "Memorial Days of the Ancient and Renewed Church of the Brethren.")

Regarding marriage, it has been agreed upon among the United Brethren, that none shall take place without the consent of the Board of elders of the congregation. Upon due application this consent is

signified to the parties, whereupon they are solemnly betrothed, in presence of the elders and nearest connexions, and the marriage then takes place, according to the forms prescribed by law in each country.

The following is a List of the Congregations, Societies and Missions of the Church of the United Brethren, at the close of the first century, since its renewal.

### I. CONGREGATIONS.

#### IN EUROPE.

*In Upper Lusatia* there are four congregations—2,135 members.\*

*In Silesia*—Thirteen congregations—4,156 members.

*In Great Britain*—Twenty congregations—3,432 members.

*In Ireland*—Six congregations—1,265 members.

#### IN ASIA,

One Congregation—449 members.

#### IN NORTH AMERICA.

*In Pennsylvania*—Eleven congregations—2,860 members.

*In Ohio*—Three congregations—352 members.

*In New-York*—Two congregations—433 members.

*In Rhode Island*—One congregation—50 members.

*In Maryland*—One congregation—341 members.

*In North Carolina*—Six congregations—1,670 members.

### II. SOCIETIES.

*In Germany and Prussia*—Fifteen societies—31,336 members. (Returns incomplete.)

*In Switzerland and France*—Seven societies—2,664 members. (Returns incomplete.)

*In Denmark, Norway and Sweden*—Twenty-two societies—42,300 members.

### III. MISSIONS.

*In Greenland*, since 1733—(Among the Natives on the Western Coast,) Three congregations, eighteen missionaries, 966 converts.

*On the Coast of Zabrador*, since 1770—(Among the Esquimaux Indians.) Three congregations, twenty-five missionaries, 607 converts.

*In North America*, since 1734—(Among the Delaware and Cherokee Indians.) Three congregations, seven missionaries, 180 converts.

*In South America*, since 1738—(Among the Negro population.) One station, eleven missionaries, 1,388 converts.

IN THE WEST INDIES—(Among the negro slaves:)

*In the Danish West Indies*—Seven stations, thirty-six missionaries, 8,250 converts.

*In the British West Indies*—Twelve stations, thirty-five missionaries, 16,447 converts.

#### IN SOUTH AFRICA,

Since 1792—Three stations, thirty-six missionaries, 1,729 converts.

#### IN RUSSIAN ASIA,

(Among the Calmucs.)—*Island in the Wolga, near Surepta*—3 missionaries, 22 converts.

*Recapitulations of numbers.*—Members in communion, 16,125; In Societies, 79,184; Converts in Missions, 33,169.

\* The number of members include the children and refer to the year 1822.

From the preceding accounts which have been chiefly taken from accredited histories of the Brethren's Church; it will be seen that they have been a singular people, and that many of the peculiarities which constitute their singularity, are those which should always characterize the church of Christ—a spirit of humility and self-denial—and of active zeal in spreading the good news and glad tidings of salvation, wherever a door of utterance could be found.

We see that when they were *in number very few and without a sure abode*, and in the midst of great poverty, they undertook to preach the gospel to the most destitute, those who sat in darkness and saw no light; and it may be observed, that the Moravians, at least, are not obnoxious to the charge, perhaps justly made, by a late writer in this periodical—that where there was no refinement in a country, and where there was nothing left but the bare circumstance of enlightening the heathen, it seemed to be an object which alone had not sufficient charms to enlist the energies of most missionaries. For the bleak and inhospitable climate of “Greenland's icy mountains,” where there was neither refinement nor comfort; amongst the negro slaves in the West Indies, and the christian slaves in Algiers, were the places where the Brethren first labored. They left little room to doubt of the purity of their motives, and of their singular disinterestedness. Some of them actually selling themselves for slaves, that they might thereby have an opportunity of preaching Christ to the oppressed African.

It was this peculiar trait of benevolence to the destitute, which characterized the Moravians, that first induced the compiler of these sketches to endeavor to bring their history more particularly to notice in our own church. Being impressed with the belief that we, as a church, have not, as we ought to have, that spirit of devotedness to the cause of our Master, which characterized the church in the days of the Apostles, that we seem to think that it is not required of us *now*, that we be followers together of such a man as Paul, that it would be considered as super-service to take for an example men, who were willing to spend and be spent in the service of Christ; believing that we have much need of examining ourselves, whether we are *rendering according to the benefits received*, these sketches were designed to show that others, whom we justly considered as not having attained to that degree of clearness in doctrine, government and discipline, which we claim, have yet, in their missionary labors, set us an example worthy of our imitation. Shall we, who, in the good providence of God, have been delivered from the darkness of popery and prelacy, and who have received from our covenanting fathers such a clear exposition of the scriptures, as are contained in our confession of faith, we, who have been enabled to reject the will-worship and ceremonies which the Moravians have fallen into, shall we not do *more than others*?

ADELPHE.

---

## ART. II. *Slavery essentially immoral.*

(Concluded from page 325.)

The Apostle did indeed give directions, pointing out the relative duties of *master and servant*, by which he recognized the relation to be

lawful. It is here we presume, the mistake is made. The Apostle mentions, *masters* and *servants*. We know from profane history, that there was a system of slavery, similar to our own, then practised in the Roman Empire; and consequently many infer that it must be servants held by that system, which the Apostle referred to; and they go to the Roman heathen statute book, instead of the Bible, to understand the tenure by which they were held, and the laws that were to regulate the system. But when the Apostle gave directions regulating the conduct of *master* and *servant*, it must be such a servitude, as was recognised by God's laws. The servant's duty to his master must not come in competition with his duty to God. It can not disannul God's other general precepts, by which all are to be governed. It must not stop a man from entering legally into the marriage relation, which is the covenant of his God, and the first link in the chain of all social ties; which if broken, all others are severed. But *slaves* can make no contracts which are binding, consequently every male and female slave, who live as husband and wife, live in a state of concubinage, so far as civil law is concerned—But let this suffice to shew, that the servant's duty to his master must not come in collision with God's precepts.

The Apostle in writing to the different churches, was writing to people who had been admitted to church fellowship. They had already acceded to the terms of communion; we could not expect him to make any new terms; their slaves had already been disposed of according to the requisitions of the gospel, though they still retained them, or a portion of them in their employment; accordingly he instructs the masters to treat them with "justice and equality," and to "forbear threatening"—threatening that they would again reduce them to their former state of bondage; as we presume they depended solely on the christian principles of their masters, for their protection. He does not say you shall not brand them with hot irons, or you shall not suspend them with a weight tied to their feet—when you apply the whip until it lacerates their naked bodies, or other barbarities, which were then used. The Apostle would not have such barbarities as much as named amongst Christians, and which we know are practised in our own country, and which are necessary appendages to the system—When man is yoked to labor like the brute, like the brute he must be coerced, nay worse than the brute, for he will not work under the yoke so tamely. The Apostle exhorts the servants to discharge their duty with "fidelity," a very necessary advice to a people emerging from a heathen state. Servants might suppose that a religion, which breathed so much benevolence and love, and had such an equalizing tendency, made it no more necessary for them to labor—that the benevolence of their brethren in the church, should support them, or that they should have all things common.

There was another class of servants whom he addressed, who were actually slaves, who had heathen masters, those he exhorted to exercise christian-patience and to be diligent and faithful in their business, that the word of God might not be blasphemed. Not that they owed the labor in justice to their masters; nor was there any need to promulgate any new laws respecting slavery, for the fundamental principles of the christian religion utterly condemned it. It could not be maintained without sapping their foundation principles—supreme love to God, and love to our neighbors. The judicial law was full and explicit, giving directions regulating the Hebrew servitude. (Dent. xv. and 12, 13, 14, 15.) The moral part of this law is always binding—for as we have already

said, the standard of moral obligation, in respect of love to our neighbor, is certainly no lower under the Christian dispensation than under the Jewish.

When the Apostle gave directions for the discharge of other relative duties, did he recognize the absurd and wicked laws, by which these relations were governed in the Roman Empire? By no means. He gave directions for the discharge of the relative duties of husband and wife, and parents and children; now we know that the wife was reckoned by the Roman laws the husband's slave; and he had the same authority over her as over his slaves. The father had as much authority over his children, as he had over his slaves, in some respects the father's authority over his child, was more absolute than over his slave. A son could not do business for himself in his father's lifetime, except his father first emancipated him, in a formal manner three different times; and a slave was made free by being but once emancipated. Now the Apostle did not consider it necessary to say any thing against any of these absurdities, he intended we should go to the Bible for our instructions. Some of our pro-slavery friends seem to be of the opinion, that if the Apostle had preached the duty of emancipation, it would have made such an *uproar*, that we certainly should have heard of it, and that the Apostle was awed from preaching this christian duty, because he was afraid of the displeasure of the despots, who were then in power. Now the Apostle was "no tame, time-serving priest." He knew that, "the fear of man bringeth a snare." He was not afraid to "lay the axe to the root of the tree," to their idolatry, of which slavery is the legitimate offspring. Do we suppose that they would be more attached to their slaves than to their gods? The Apostle did not appear to be afraid to tell them, that "they were no gods, that were made with hands." Though alas! christians in our day seem to be more attached to *their system of slavery*, than to *the laws of their God*.

Emancipation was not so rare an occurrence, in the Roman Empire, that it needed to make such a great commotion—humane masters gave slaves greater facilities for obtaining their freedom, under the Roman government, than do our American slave-holders. Cicero says, that "sober industrious slaves, at least such as became slaves from being captives in war, seldom remained in servitude above six years." There were laws in the Roman Empire at one time, prohibiting persons from emancipating more than a portion of their slaves; for the emancipation had been so great, previous to that time, that they became alarmed for the safety of their system, which shews that emancipation was not so very unpopular amongst the people. The Apostle's greatest effort was directed against idolatry, but he does not particularize every evil, which flowed out of that system. There were many crimes existing in the Roman Empire, which the Apostle did not in precise language reprove; yet to construe his silence into an approval, would be as great a slander on his character, as to say he approved of slavery. Did he approve of their gladiatorial shows? because "they are not in the catalogue of crimes" that he has mentioned and which were most barbarous spectacles of cruelty and murder. A duelist might say, that the Apostle approved of duelling, because there was more barbarity manifested in the gladiatorial shows than in duelling, and these shows were practised to a great extent in the Roman Empire in his days; but he did not express any disapprobation of them, on the contrary, he borrowed figures from them, to represent the christian's warfare; "So fight I not, as one that

beateth the air." Fathers in the Roman Empire exposed their children, when infants, in such a manner, that death was the consequence; and even when they came to the years of maturity, they put them to death by any punishment they saw proper to select. Deeds of this kind were of common occurrence. The Apostle in his catalogue of crimes, says nothing about those deeds of atrocity committed by fathers. Did he therefore approve of them?

Nor would it do to say that in all cases, wherever God gave commandments, regulating transactions, that it was equivalent to an approval. Did God approve of Laban's pursuit after Jacob, in search of his gods, when he gave him directions how he should conduct himself on his interview with Jacob? There is no evidence, that he said one word to him respecting his idolatrous designs after his gods? Did he approve of Balaam's journey to Moab, with a view of cursing Israel? God even told Balaam to go with the messengers of Balak, and yet he highly disapproved of his mission, and the motives by which he was impelled? And did not Christ say to Judas, "what thou doest do quickly?"

Is it true, that Christ and his Apostles did not give slavery a rebuke? Did not Christ preach an emancipation sermon in Nazareth from this text? (See Luke iv. 18, 19.) "The spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor, he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord." The great Jubilee trumpet was to be blown, but it may be said that this is all prefiguring spiritual maladies which are to be remedied by spiritual blessings. Grant, that these are principally intended, but notwithstanding, it is to be literally fulfilled. Christ's precepts and example, were as far removed from slave-holding, as the east is distant from the west. He showed a tender regard, both for the souls and bodies of men. He stooped to the humblest offices to teach us humility. The criterion by which his disciples were to be distinguished from the world, was their love one to another, and they were to do good to all men; and he prohibited any thing like a domineering spirit amongst his followers. He said, "whosoever would be chief, let him be servant," and gave himself as the example to be imitated.

If a person wanted authority, let him become more useful to his fellow men. Now this is the very principle which runs through all God's institutions. God never gave authority to any individual, to lord it over his fellow men—for the exclusive benefit of himself. And he gave one rule, by which our whole intercourse with our fellow men is to be governed, which would root out slavery, were there not another text in the Bible to say one word on the subject, namely: "*whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets.*"

We will now examine whether slavery may not be legitimately included amongst the catalogues of crimes, given by the Apostles. "No covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God, nor extortioners, adulterers, disobedient to parents, proud, boasters, lovers of their own selves, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God, inventors of evil things, without natural affections, implacable, unmerciful, effeminate, hateful and hating one another, *men-stealers*, or (as Greek scholars say it should

be rendered) *men-dealers*." We have put down covetousness first, as that is the source from which slavery flows—the love of money, which is the root of all evil,—*avarice*.

We have no Dictionary of the English language at hand, except Walker, who defines covetousness to be "avarice" "greediness of gain," &c. "Extortioner" is derived from "extort," which is thus defined: "to draw by force, to force away, to wrest, to wring from one, to gain by violence or oppression, or by usury." The Apostle says (1st Corinthians, v. 11,) "If any man that is called a brother, be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner, with such a one no not to eat." Now if slave-holders are not "covetous, extortioners," we would not know where to find such characters. And the text just quoted, we think, is an ample justification of the course which the Secession church has pursued in excluding slave-holders from church fellowship. We bless God for the faithfulness to which they have already attained on this subject—the discipline of the church being an appointed means in the hand of God to reclaim forward sinners; and we humbly pray it may be made effectual for this end.

But to return. As it respects "adultery," slavery is a system of adultery, and does in all cases produce this evil fruit, as in the plentitude of its power, it refuses to acknowledge the legality of the marriage covenant, entered into by its victims. Also by the same assumption of power, it prevents parents and children from discharging their reciprocal duties, and consequently, is chargeable with "disobedience to parents." Slavery is awfully chargeable with generating that wicked disposition "hateful and hating one another." Slavery has a tendency to degrade its victims to the level of the brute that perisheth. Is not that the reason why we despise our colored brethren, and refuse them that love and courtesy which God has commanded us to extend to all the human family? We are also constrained to believe that the Apostle James had slave-holders in view, when he drew his picture—it has such a striking resemblance to the original, (James, v. 1-5.)

What we have dwelt upon in this discussion, is the system of slavery, (separate and apart from its practical enormities) viz. the principle of holding man as property. If it is lawful to hold man as property, it will justify the greater part of the enormities of the system. In short, if man is property, we are authorised to dispose of him in any way which would best subserve our interest, however it might agonize his tenderest affections. He must be entirely at the disposal of the owner. We think it quite consistent with the principles of the system, that he should have the power of life and death, and indeed it is a mere pretence to say he has not. We are all aware of the corrupting influence of absolute dominion. Hence it plainly appears there is no remedy for the flagrant practical evils arising from slavery, but to *eradicate the root, cut off the property-holding power*. Now we think we have given scripture, and arguments enough to show that man is not lawful property, and cannot be held as such, without highly infracting God's laws; and whoever holds him as such, is accessory to all the enormities of the system. It is humiliating in this enlightened age to be put to the necessity of adducing a series of arguments, to demonstrate, that a man belongs to himself, that he owns his own bones and muscles, and mental faculties, when he is in actual possession of them—the possession of which, and God giving laws how he is to exert those faculties, is proof positive, that, so far as man is concerned, he is the sole proprietor. Can

there a doubt remain that it is not highly immoral to extort those faculties from the rightful owners, and appropriate them to our own use? Is it not *man-stealing*?

Now we think if we have been so happy as to make ourselves understood, that we have succeeded in showing that slavery is essentially immoral in itself, or in other words, *is sin*. It is both "a want of conformity unto, and a transgression of the law of God." We will now test the qualities of this system by the fruit it bears. It is generally customary to show the sufferings inflicted on the slave, in order to delineate the evils of slavery—but we will show the moral evils that it inflicts on the upholders and abettors of this system. And for this purpose we will give the testimony of slave-holders themselves.

In a short extract from a pamphlet, published some time since by order of the Presbyterian Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, is the following: "The influence," say they, "of the negroes upon the moral and religious interests of the whites, is destructive in the extreme. We cannot go into especial detail. It is unnecessary. We make our appeal to universal experience. We are *chained to a putrid carcase*—it sickens and destroys us. We have a mill stone hanged about the neck of our society, to sink us deep in the sea of vice. Our children are corrupting from their infancy, nor can we prevent it. Many an anxious parent, like the missionaries in foreign lands, wishes that his children could be brought up beyond the reach of the influence of the depraved heathen. Nor is this influence confined to mere childhood. If that were all, it would be tremendous. But it follows us into youth, into manhood, and into old age. In all our intercourse with them, (the slaves) we are undergoing a process of intellectual and moral deterioration; and it requires almost superhuman effort to maintain a high standing, either for intelligence or piety." What a deplorable picture of moral depravity, and intellectual deterioration! Their own mouths have testified against them.

These Rev. Gentlemen ("blind guides" we fear) were investigating the practical enormities of their system, in order to remedy the evils of it, without any idea of its abandonment. If they had applied this unerring test to the case in hand, and applied the remedy provided in such cases, they would have showed themselves more like "scribes who were instructed unto the kingdom of heaven," viz. "a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit, every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit, is *hewn down and cast into the fire*." We see that our slave-holding brethren, by forging chains for others, have become enchained themselves. They say "we are chained to a putrid carcase, it sickens and destroys us." *O wretched men that they are; who shall deliver them from this body of death?* Christ says, "come unto me all ye that are weary, and heavy laden, and I will give you rest." "Let them loose the bands of wickedness, undo the heavy burdens, and let the oppressed go free," and that will break *every yoke*; let *them unchain the slave*, and then they will *themselves also be unchained*. Satan has nothing but chains in his kingdom, but mankind are prone to cling to them as though they were regal ornaments. It is truly astonishing to see with what pertinacity they cling to this sinful institution. The god of this world hath blinded their eyes. Is christianity so impotent that she is to yield to the giant grasp of this foe of God and man? Has it chariots of iron, and therefore are men not able to thrust it out of the church of God? Is not the omnipotent God plied-

ed for the existence and extension of Christianity? And he is King of kings and Lord of Hosts. Christianity has no need to immolate human victims on the altar of slavery, to satiate the appetite of avarice and despotism to gain admittance into the world. And what would it gain by such admittance? why forsooth, it would gain slave-holding members to its churches, and thus obtain the *mighty* and the *noble*. This would ingratiate us into the favor of slave-holders, and they themselves being persuaded of the evils of slavery, we might thus procure their aid, as they are the only people who have power to abolish it. But we have no need of any unholy alliances, for the purpose of eradicating slavery, or any other immorality; as "he whose fan is in his hand will thoroughly purge his floor." We humbly hope that there are many amongst the slave-holders, who are bewailing the evils of slavery—we feel for their unhappy situation, but we think there should be action on the subject, as faith without works is dead. The God that sustained Moses and Aaron in their enterprize, can also sustain them. They may be few in number, though if an host encamp against them, they need not be afraid; if the Lord of Hosts be on their side, one shall chase a thousand. They ought not to forget to avail themselves of that powerful auxiliary, prayer.

We think if our brethren in the slave-holding States, who were formerly members of the Secession Church, had a due estimate of the privileges of God's house, they would not for so slight a cause as the abjuration of slavery, give up their fellowship in the church. There is no judgment more to be deprecated, than the removal of the candlestick. If that fails to awaken, God will send desolating judgments, that may be felt; for he is pledged to hear the groans of the oppressed. The terms of the Secession Church, can not operate on them with more loss to their pecuniary interest, than did our Saviour's to the young man in the gospel,—“Sell all that thou hast, and give to the poor,” &c. Christ will not have a rival in our affections. They are not required by the act of the Secession Church to give any of their property to the poor, they are only required to return to the poor what is evidently their own, viz. their bones and muscles. The officers of Christ's house have no authority to make the terms of church fellowship any wider than Christ has made them. Christ does not allow his ministers, when fishing for men, to use the world for a bait. He said except ye forsake all, ye cannot be my disciples. They have no authority to give indulgences to commit sin, from any supposed benefit arising from it; though obedience to God's commands has the promise of temporal blessings, as well as spiritual, as far as it is for God's glory, and their own good. And recent occurrences fully demonstrate, that emancipation is profitable, even as it respects pecuniary interests.

There is another class of mankind that the ministers of Christ have a special message to, viz. the wounded, the despoiled, the distressed, the afflicted and the down-trodden. To these they are to act as did the good Samaritan, and to preach the gospel to the poor, to heal the broken hearted, and preach deliverance to the captives. Ethiopia is also to stretch out her hands to God. Would it not be enough to petrify the heart of the slave, and to forever seal it against a religion that would sanction the oppressor in robbing him of every thing that endears human existence, and putting him to grind in the prison house? Could they think God pities them, as a father pities his children, when he approves of their brethren of mankind, in thrusting them from the society of men,

and ranking them with the beasts of the field; blotting out their name from under heaven, so that they are known on the earth only as beasts of burden for their brethren, and excluded from the privilege of showing their love to their Saviour by keeping his commandments? Could they believe that they had a mansion in their father's house in the heavens, if when traveling through the pilgrimage journey of this world, they are made to think that it is by God's authority they are thus treated, as if they were an execration on the earth?

We will now close our remarks. We feel that we have too heavily taxed the pages of the Monitor, and the patience of its readers, by the length of this essay. When commencing this article, we had no idea of making any more than a few passing remarks, as we said, on the sentiments adduced by our brother A. R., and others on his side of the question; but our anxiety for the extirpation of slavery, the scourge and disgrace of mankind, from our country, has inadvertently led us, step by step, into this protracted discussion. We hope A. R. will once more minutely view this subject through the glass of God's word. We give him full credit for his integrity of purpose, but he is certainly doing a very great unkindness to those he would wish to befriend—they certainly have no need of opiates, they have more need of a voice of thunder to arouse them from their lethargy, lest they *sleep the sleep of death*. Every friend to his God, friend to his country and friend to his species, should lend his aid for the removal of so pernicious an institution. We would hail that day with peculiar delight, when slavery will be abolished, not only in our own country, which with all its faults we sincerely love but *that it will be abolished* throughout all the world. We would consider it a harbinger of that blessed day when God will take unto himself his great power and reign; when the "kingdoms of this world will become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ."

ANTI-SAVERY.

---

ART. III. *An examination of the decision of the Associate Synod of 1838, respecting the two parties claiming to be the Presbytery of Albany.*

There is a common propensity among men to judge between contending parties, and to espouse the cause of the one or the other; and this propensity is not always restrained till the means of forming a correct judgment are afforded. In the decision of the late Synod respecting the parties claiming to be the Associate Presbytery of Albany, the means of forming a correct judgment are only exhibited partially and in a scattered form; some of them being contained in the Minutes of preceding years, and in other publications, some only to be ascertained by comparisons of different documents, and others again only known to such as were present to hear the statements of the parties, and the reasonings of the members of Synod. It is a judicious method in church courts, when any decision of importance is made, to accompany it with the reasons which gave rise to it. This however the Synod has not fully done in the present case, and, in consequence of this, mistaken apprehensions have prevailed to some extent. Although not possessing any authority from the Synod to interpret their views, or presuming to suppose that the views to be expressed will be found exactly agreeing with those which influenced their decision, I hope I may be allowed as an in-

dividual to state my opinion, and my *belief* of what was the opinion of others.

To understand this case correctly, it is necessary to give a history of it. In 1836, the Presbytery of Albany referred to the Synod which met at Philadelphia, a libel against the Rev. Andrew Stark, charging him with a number of flagrant offences, and assigning as reasons for the reference, that he had refused to obey their citations, and had also in a written communication, peremptorily refused to be tried by them. A question has since arisen respecting the true character of this latter paper, whether it be a total declinature, or only a declinature in the particular case to be tried. Mr. Stark now alleges that he only declined the authority of the Presbytery in this particular case. He says of this paper, "It was merely a statement of his reasons, why he thought the Presbytery ought not to try the libel they had laid against him." (*Associate Presbyterian Magazine*, p. 18.) In the paper, however, both the language and the reasons are general, implying that he would not be judged by the Presbytery in any case, but would hold all their proceedings as null and void. He does not say, I protest against their trying me in *this case*, but "I protest against their interfering with me *in any way*, and that I shall hold as null and void and of no account, *whatever decisions* they may make." Candour would readily attribute this general language to inadvertence, had the reasons of the protest been special; but they are of the same general character, and if correct would prove the Presbytery not only disqualified for the trial of Mr. Stark in any case, but for the trial of any body else. He states in his first reason, not simply that the Presbytery were not disinterested in this case, but in general terms, that they had destroyed "their character for disinterestedness, impartiality and fair dealing," That it was quite evident to him that such a court "could not act on the principles of truth and righteousness," and that "it would be perfectly idle to expect justice from it." "If," says he, "I were as innocent as my Master himself, I could expect nothing else than to be condemned by such a court, provided it might suit its policy. Therefore a trial" (not *this* trial, but indefinitely, *any trial*) "before such a court is, in my humble opinion, a very needless formality." The remaining reasons are of the same general character. He accuses the Presbytery of slandering him because they had been witnesses against him; and refuses altogether to be tried by them, till they would try themselves and some others whom he names. He says that his confidence in the Presbytery was destroyed, that they had lost all just claim to respect, that they had "done all they could do, to destroy all distinction between truth and falsehood, and to establish a most heartless, spiritual despotism," and that he could not "in any way countenance the Presbytery in a course of backsliding."

Now it may be safely left to any candid reader, without further remark, whether a declinature stated in such general terms, based on such general reasons, and accompanied by no appeal to the superior court, ought not to be regarded as a total and final declinature, both of the Presbytery and of the church. It may also be left to every such person to judge whether the man presenting it and refusing to withdraw it, could with any consistency be admitted to a seat in the court whose character he thus persisted in reviling, and whose authority he thus persisted to despise. It is difficult to reconcile his claiming a seat with either christian or honorable feelings; yet if he could be so wanting in

self-respect as to make one among those whom he professes to regard as so utterly abandoned, it does not follow that they should so far forego their self-respect as to sit with him on these terms. It is not to be supposed that the Synod could ever have deliberately intended this, and there is none of their acts which affords any evidence of such intention.

It is indeed true, that Mr. Stark was allowed, after handing in this paper, to sit as a member in Synod, (having been notified to attend,) but this cannot prove that the paper was not a declinature, nor that it might not be so regarded both by the Presbytery and Synod, for though noticed by the Presbytery in their report as exceptionable on this very account, as well as on account of the heavy charges which it contains, it was never formally considered, so as to pass any judgment upon it or its author.\* It might be regarded as the party ebullition of disordered passions, or as an inconsiderate expression of what the writer did not really intend, and which in moments of more deliberation, he might choose to withdraw. Judgment upon it was postponed, and the only use made of it was to read it in Synod, as one of the chief reasons for referring the libel. It is of importance to observe, that this paper itself was not referred to the Synod, but was expressly reserved for future judgment by the Presbytery. It seems to be the impression of some that all matters affecting the standing of Mr. Stark, had been before the Synod which met at Pittsburgh in 1837, and that therefore the Presbytery of Albany had no right to take up this paper or any thing affecting his standing previously to that meeting. The error of this impression will be clearly manifested by consulting the Report of the Presbytery of Albany, in which, after referring the libel against Mr. Stark, they say :

“Resolved, further, that the Presbytery still retain the right, if they shall think it proper, hereafter to call Mr. Stark to account for the truly offensive and libellous matter contained in his reasons of protest, which go before the Synod, and also in the paper alluded to, in which he gives his reasons for refusing to be tried by this Presbytery.” (Rel. Mon. v. xiii. p. 25.)

The latter of the papers mentioned was the declinature, of which the Presbytery had complained as containing “cruel, unjust and slanderous statements.” The Synod did not examine these papers or pass any judgment respecting them, but not only acquiesced in their being retained in the hands of the Presbytery for future judgment,\* but they explicitly referred them to that Presbytery, with orders to deal with Mr. Stark respecting them. The following are the words of their their act: “On motion, Resolved, that as exceptions have been taken against the papers of Mr. Stark on various accounts, these papers are hereby referred to the Presbytery of Albany, to deal with him respecting them.” (See Minutes as above, p. 32.) After Mr. Stark was convicted and suspended, he handed in another paper declining the authority of the Synod, which was also referred to the Presbytery. (See Minutes as above, p. 40.) Thus it appears that there were three different papers in the hands of that Presbytery, viz:—Mr. Stark’s Reasons of Protest, his Declinature of the Presbytery, and his Declinature of the Synod, for all or any of which, it was their right and duty, to deal with him, with the consent and by the order of Synod. The Pres-

\* The Synod did so far act on that paper as to decide unanimously that in it Mr. Stark had declined the authority of his Presbytery; and this greatly adds to our correspondent’s argument. (See Minutes, p. 29.)—[Ed. Rel. Mon.]

bytery however during the succeeding year, did not act on any of these papers, as Mr. Stark continued to preach in contempt of the deed of Synod, did not claim a seat in the Presbytery, and might be properly considered as having withdrawn from all connexion with the Associate Church.

At the Synod which met at Pittsburgh, May, 1837, agreeably to various petitions, and with the consent and votes of a number who had previously voted and still believed Mr. Stark legally and justly convicted, it was decided, "to review the Synod's deed of last year in the case of Mr. Stark." It was also decided that he should be relieved from the sentence of suspension which had been passed against him. Afterwards a resolution was adopted convicting him of insubordination, but further proceeding in the case was deferred till the next meeting, when the deed of the former Synod was to be reviewed. In none of these cases was there any action upon the paper of declination, or reasons of protest reserved by the Presbytery of Albany, or the declination of Synod referred to them at the previous meeting. No judgment was passed respecting these papers, nor any thing done directly or indirectly taking them out of the hands of the Presbytery. The thing could not have been legally done as they were not brought up by reference or appeal, nor was it attempted. The deeds of the Synod make no mention of the *whole case*, but in all their details are expressly limited to the libel on which Mr. Stark had been convicted, and to his subsequent insubordination.

It seems to have been taken for granted by some, that, because, as they allege, Mr. Stark was restored to good standing by the Synod, nothing could be done to affect his standing during the year. This is quite a novel doctrine, and exhibits Mr. Stark in the light of a very favorite child, having an immunity from all process in all supposable cases. Presbyteries have often dealt with others whose standing was at least equally good, without any charge of rebellion against the superior court. Whence then did Mr. Stark derive this peculiar right, not to be touched by his Presbytery? If the Presbytery had attempted to reverse any of the deeds of Synod; if they had entered upon any part of the process which the Synod had taken into their own hands; if they had renewed the sentence of suspension from the ministry for the offences charged in the libel, or in any way interfered with those things which were in the Synod's hands, there would have been room for the charge of insubordination. But they did none of these things; they only judged of things which were in their own hands, with the knowledge, consent, and express order of the Synod.

Subsequently to the above-mentioned deed relieving Mr. Stark from suspension, he appeared and claimed his seat as a member of the Presbytery of Albany, and for all that appears to the contrary, they were ready to admit him, out of respect to the authority of Synod, notwithstanding the heavy charges of which he stood convicted by a large majority of the votes of Synod, and in the minds of all acquainted with the facts of the case. They however judged that he ought to withdraw the declination in which he had brought the charges against them before noticed, and declared that he would hold all their proceedings as null and void. Though in reserving this paper, they had characterized it as "cruel, unjust and slanderous," instead of instituting a process against him for this and the other papers containing libellous matter, they adopted the lenient and pacific course of passing the latter papers without notice, and merely requiring him to withdraw the former. He and others for

him plead that this was virtually done when he claimed his seat. It would seem much more just to say, that the declinature and the charges contained in it were virtually renewed, when at the request of a member or members of the court he refused to withdraw them. In consequence of this refusal, the Presbytery rejected his application for a seat, and though they have not assigned their reasons in their minutes, they have done it elsewhere. They did not suspend Mr. Stark, or interfere in any way with his ministry, but only stood upon their own rights as a Presbytery, refusing to recognize as a brother member one who persisted in thrusting upon them a declinature in which he refused all submission to their authority, reviled them as the worst of men, and plainly enough told them that he considered himself no brother of theirs. They could not with any propriety take in among them one who like a bishop or pope would judge them, but would not himself be judged by them. They regarded this as utterly subversive of Presbyterian purity and of Christian liberty.

The Presbytery assign as another ground of their refusal, the vote of Synod convicting Mr. Stark of insubordination; a scandal not purged. The principle of this reason is obviously correct, but as the Synod involved itself in the inconsistency of convicting Mr. Stark, and then leaving him unpunished, this reason reflected on that deed of the superior court; and though the principle of it be correct, it was not necessary to their defence. The former reason is amply sufficient; and the propriety or impropriety of introducing this need not be debated. A hundred weak or wrong reasons will not invalidate an act for which there is one good reason, any more than weak and insufficient arguments will invalidate the truth. This decision of the Presbytery, even if wrong, was not an act of disobedience to Synod, nor so evidently wrong as to be pronounced "of itself null and void," without being reconsidered and reversed.

A protest accompanied with an appeal was entered against this decision by "Messrs. Bullions, Stark and Blair;" and if they had been wronged, by prosecuting this appeal, they might in a regular way have obtained redress. The course however which they chose to pursue was very different.

As Mr. Stark's case was to come before the next meeting of Synod at Philadelphia, in May, 1838, it became a special object with him and his friends, to secure if possible a majority in his favor. A missionary was sent forth, and money raised to bring on such as it was thought would befriend him. It was also made sufficiently evident at the meeting of the Synod, that among the measures concerted, was the securing by a full and timely meeting of Mr. Stark's friends in one or more Presbyteries, a majority in his favor, who should, when the other members arrived exclude them from their seats, and so prevent them from being members at the organization of the ensuing Synod. This plot is the true key to the subsequent proceedings of Mr. Stark and his friends in the Presbytery of Albany. But what proof, it may be asked, appeared before Synod to warrant so serious a charge? The proof was so ample and so convincing that even the friends of Mr. Stark did not deny it. One of the persons concerned in this plot owned it upon the floor of Synod, stating that they had been long praying for such an opportunity, and that Providence had answered their prayers even beyond their expectation. Connected with the Resolutions published by these brethren in the 3d No. of their Magazine as the the pacific measure rejected by Synod,\* there

\*These resolutions are erroneously attributed to the Rev. Mr. Rodgers, and erroneously and to have been moved by Mr. Rodgers and seconded by Mr. Bell.

was one to this amount, and nearly in these very words—"Resolved, that Dr. P. Bullions, Messrs. Stark and Blair are censurable for the hasty manner in which they constituted the Associate Presbytery of Albany, without waiting for the arrival of their brethren, and also for the manifestations which they have given of intrigue in so doing." Why have these men in giving to the world an account of what their friends attempted in their favor, omitted this resolution which would have revealed what these friends thought of their proceedings? The resolution is repeated from memory after an interval of half a year, but though it no doubt varies somewhat in words, it does not reflect on the conduct of these men more than the original. Their omission of it is a tolerable specimen of the dependence to be placed on their statements.

It appeared from the papers and other representations of the two parties claiming to be the Associate Presbytery of Albany, that this Presbytery was to meet, by adjournment, at Albany, on the morning of April 18th, 1838. In conformity with the plan which had been adopted, Mr. Stark, who had not attended before since his exclusion on the 28th of the preceding June, was now present with an elder, though his arrival in the city was not known to the other party till they found him occupying a seat in the Presbytery. Mr. H. H. Blair called upon Mr. Martin early in the morning to ascertain whether a distant member had arrived whose presence might have materially deranged their plans, but to his great gratification, and as an answer to his prayers, he found that he had not arrived; and he hurried away to convey to his brethren the welcome intelligence. Things being in this state, Dr. P. Bullions, Messrs. Stark and Blair, with their elders, met at the appointed place, and at the precise time to which the Presbytery stood adjourned. Without waiting for their brethren, who were known to be in the city and not twenty rods distant, they constituted with prayer, and proceeded to transact some very important business.

Mr. Stark is mentioned in their minutes, together with his elder, as among the members constituting the Presbytery. They say, "The Associate Presbytery of Albany met, and was constituted with prayer by the Rev. H. H. Blair, Moderator. Members present, Rev. P. Bullions," (clerk pro tem.) "Messrs. Stark and Blair, ministers, together with Messrs. Whitewright, Brinkerhoff and Black, ruling elders." But though they had thus made him a constituent member in the act of meeting, they proceeded to constitute him a member a second time. The way in which this was done, certainly deserves the credit of originality; and as they claim in connexion with their friends to be the Scotch party, and have often told us of their being the learned, respectable and pious portion of the church, this specimen of their wisdom deserves a little examination. It is questionable whether any other six men in the country would have hit on the same way of getting over a difficulty.

It is a common principle in both civil and ecclesiastical courts, that their acts must be held as valid till legally reversed. Even if illegal, the law provides ways in which this is to be ascertained and declared; and to set aside in an illegal manner such acts, would only be trampling on law to maintain the honor of the law. On the supposition that the exclusion of Mr. Stark was illegal, two ways of redress presented themselves, agreeable to established order. On one of these ways these brethren had entered by protesting and appealing to the higher court, but this process was too tedious to answer some other purposes, and was abandoned. Another method in which the same thing might have been done,

was the reconsideration and reversal of their former deed by the court itself. To this, however, common order presented a difficulty of considerable magnitude. Rules of discipline provide that motions for reconsideration must proceed from those who voted with the majority, so that by this fact it may be perceived that there is not merely a change of members in the court, but to some extent a change of mind. Here then was the difficulty in the present case; as there were no members present who had voted for the exclusion of Mr. Stark, a motion for reconsideration could not even be made without a direct violation of established rules. In this emergency, the following expedient was adopted: "Dr. Bullions gave notice that he withdrew his protest against the decision of Presbytery excluding Mr. Stark from a seat," and what then? did he say, he was now satisfied that that decision was just, and that he would no more oppose it? Instead of this, he seems to have supposed that this shooting in an opposite direction had quite nullified the deed. He says, "that decision being in itself null and void, because in opposition to a decision of Synod." What if the other protesters had not followed his example, as they however did, but adhered to their protests? They would then have come up to Synod in opposition to the act, and Dr. Bullions as acquiescing in it! This, certainly, to say the least of it, is a new invention, to withdraw protests in order to nullify the deeds against which they had been entered. But by this singular step Mr. Stark was admitted to a seat in the Presbytery whose authority he persisted in declining, and whose act excluding him was yet unreversed. If under these circumstances he was not illegally admitted both in fact and in form, it would be difficult to say when an admission could be illegal.

The admission of Mr. Stark's elder was equally irregular. As the congregation of Mr. S. adhered to him in his disobedience to Synod, the Presbytery had declared them to be in a state of insubordination, and not entitled to a representation in their meetings. The Synod of 1837, though relieving Mr. Stark from suspension, did nothing to purge the scandal of this disobedience from his congregation. They did not reverse this deed of the Presbytery, nor had the Presbytery reversed it. Even those who admitted Mr. Stark took no notice of it; so that there were two members admitted to seats in direct opposition to acts of the Presbytery excluding them.

When these brethren had by such proceedings strengthened their hands, they felt prepared for the other and more important part of their plot, the exclusion of those who were known to be opposed to Mr. Stark. They had constituted with prayer, attended to the preceding items of business and made a minute of them, all in the space of about ten minutes, when Messrs. Campbell and Martin, ministers, and Mr. Milmine, ruling elder from Florida, came into the house. Mr. Martin says that he examined his watch as soon as he came in, and that it was scarcely ten minutes after the hour at which the Presbytery was to meet; Dr. P. Bullions *supposed* it to have been about fifteen minutes. Dr. P. Bullions, who had been making minutes with a pencil, there being neither pen nor ink in the apartment, now produced a paper written with ink, and prepared, as he was constrained to own, previously to the meeting of the Presbytery. In this paper, Dr. B., who was himself under process, and to be tried at this meeting, contrary to all order came forward as the accuser of his brethren, and moved to exclude from seats Messrs. Martin and Campbell, because, as he alleges, they had "acted in opposition to a decision of Synod, in depriving Mr. Stark and the elder from his congregation of their

seats in Presbytery." It is difficult to account for the inconsistencies of this step in a man not destitute of sense, except on the ground of extreme eagerness to accomplish a purpose. It is not only inconsistent in a member under process to accuse those who are to be his judges, except in the way of objecting to their sitting upon his trial, but still more so to accuse individuals of what was the deed of the court. If there were an offence at all, the court, as such, was the offender; and if the real offender had been named, then the motion of Dr. B. was that the Presbytery should sit in judgment upon itself, and that the criminal should be his own judge and executioner. The Presbytery was called to judge that by their own acts they had forfeited their seats, and so to turn themselves out of doors. But taking the motion as it stands, it proceeds on the supposition that the members of a court may be proceeded against by the court itself, for the votes they have given in answer to its call, according to their judgments, which would be one of the greatest outrages upon liberty. And if that common maul, the "pope," with which all our modern martyrs of discipline assail their "persecutors," had not been so plentifully used of late that it has become in a great measure harmless, we might in our turn take it up, and lay a few blows about the head and shoulders of the above resolution.

Messrs. Martin, Campbell and Milmine endeavored to check these proceedings by protests. This privilege was refused. They endeavored to reason with their brethren, but the liberty of speech without constant interruption could not be obtained. Perceiving that their brethren had plotted against them to exclude them without cause, they chose rather to withdraw and act by themselves. Of this Mr. Martin gave notice, and accordingly he and Messrs. Campbell and Milmine withdrew.— These three, together with an elder from Albany who had not arrived previously to this step, met and constituted in another place. Now the question is which party is entitled to be considered the true Presbytery of Albany. The Synod decided in favor of those who withdrew, and their decision may be justified by the following reasons:

1. The great precipitance with which those who met at the precise time constituted, and proceeded to business. At the most, according to their own admission it was but fifteen minutes after the hour when Messrs. Campbell, Martin and Milmine arrived. As Mr. Martin examined his watch, his statement is entitled to the most credit, that it was scarcely ten minutes. They could hardly have constituted with prayer, and attended to all the business recorded in their minutes, in less than eight or ten minutes. If then they waited at all after the hour, it could not have been over six or seven minutes; the probability is, they did not wait one. If they had not known of other members in the city intending to meet with them, and within a few doors of the place of meeting, their haste had been more excusable. But this excuse they did not and could not plead. Or, again, if the business to be transacted had been of little consequence, or relating to things wherein no disagreement was anticipated, such haste though not courteous to their brethren might not have been regarded as particularly censurable. But neither could this be said in their favor. Measures contemplating the reversal of former deeds of Presbytery, the restoration of an excluded minister to his seat and of a refractory congregation to communion, were of the first importance, and difference of opinion might in any cases of this kind be anticipated; in this instance it was known to exist. What if the Synod had sustained this precipitance in their meeting? Would it not have

been saying to the members of other Presbyteries, "Go and do likewise? If you have any favorite scheme to carry, and fear the opposition of your brethren, you have nothing more to do but to meet at the precise moment, and if your brethren be a few moments later, you can easily carry your measures before their arrival, and if you choose, you may also gather in excluded members, or by other means enlarge your number, so that when your brethren arrive you can exclude them from seats, and shut the door in their faces, saying, we are six against three; we have made up a majority, and must unquestionably be the true Presbytery." It is evident that the approbation of such proceedings would tend to the destruction of all confidence among brethren, and lay a foundation for endless intrigue and confusion.

It is not at all uncommon for members of Presbyteries to wait not only one or two minutes, but quarters of an hour, and sometimes even hours, for the arrival of others who are expected; and to postpone to future meetings business of importance, in consequence of the absence of some members. This is especially done when it is known that the absent members are much interested in any proposed measures, either as advocates or opponents. Every principle of honor and religion commends this course, and condemns the taking advantage of a few moments delay on the part of brethren to carry measures against them, and especially measures tending to their exclusion from the church. Such precipitate meetings may possibly consist with the letter of the law, though we are not sure even of this; but we are sure that they contradict the spirit of the law, and overturn its very foundations.

2. The Synod were justified in their deed on the ground of the illegal admission of Mr. Stark and his elder to seats in the Presbytery. This was the main ground occupied in defence by those who withdrew; and it appeared also to be regarded in the same light by the Synod in their decision. It was pleaded on the floor of Synod, and the argument was not then, and has not since been answered nor even contradicted, that the admission of illegal members vitiates the court admitting them. This principle is extensively, and probably, it is universally acted on in civil proceedings. If one man were allowed to sit on the bench as a judge without legal authority, the whole court would be vitiated, and their deeds made null and void. If one man be admitted into a jury as a member, or even allowed to be present with them without being a qualified juror, the whole jury is vitiated, and their verdict set aside. In an election, where the electors do not hold office, but only stand in a remote relation to it by the choice of others, illegal voters vitiate the election and the officer elected. The same principle has been acted on in ecclesiastical bodies. It was distinctly avowed by the first Seceders, and the violation of it was assigned as a chief ground of their secession. They regarded the judicatories of the Church of Scotland as vitiated, so as no longer to be lawful judicatories of Jesus Christ, because of the intruders or ministers settled by the violence of patronage, who were allowed to occupy seats as members in these courts. They could not regard these men as legal ministers of Christ, and thus pronounced the courts not legal in consequence of their admission. Even in cases where the persons acting are regular office-bearers in the church, but not entitled to seats in that particular court which admits them, the proceedings are vitiated by their votes. Members of sister courts may be invited to sit and deliberate, and may aid their brethren by their counsel, but how could Sessions or Presbyteries be safe, if, at any time, a host of neighboring

ministers and elders might be brought in to vote down the will of the majority? No farther back than the year 1836, the Associate Synod set aside a deed of the Presbytery of Cambridge on this very ground. The following are the words of their act: "*Resolved*, That the proceedings of the Presbytery of Cambridge in this case be set aside, in consequence of their irregularity in admitting a member of another Presbytery to act as a judge, and vote, contrary to the acknowledged rules of Presbyterian Church Discipline." (See *Rel. Mon.* vol. xiii. p. 41.) This decision may be considered as founded on the very definition of a Presbytery, as ordinarily given in books on government and discipline. These books say, that a Presbytery consists of all the pastors within certain bounds, together with a ruling elder from each congregation; and they define the correspondence of Presbyteries by commissioners to each other, as intended for mutual advice. (See *Stewart's Collections*, book 1, title 12, sec. 1 and 8; *Overture of a Book of Discipline of the Associate Church*, chap. 4, sec. 3, &c.) If, then, lawful rulers in the church vitiate the proceedings of courts in which they have no right to act, the same effect must follow from any person's acting who has been unlawfully admitted. And that Mr. Stark and his elder were unlawfully admitted, we think has been made sufficiently evident.\*

3. It adds to the weight of this reason that the character of the court was changed by these illegal admissions, so that a majority was gained by those who had been, and would otherwise have still been, a minority. The brethren constituted under Mr. Blair pleaded that they would have had a majority independently of Mr. Stark—there would still have been five of them against the three who withdrew. But it is to be remembered that exception was taken against Mr. Stark's elder on grounds even

---

\* It appears to be taken for granted by Mr. Stark, in the *Associate Presbyterian Magazine*, pp. 21, 22, that Messrs. White, Goodwillie, and Pringle, were illegally excluded from seats in the Presbytery of Cambridge, in the trial of Dr. A. Bullions, and that this illegality was admitted by the Synod. Thus he supposes occasioned great difficulty and perplexity in connexion with his case; for if the Presbytery of Albany were vitiated by the illegal admission of Mr. S. and his elder, this would go equally to prove that the Presbytery of Cambridge was vitiated by the illegal exclusion of three of their members. This difficulty, however, has no existence except in Mr. Stark's own mind, if it even have existence there. The question about the exclusion of these members did not come before the Synod at all, as those who had protested against it, had fallen from their protests, and were, therefore, to be considered as acquiescing in the decision. Even if the question had come before Synod, there was no evidence produced to show that the Presbytery were not warranted in what they did. Two of these men were excluded because of near relationship, the one being the brother-in-law, and the other the son-in-law of the accused. This is recognised in books of discipline as a warrantable ground of exclusion. *Stewart says*, Book iv., Title 5, Sect. 9, "There is likewise a warrantable declination which may be made against particular members, who are related to the party by consanguinity or affinity, nearer than a cousin-german, or who have behaved themselves as parties in the cause." This rule is not imperative, so that proceedings would be vitiated where no objection was made against such members, but it supposes that relationships may lead to such evidences of partiality that exclusion will be warrantable. In this instance the Presbytery judged that their decision was warranted by both these reasons. As to the other individual excluded, the former of these reasons did not exist. What the judgment of the Synod would have been, if the case had come before them for examination, it is impossible to tell. From the statements incidentally made before them. Some who had no doubt as to the correctness of the Presbytery in excluding the others, expressed doubts as to this step. It may be that a full and fair examination would have removed these doubts; it may be it would have confirmed them. And if this decision of the Presbytery had been brought before the Synod by an appeal, it may be that they would have reversed it; and though the exclusion of this one man did not change the character of the court, if it had been pronounced illegal, it may be that the Synod would, on this ground, have set aside the proceedings of the Presbytery as, on this ground, null and void. It is a hard matter indeed if church courts must not only be reproached for what they do, but for wrong steps which they might have taken, in cases supposed, but never existing.

more clear than against Mr. Stark himself, for nothing had been done either regularly or irregularly to remove the objection against him as belonging to a congregation placed by their own act, and declared by the act of the Presbytery out of the jurisdiction of the church. It is also to be remembered that though only the three had arrived who afterwards withdrew, there was an elder from Mr. Martin's congregation who was on his way to the Presbytery, and who afterwards met with them. The true proposition of members, without those illegally admitted, would have been four against four; and as Mr. Blair was Moderator, there would have been on the floor of Presbytery only three of Mr. Stark's friends against the four who afterwards constituted separately. And besides, as Dr. Bullions was under process for scandal, and to be tried that day, it was not probable that he would have been allowed to take part in any business affecting the standing of other members. It is evident, therefore, that the illegal admissions did change the character of the court, and that if they had waited a few minutes for the arrival of their brethren, they would not have been able to carry their measures.

4. In connexion with the foregoing reasons, another consideration must not be omitted, though it may be regarded rather as an inference from the preceding, than a separate reason: I mean the profane and disorderly character of the proceedings of these brethren. Was it not profanely prostituting the ordinances of prayer, of a solemn constitution as a court in Christ's name and of discipline, to employ them for the purpose of carrying out a measure, which, to say the least of it, and this is what their friends said of it, was full of intrigue. And were not their disorderly proceedings such as might have been anticipated from this profane beginning? If men ask the presence of Christ, and *his blessing* upon underhand plots; if they seek his Spirit as a Spirit of judgment when they are devising mischief, for what else can we look, but their being left to foolishness and confusion in their counsels?

It was not, perhaps, the mind of some who voted with the majority of Synod in this case, that each one of the foregoing reasons would, by itself, have warranted the decision which was adopted. It was, I think, the opinion of a considerable number, perhaps of most of them, that the Presbytery, though much to be condemned, was not vitiated by their hasty constitution. The majority, however, appeared to be all of one mind as to the court's being vitiated by the above-mentioned illegal admissions. This, therefore, may be regarded as the main ground of defence; the other circumstances noticed, add, however, to the weight of this.

After all, supposing that the decision of the Synod was wrong, it was a mere measure of administration involving no relinquishment or change of our public profession. And what church would not soon be broken into fragments, if all measures of administration supposed to be wrong were resisted and made grounds of secession? At the meeting of Synod, at which it was agreed to review the deed convicting Mr. Stark, many of the members felt deeply aggrieved by what they considered wrong acts of administration. But did they therefore cry out that our profession was abandoned, and popery substituted in its room? Did they put themselves into the attitude of rebellion, and withdraw or threaten to withdraw from the church? Did they say in regard to matters of this description, "We will obey God and not man," and as we consider Mr. Stark restored contrary to the will of God, we cannot sit with him without a renunciation of our principles and our liberty? They adopted no

such divisive measures, and employed no such canting language. If the principle on which these brethren proceed be correct, and every one in matters of discipline and administration is to do that which is right in his own eyes without respect to the decisions of church courts, then these courts might as well be dissolved finally and forever. For to what does all their deliberations and judgments amount, if, after all, every man is to be his own judge in all matters, and to act with as perfect independence as if there were none under God whom he is to obey, and to whom he is to submit himself? If the ground taken by these brethren be not ecclesiastical radicalism, and radicalism run mad, then we have yet to learn what radicalism is. These men were not put on trial for any offence, they were not subjected to any censure, they were not required to own any guilt. They were not so much as required to own that their procedure had either been wrong or irregular. The Synod judged it to be such, and if there were sin in this judgment, they took it upon themselves; and did not require them to bear any part of it. On the contrary, the door was expressly opened for them to exonerate themselves by a protest. In this way, they might have vindicated themselves before the church, the world, and their own consciences from all approbation of this deed. But they refused to take this peaceful course. When they could not be sustained in their efforts to exclude their brethren of the Presbytery of Albany, they chose to exclude themselves by withdrawing from the church. The sentence of suspension afterwards past was not for their conduct in the Presbytery, but for their obstinacy and contempt of Synod. Their secession is their own act, and on their own head is the responsibility. It is true that two of the individuals, Dr. P. Bullions and Mr. Stark were under process, and might be afraid that they would fall under the censures of the church; but so far as relates to the decision respecting the party to be recognized as the Presbytery, all that was required of them was to return and act with their brethren as before. To perceive how this could be a giving up of their profession, or involve any matter of principle, requires more penetration than is possessed by

A TRANSYLVANIAN.

*Note.*—Upon a review of the preceding remarks, I find that in speaking of the minority in the late Synod, they are sometimes called the friends of Mr. Stark and those who took part with him. It is not intended to characterize any as friends or enemies, except in reference to the cause which they advocated or opposed. Mr. Stark labors under a great mistake, if he thinks that the measures of the Synod were the result of any provocation or personal ill will; and under an equally great mistake, if he suppose all those who voted in his favor to be believers in his innocence. On the contrary, if he would now acknowledge himself guilty of the things laid to his charge, it would produce no change of sentiment, except that some might have a more favorable opinion of his honesty.

---

ART. IV. *Family Government.*—By Dr. HUMPHREV.

(Continued from page 330.)

It has always been a question, how early children become the proper

subjects of parental training, and whether they should be subjected to any kind of authority or restraint, before they are capable of being influenced as moral and accountable agents. That during the first few days of its life, an infant can no more be brought under government, than any of the lower animals, I suppose all will agree; and the decided opinion of some, perhaps of the majority, is, that nothing like discipline should be attempted, till the child is old enough to understand the reason of it. To this opinion, after some experience and the maturest reflection, I cannot subscribe. I regard the question merely as a question of *fact*, and not as involving the accountable agency of the child at all. How early *can* you begin to check its pevishness, and mould its temper to your wishes? If you can safely and with any advantage, begin when the infant is three months or six months old, it is a point of no importance with me how low it is found on the scale of moral agency. As God has nowhere told me, that I must wait till my child can reason and feel itself to blame for crying and showing a bad temper, before I attempt to lay it under any restraint, I consider myself authorized, nay bound, to take it in hand, just as soon as I can bend the twig in a right direction.

Without, therefore, pretending to fix upon the earliest week, or month, I do not hesitate to give it as my opinion, that considerable progress may be made under *six* months, if not under *four*; and that parental authority ought to be well established within the first year and a quarter. It has been done a thousand times, and why should it not be, a thousand more? The best governed children, and will you pardon me if I add, the only well governed children, are those who are brought into complete subjection in the nursery; and most of them at so early a day, that they cannot remember when, half choked by their stubborn wills, they first lipped out, "*I wont*," to try the great question of mastery with their mothers, and were conquered. One thing every body must admit—children are capable of showing, plainly enough, to what race they belong, at a very tender age. It is astonishing to see how early the spirited little fellow will stiffen its body, and throw back its head, and kick and strike, and put forth other demonstrations of its high displeasure: and who can doubt, that when these signs of depravity appear, it is time for the parent to enter on a course of counteraction and repression?

Every nurse must have observed that infants begin to form habits, troublesome or otherwise, almost as soon as they begin to breathe. Lay them quietly down at first, and they will soon become accustomed to it, so as to relieve you of a great deal of care. Rock them to sleep a few times, and you must do it always. Carry them about the room for a single day in your arms, when they are uneasy, and they will find you exercise enough for the rest of the year. Now why should you not take advantage of this extreme ductility, to mould them into all good habits, including the most important of all, a cheerful submission to your authority? As it is easy to accustom children, before they are a year old, to go to bed alone in the dark, and exceedingly delightful to hear them cooing and talking themselves to sleep, so may they unquestionably be brought to yield implicitly to the look and the voice of a parent, at the tenderest age; and when the habit is thus early formed, it saves infinite trouble to both.

Waiving entirely, for the present, the question whether the rod is ever

to be used in the administration of family government, I remark in the first place, that *this government should be uniform.*

This is a point in which a great many worthy heads of families shew their almost utter want of tact and good judgment; and failing here, they succeed but poorly in any of their efforts to establish and maintain the authority which God has made it their duty to exercise over their own household. There is no reason to doubt, that parents of this class love their children as tenderly as any other class; and it is certain, that many of them intend to be conscientious and faithful in the discharge of all their duties. Their theory of government may be perfectly correct, and they begin quite well, perhaps. They bring the child to terms, and make him feel that direct resistance to their will is hopeless and out of the question. But they do not carry an even hand. Now they are strict, even to a fault, and anon they vibrate to the opposite extreme. What they forbid one day, they allow the next. There is no certainty, no uniformity in their administration. Their own temperament is fitful. They are governed more by the east wind, than by a sober judgment. The child, if it does wrong, is in greater danger before dinner than after. He is punished, perhaps, too severely, one hour, and stuffed with cake and sugar plumbs the next, to square the account.

Now such an administration will never succeed. Children must know what to depend on. You must give them no reason to apprehend too great displeasure on the one hand, nor to hope for extreme lenity on the other. Having settled in your own minds what is right, what obedience your children owe you, and what authority it is your duty to exercise over them, you must hold a steady rein. What you are and what you require to-day, you must be and must require to-morrow. Giving with one hand and taking with the other; doing and undoing; demanding all, and then yielding more than all, is worse than lost labor. No government can be efficient, whether civil or domestic, where there is a great want of uniformity and consistency in the administration.

Secondly: *Family government should be strictly impartial.*

Nothing can be more destructive of domestic harmony than parental favoritism. So long as children of the same family differ essentially in their characters and dispositions, (and this is often the case,) so long as some are gentle, affectionate, and obedient, and others stubborn and un-filial, it is impossible for any parent to regard them alike; and if he could, it would only show his own want of moral discrimination. He must approve and disapprove, reward and punish, with a strict regard to personal character. This is the great principle on which every good government is administered. So far as parental love consists in *complacency* a father may certainly love a dutiful better than an undutiful son. Indeed, he cannot help it, and there is no partiality in this. But if he indulges one child more than another; if he punishes this and lets that go free; if he is blind to the faults of one and severe to mark those of another, he is partial, and can never in this way govern his family well. His children will see and feel the wrong. If those who have reason to complain obey him, it will be from fear and not from affection; and he will be so far from securing the reverence and gratitude of his favorites, that they will be the first to despise his authority and "bring down his gray hairs with sorrow to the grave." If a perverse child will complain, because his privileges are abridged, and he is made to eat the bitter fruits of his own ways, there is no help for it. He might restore himself to the standing and affection which he has forfeited, if he would; and he has

no more right to say, when he is punished and others are rewarded, that injustice is done him, than the thief has to complain, that he is imprisoned while his honest neighbors are unmolested. But while this is true on the one hand, let every parent guard as much as possible against all appearance of partiality on the other; and the moment the prodigal returns, and says, "father, I have sinned," let him be received with open arms, however far he may have wandered, and whatever grief he may have occasioned.

Thirdly: *Family government requires unity of feeling, judgment and action.*

If parents are not of one heart and one mind, in regard to this matter, it will be found extremely difficult, if not impossible, to rule their household well. And how many families suffer from this want of *unity!* The father and mother, instead of "seeing eye to eye," and directing all their efforts to one point, differ essentially, both in theory and practice. As they do not think alike, they move in opposite directions. One parent, perhaps, is too stern, and the other too lax and indulgent. Or if one has correct views of parental authority, and the manner in which it should be exercised, the other looks at the whole subject in a very erroneous point of light. What one regards as a serious fault, the other overlooks as an excusable foible. Where one thinks the rod is called for, the other is entirely opposed to it. Where one is actuated by principle and good judgment, in the painful administration of necessary discipline, the other is swayed by a morbid tenderness, which would screen the little culprit, perhaps to his undoing.

I am aware that a perfect agreement in regard to the most judicious system of family government cannot in all cases be expected. The father and mother may not be able, though they earnestly desire it, to think alike on this subject; nor upon some others, perhaps of great practical moment. This is exceedingly to be regretted. But although you may differ in *judgment*, you may sustain each other in *action*, and you must do it, or your authority is gone. What can the father do, if the mother takes the part of the child? Or what can the mother do, if the father comes in and takes the darling boy out of her hands? Discuss these matters between yourselves as much as you please, but never let your children know or suspect that you are not perfectly agreed. A mother will sometimes think that the father is too severe; and let her convince him of it if she can, as soon as they are alone. A father, in his turn, will sometimes think the mother injudicious; and let him do the same. But never let either interfere at the time. Suppose the most trying case that is likely to happen; suppose the child to be punished a little beyond its demerits; how trifling is the momentary suffering, compared with the mischief which would result from that kind of interference of which I am here speaking! Think alike, if possible. At all events, strengthen each other's hands, and never *seem* to differ. Let your children see, that in the administration of government you are one; that you have one heart and one aim; and that nothing is to be hoped for from any appeal that can be made to either. Take the opposite course; let the jarring of interfering and conflicting action be felt, and your house, being "divided against itself, cannot stand." Your own opinion is, that you better know how to bend the twig than your wife, or your husband, as the case may be. If this be true, render thanks to God for giving you the talent, and make the most of it; but never use it to weaken the authority of

your companion, who, after all, will sometimes be nearer right than yourself.

Fourthly : It is essential to a wise and efficient domestic administration, that each parent should carry through any course of discipline that he or she undertakes, without any direct assistance from the other. In almost every such case, either to offer aid or to apply for it, weakens the authority which it is intended to strengthen. Whenever a father undertakes to subdue a perverse child, he must do it effectually without looking any where but to God for help, and without accepting it, should it be ever so kindly offered. If the boy sees that he needs or receives any extraneous aid, his authority is weakened. In like manner, whenever the mother commands, she must be obeyed; and if there is any resistance, she must be left to overcome it by herself, especially in the nursery. The father may be convinced that he could accomplish the object sooner than the mother, and may wish to relieve her from the painful struggle in which he sees her engaged, but it will never do. What she has begun, she must finish. The child must yield, and must yield to her, and not to somebody else. She may regret that she did not leave the task to stronger nerves; but there is no retreat. She must carry her point, or her authority will be despised. Every thing of this sort, no doubt, ought to be well considered, and as far as practicable, agreed upon beforehand; and if an older child requires discipline, the father ought in most cases to undertake it. But the point on which I insist is, that what either parent actually undertakes, must be finished without any immediate and obvious help from the other.

Fifthly : *That in the government of a family, every thing depends upon a good beginning.* If you fail here, very faint is the prospect that you will ever succeed. If your child is not well trained, and brought under entire subjection to your authority, you will find it extremely difficult to rule your household well afterwards. What can you do with the younger children, how can you expect they will reverence and obey you, when they have the example of headiness and insubordination in an older brother, constantly before their eyes? As 'one sinner destroyeth much good' in a community, so does one ungoverned child in a family; and, above all, if he be the *eldest*. It would be next to a miracle, if his example did not prove a permanent source of contagion.

On the other hand, if you succeed happily in the management of your first-born; if he is docile, obedient, and affectionate from the cradle, he will help you exceedingly, by the influence of his example upon the minds, tempers and habits of his younger brothers and sisters. The principle or instinct of imitation, as every one knows, is much stronger in early childhood than at any other period of life; and no where is it so strong as in the domestic circle. It is the electrical wire, which the eldest holds in his hand, and by which he communicates the spark to all the rest at pleasure. If, by the blessing of God, you succeed well in your first endeavors; if the early establishment of your authority is unquestionable and unquestioned by your own fireside; the prospect is fair, that with comparatively little trouble, you will secure the cheerful obedience of all your children; but if you stumble at the threshold, you can scarcely expect ever to recover from the shock. If you cannot mould the temper and habits of *one* child to your wishes, how can you manage *several*, under all the disadvantages, arising from his bad example.

But perhaps your first-born is your *only* child; and if so, you will need

to be especially on your guard against the undue ascendancy of those parental yearnings, which bind it so closely to your hearts. It is a common remark, founded on observation and experience, that an only son or daughter is in great danger of suffering by too much indulgence, if not of being spoiled; and quite certain I am, that it requires more self-denial to thwart the wishes and curb the temper of an only child, than it would if he were but one of a numerous family. If you do not watch and pray without ceasing, the dear little creature, upon whom your fondest hopes and affections are concentrated, will take undue liberties; and in one way or another, make dangerous encroachments upon that authority with which God had clothed you, and for the proper exercise of which he holds you accountable. Depend upon it, if you yield to the importunities of your son, or spare him when he does wrong, because you have but *one* and cannot bear to deny or chastise him, he is getting the mastery of you, to your certain retribution for unfaithfulness, and probably to his own undoing. Say not then, he is my *all*, and therefore I cannot deny him, I cannot be severe in marking his faults; but rather say, that *as* he is my all, it becomes me to be the more exact and faithful in the discharge of all my parental duties.

Sixthly: *The rights and duties of parents, in this regard, extend through the whole period of the child's minority.* It is not enough for parents to bring their children early under proper subjection, and then leave their authority to take care of itself. There is no such executive energy in any domestic code, however wise or reasonable. The work is only commenced, when you have subdued the refractory spirit of your child. It is indeed an auspicious beginning; and if you keep the advantage which you have gained, the task will ever be comparatively easy. But you must never let go the reins. If you relax, if you leave the child after it has once yielded, to follow its own depraved inclinations, it will soon become as headstrong as ever; and if it does not get entirely beyond your reach, it may cost you infinite trouble to regain the ground which you have lost. All the natural tendencies in the minds of our children are downward; and there is no overcoming this gravitating power, but by constant effort. "Line must be upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little."

A judicious parent will not use exactly the same means to govern a boy of eight years old, as he does to govern a child of two; nor will he deal with a grown up son of fifteen, just as he does with a lad of ten. But though the *means* will be different, the *end* is the same. The young man of twenty, in his father's house, has no more right to say that he will use his own discretion, in regard to observing the rules and regulations of the family, than a child of ten; and that parent sins against God, against the community in which he lives, and against his own family, who throws up his authority, before his children can safely be left to govern and take care of themselves. What a heavenly example has Jesus Christ left, for the imitation of all children, down to the end of the world. When, after three days anxious search, his parents "found him in the temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them and asking them questions," what did he do? Did he decline going home and being any longer under their control? No. "He went down with them, and came to Nazareth, and was *subject* unto them." Let every son of twelve years old, who begins to feel restive under parental authority, and most undutifully to hanker after independence in his father's house, turn to *Luke second*, and read from the *forty-first* verse to

the end of the chapter, and blush to think of the contrast between his undutifulness, and the filial obedience of the Saviour of the world !

Seventhly : *Family government, to be well and successfully administered, must be absolute.* Gentle reader, startle not at this proposition, as some autocratical ukase in the empire of education. Pronounce it not false and dangerous, till you have taken time to think of it, and candidly to weigh the few thoughts which I have to suggest in its defence. I am sensible, that nothing in the English vocabulary grates so harshly upon republican ears, as the word *absolute*. To talk of an absolute government any where, within the protection of our stars and stripes, is calculated to stir up the spirit of *seventy-six* from ocean to ocean ; and to call forth a voice of denunciation louder than "seven thunders." But hear me patiently, and then judge.

Is an absolute government *necessarily* despotic and oppressive ? What will you then say of the highest and most perfect government in the universe ? Does not the great Father of the whole human family govern it with a perfect sway ? Can any one stay his hand or resist his will ? The objection, therefore, lies not against this form of government, but against the almost certain *mal-administration* of it, in the hands of any earthly ruler. In an absolute monarchy, the will of the sovereign is the supreme law of the land. All power, legislative, judicial and executive, is vested in him. If he abuses it, he is a tyrant. If he wields it to oppress the people he is a despot. But he is not obliged to be a despot because he is absolute. He might reign in righteousness, and in all his measures have a supreme regard to the happiness of his subjects ; and if such a ruler could be found, endowed with wisdom, too, equal to his virtue, we might expect that his reign would be pre-eminently beneficent and prosperous. But this there seems to be no reason to look for, till "the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Any government is absolute, where the will of the head is the supreme law ; or, in other words, where there are no co-ordinate powers to modify and control it. And this is what I mean, when I say that family government is absolute—not *tyrannical*, not *despotic*—as far from it as possible ;—but *supreme*. A patriarchal government cannot be otherwise. The moment you modify it, in any way, it ceases to be patriarchal. Every parent must make the laws in his own little empire, and must see that they are obeyed. This, as I remarked in a former paper, is the divine institution. Parents are placed at the head of their respective families to *govern*, as well as to *teach* their children, and how could they govern according to their best judgment, and the dictates of their consciences, if the power was partly in other hands ? In what other hands could it be safely placed ? Would it do to bring in the children themselves legislators, and leave it with them to decide, what laws they would or would not sanction by their co-ordinate vote ? Could it be done by a general confederation of heads of families, within certain limits ? Could parents make the laws and then refer them, for approval, to the legislative authorities of the state ? I need not say a word to show, that either of these expedients would be ruinous. And then, if the administration of family government is not absolute and final, how can the authority of parents be sustained for an hour ? The right of appeal supposes that there is some higher power to review and reverse their decisions. Where could such a power safely be lodged ? What an anomaly would it be in human jurisprudence, to see children bringing their fathers and

mothers by regular process before the tribunals! But I will not enlarge. In the very nature of the case, the parental prerogative must be supreme, or family government cannot be maintained. How it ought to be exercised is quite another thing; and it is a question of vital importance, which I propose to consider in its proper place. But I feel well assured, that no other form of domestic government can ever succeed. In the wide range of national rule, supreme power in the hands of one individual is not necessary—is not safe; but every man must rule his own house, according to his best light and judgment. His children must feel that he has a right to decide in all cases; and that his will is to govern, unless it plainly contravenes some paramount moral obligation, and thus encroaches upon the sacred rights of conscience.

[To be continued ]

#### ART. V. *Precious Remedies against Satan's Devices.*

(Continued from page 279.)

[Omitting Parts III and IV, we shall only republish, in two brief insertions, the Author's "APPENDIX. touching four more of Satan's Devices; whereby he prevents poor souls from receiving and embracing the Lord Jesus, and from relying upon him only for everlasting happiness, according to the gospel; and remedies against these devices."]

**CHAP. I.** *His first device to keep the soul from believing in Christ, is,* By suggesting to him the greatness and vileness of his sins. What, saith Satan, dost thou think that thou shalt ever obtain mercy by Christ, who have sinned with so high a hand against him? Thou hast slighted the tenders of grace, grieved the Spirit, and despised the word of God; and hast spoken and done all the evil that thou couldst. (Jer. iii. 5.) No, no, saith Satan, he hath mercy, pardon, and righteousness for others, but not for thee, &c. Now the remedies against this device are these:

*Remedy 1.* Consider, that the greater your sins, the more you stand in need of a Saviour: the heavier your burden, the more you stand in need of one to help to bear it: the deeper the wound, the more need is there of the surgeon: the more dangerous the disease is, the more need of the physician. Who but madmen will argue thus? My burden is great, therefore, I will not call for help; my wound is deep, therefore, I will not call for balm; my disease is dangerous, therefore I will not go to the physician. Ah! it is spiritual madness, it is the devil's logic, to argue thus: 'My sins are great, therefore, I will not go to Christ, I dare not rest nor lean on Christ,' &c. whereas the soul should reason thus: 'The greater my sins are, the more I stand in need of mercy, of pardon: and, therefore, I will go to Christ, who delights in mercy, who pardons sins for his own name's sake.' (Micah vii. 18 Is. xliii. 25.)

*Rem. 2.* Remember, that the promise of grace and mercy, is to returning souls. And, therefore, though you may have been never so wicked, yet if thou wilt return, God, and mercy, and pardon shall be thine. (2 Chron. xxx. 9. Jer. iii. 13.) 'Go, and proclaim these words'—(Joel iii. 13.) 'And rend your hearts, and not your garments,'—(Is. lv. 7.) 'Let the wicked forsake his ways, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon: or as the Hebrew reads it, 'He will multiply pardons.' (So Ezek. xviii.)

Sinner! it is not thy great transgressions that can exclude thee from mercy, if thou wilt break off thy sins by repentance, and return to the fountain of mercy. The heart and arms of Christ are wide open to embrace the returning prodigal. It is not simply the greatness of your sins, but your obstinately persisting in sin, that will be your eternal overthrow.

*Rem. 3.* Solemnly consider, that the greatest sinners have obtained mercy; and therefore all the angels in heaven, all the men on earth, and all the devils in hell, cannot tell to the contrary, but that thou mayest obtain mercy. Manasseh was a notorious sinner, he made Judah to sin more wickedly than the heathen did, whom the Lord destroyed before the children of Israel, and caused the streets of Jerusalem to run down with innocent blood.\* What a devil incarnate did he appear to be in these proceedings? Yet when he humbled himself, and sought the Lord, the Lord was intreated of him, and heard his supplication, and brought him to Jerusalem, and made himself known unto him, and crowned him with mercy and loving kindness, as you may see in (2 Chron. xxxiii.) So Paul was once a blasphemer, a persecutor, and injurious, yet he obtained mercy. (1 Tim. i. 13.) Mary Magdalene also, was a notorious strumpet, one out of whom Christ cast seven devils; yet she is pardoned and dearly beloved of Christ. (Luke vii. Mark xvi. 9.)

Bodin hath a story concerning a great rebel who had made a strong party against a Roman emperor. The emperor made proclamation, that whoever should bring the rebel, dead or alive, should have a great sum of money. The rebel hearing of this, came and presented himself before the emperor, and demanded the money. 'Now, (said the emperor) if I put him to death, the world will say, I did it to save my money.' And so he pardoned the rebel, and gave him the money.

Oh sinners! shall a heathen do this, who had but a drop of Mercy and compassion in him? And will not Christ do much more, who hath all fulness of grace, mercy, and glory in himself? Surely his bowels do yearn toward the worst of rebels. Oh! if you do but come in, you will find him ready to pardon, yea, one made up of pardoning mercy. Oh! the readiness and willingness of Jesus Christ to receive to favour the greatest rebels.†

Sinners! if these bowels of mercy do not melt, win, and draw you, the justice of God will be a swift witness against you; you will lie down in eternal misery, for kicking against these bowels of mercy. Christ hangs out still, as once that warlike Schythian did, a white flag of grace and mercy to returning sinners; who humble themselves at his feet for favor; but if they shall stand out, he will put forth his red, his bloody flag, and they shall die for ever by a hand of justice. Sinners, there is no way to avoid perishing by Christ's iron rod, but by kissing his golden sceptre!

*Rem. 4.* Consider, that Jesus Christ hath no where in all the scripture excepted against the worst of sinners, that are willing to receive him, to believe in him, to rest upon him, for happiness and blessedness. Ah sinners! why should you be more cruel and unmerciful to your own souls, than Christ is? Christ hath not excluded you from mercy, why then should you exclude your own souls? Oh, that you would

\* The Hebrew doctors write, that he slew Isaiah the prophet, who was his father-in-law.  
† Col. i. 19. ii. 3, 4. Neh. ix. 17. Heb. But thou a God of pardons.

dwell often upon that choice scripture, (John vi. 37.) 'All that the Father giveth me, shall come to me, and him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out;' or as the original hath it, 'I will not cast out.' (1 Cor. vi. 9—11.)

'Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever,' (Heb. xiii. 8.) He was born in an inn, to shew that he receives all comers; his garments were divided into four parts, to shew that out of what part of the world soever we come, we shall be received. If we are naked, Christ hath robes to clothe us; if strangers, Christ hath room to lodge us. That is a choice scripture, (Acts x. 34, 35,) 'Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons. But in every nation, he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him.'

*Rem. 5.* Consider, that the greater sinner thou art, the greater honor thou wilt be to Christ, when he shall behold thee as the travail of his soul, (Is. liii. 11.) 'He shall see of the travail of his soul, and be satisfied.' The more we pay for any thing, the dearer that thing is to us. Christ hath paid most, prayed most, sighed most, wept and bled most, for the greatest sinners, and therefore they are dearer to Christ than others that are less sinful; Rachel was dearer to Jacob than Leah, because she cost him more; he obeyed, endured, and suffered more by day and night for her, than for Leah. (Gen. xxix. 30.) Ah sinners! the greatness of your sins does but set off the fulness and riches of Christ's grace, and the freeness of his love.

*Rem. 6.* Seriously consider, that the longer you keep from Christ, the greater and stronger your sins will grow. All Divine power and strength against sin, is derived by the soul's union and communion with Christ. (Rom. viii. 10. 1 John i. 6, 7.) While you keep at a distance from Christ, you keep from that power which only is able to make you sufficient to trample down strength, lead captivity captive, and slay the Goliaths that bid defiance to Christ. It is only faith in Christ that gives a man victory over sin, Satan, hell, and the world. (1 John v. 4.) It is only faith in Christ that binds the strong man hand and foot, cures every spiritual disease, and makes a man strong in resisting, and happy in conquering. Sin is always weakest where faith is strongest; the most faithful soul, is the most mortified soul. Sinner, remember this, there is no way on earth effectually to be rid of the guilt, filth, and power of sin, but by believing in a Saviour. It is not resolving, nor complaining; it is not mourning, but believing, that will make you divinely victorious, over that body of sin that is too strong for you, and that will certainly be your ruin, if not ruined by the hand of faith.

*Rem. 7.* Wisely consider, that as there is *nothing* in Christ to discourage the greatest sinners from believing in him, so there is *every thing* in Christ that may encourage them to believe in him, to rest and lean upon him, for all happiness and blessedness. (Cant. i. 3.) If you look upon his nature, his disposition, his names, his titles, his offices, as King, Priest, and Prophet, you will find nothing to discourage the greatest sinners from believing in him, but many things to encourage them to receive him, to believe on him. (Col. i. 19. ii. 3. Cant. v. 10.) Christ is the greatest, the most suitable, and necessary good: he is a real, an eternal, and a soul-satisfying good. Sinners, are you poor? Christ hath gold to enrich you: are you naked? He hath royal robes of righteousness to clothe you: Are you blind? He hath eye-salve to enlighten you: are you hungry? He will be manna to feed you: are

you thirsty? He will be a well of living water to refresh you: are you wounded? He hath a balm under his wings to heal you: are you sick? He is a physician to cure you: are you prisoners? He hath paid down a ransom for you. O then believe in him, and then, 'Though your sins be as scarlet; they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.' Nay, your iniquities shall be forgotten, as well as forgiven; they shall be remembered no more: God will cast them behind his back, he will cast them into the depths of the sea. (Is. i. 18. xliii. 25. xxxviii. 17. Micah. i. 19.)

*Rem. 8.* Seriously consider the absolute necessity of believing in Christ. 'The fearful and unbelieving, &c. shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death. If ye believe not that I am he (saith Christ) ye shall die in your sins.' (John viii. 24.) And he that dies in his sins, must come to judgment, and depart to hell in his sins. Every unbeliever is a condemned man. 'He that believeth not (saith John) is condemned' ALREADY. (John iii. 18. 36.) Sinners! the law, the gospel, and your own consciences, have past the sentence of condemnation upon you, and there is no way to escape the sentence, but by believing in Christ: and therefore my counsel is this: Stir up yourselves to lay hold on the Lord Jesus, and look up to him, and wait on him, from whom every good and perfect gift comes, and give him no rest till he hath given thee that jewel FAITH, which is more worth than heaven and earth, and which will make thee happy in life, joyful in death, and glorious in the day of Christ. (Is. lxiv. 7. James i. 17. Is. lxii. 7.)

CHAPTER II.—*The second Device that Satan hath to keep poor sinners from believing in, and closing with a Saviour, is, By suggesting to them their unworthiness. Ah saith Satan! As thou art worthy of the greatest misery, so thou art unworthy of the least crumb of mercy. Dost thou think, saith Satan, that ever Christ will own, receive, or embrace such an unworthy wretch as thou art? No, no, if there were any worthiness in thee, then indeed Christ might be willing to be entertained by thee. Thou art unworthy to receive Christ into thy house, how much more unworthy art thou to entertain Christ in thy heart?—Now the remedies against this device are these:*

*Remedy. 1.* Against this device of Satan, seriously consider, that God hath no where in the scripture required any worthiness in the creature before believing in Christ. If you make a diligent search through all the scripture, you shall not find one word that represents God, as requiring any worthiness in the creature, before the soul believes and rests upon Christ for happiness and blessedness; and why then should that be an hindrance to thy faith, which God doth no where require of thee before thou comest to Christ, that thou mayest have life? Ah, sinners! remember, Satan objects your unworthiness against you, only for a design to keep Christ and your souls asunder for ever, and therefore, in the face of all your unworthiness, rest upon Christ, come to him, and believe in him, and you are bappy for ever. (John vi. 40, 47.)

*Rem. 2.* Wisely consider, that none did receive and embrace Christ, and obtain mercy and pardon from him, but such as felt themselves unworthy. Pray what worthiness was there in Matthew, Zaccheus, Manasseh, Paul, and Lydia, before their coming to Christ, or before their faith in Christ? Surely none. Ah sinners! you should reason

thus : Christ hath bestowed the choicest mercies, the greatest favours, the highest dignities, the sweetest privileges, upon unworthy sinners ; and therefore, O our souls, do not faint, do not despair ; but patiently and quietly wait for the salvation of the Lord.

*Rem. 3.* Consider, that if the soul will keep from Christ till it be worthy, it will never come to him ; it will never embrace, nor be one with Christ, and so it must lie down in everlasting sorrow. (Is. l. 11.) God hath laid up all worthiness in Christ, that the creature may know where to find it, and seek after it. There is no way on earth for unworthy souls to become worthy, but by believing in Christ : believing in Christ will make slaves become worthy sons ; enemies, worthy friends. God calls none worthy, nor carries it towards any as worthy, but believers, who are made worthy by the worthiness of Christ's person, righteousness, satisfaction, and intercession, &c. (John i. 12. James ii. 12. Rev. iii. 4.)

*Rem. 4.* Solemnly consider, that if you make a diligent search into your own hearts, you will find that it is the pride and folly of them that inclines you to bring worthiness to Christ. You would fain bring something to Christ that might render you acceptable to him, you are loth to come empty handed. The Lord cries out, (Is. lv. 1, 2.) 'Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money, come ye.' Here the Lord calls upon penny-less, unworthy souls, to come and partake of his precious favors freely. But sinners are proud and foolish, and because they have no money, no worthiness to bring, they will not come though he freely invite them. Ah sinners ! what is more just than that you should perish for ever, who prefer husks among swine, before the milk and wine, the sweet and precious things of the gospel, that are so freely held forth to you, &c. Well, sinners, remember this, it is not so much the sense of your unworthiness, as your pride, that keeps you from embracing the Lord Jesus, as your Saviour.

(To be continued.)

**ART. VI. *Eight Reasons against Universalism.*—By DR. ALEXANDER.**

1. It does violence to the Holy Scriptures, and perverts the plain and obvious meaning of numerous passages which speak of the future punishment of impenitent sinners. And if in one case we may thus set aside the express and repeated declarations of God, to accommodate the doctrines to our own reason or inclinations, the volume of inspiration is dishonored and rendered useless, for upon these principles we may reject every fundamental truth of the Bible. If the doctrine of future punishment is not taught in the Bible, neither is the doctrine of future happiness ; for they are commonly inculcated in the same passages, and in similar language.

2. If it be true that sin is not punished in the future world, then it would follow that God exercises no moral government over the world ; for in the present life the wicked often live at ease and are prosperous and the virtuous are afflicted. This doctrine goes far to annihilate all difference between virtue and vice ; for we must judge of these according to the treatment they respectively receive from the Supreme Ruler ; but if there be no future punishment, there is no strong mark of disapprobation set on vice.—A doctrine which involves such a consequence as this, must be false and dangerous.

3. If this doctrine should become general, *human society could not exist*. Like atheism to which it is near akin, its malignant tendency is not fully seen, while society at large is under the influence of a contrary belief. But take away from all men the fear of judgment and eternity, and this world becomes a scene of violence—an aceldama. All confidence among men would be destroyed; all the bonds of civil society would be severed. Do not say that vice might be coerced by the civil law—a vain hope. Where the whole mass are corrupt, laws are useless. What means of ascertaining the truth in courts of justice will remain, without which justice cannot be administered, if no man fears the consequences of perjury? Suppose a man who has no fear of judgment, to be solemnly called upon to declare the truth in a case where his own honor and interest, or that of some friend, is at stake—what is there to prevent him from perjuring himself? Or if he can gratify secret malice, by swearing against the life of an enemy, what shall restrain him? He may reason with himself thus: “I know this is a wicked act, but it will serve my purpose, it will enable me to gratify my revenge; and I have nothing to fear. Detection here is impossible, and hereafter I am sure of heaven, do as I will.” What security should we have that our food and medicine would not be mingled with poison in every house? The men who propagate such doctrines are manifestly pursuing a course destructive to the peace and good order of society. I would fully as soon have an Atheist to bear witness against me on oath, or to sit in judgment as a juror, as one of these new fangled Universalists.

4. If there is no future punishment, the wicked who are driven away in their wickedness are happier than the righteous who are preserved to suffer. The wicked antediluvians who perished in the flood, had a better portion and a richer reward than Noah, for they all escaped the troubles of life and went to heaven, while Noah and his family were subjected to innumerable hardships for some hundreds of years. The inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah were better off, though they were destroyed by fire from heaven, than righteous Lot, who escaped; for they were released at once from all pain and sorrow, but his afflictions were many. The wicked Cananites were too bad to live upon earth, and therefore God enjoined it on Joshua to extirpate them: but not too bad to be admitted at once to heaven without any repentance or sanctification. Their lot was, therefore, greatly preferable to that of the Israelites, who endured many toils and sufferings. Upon this theory Judas was rather benefitted than injured by his base and ungrateful crime of betraying his Lord, and by his suicide. Indeed if there be no future punishment, and the next world be better than this, not only will suicide be innocent and beneficial, but there can be no great harm in murder. It only ushers a fellow creature into superior bliss a little earlier than if he were left to die a natural death.

5. Upon the supposition that this doctrine is true, repentance is useless; neither is their any need of sanctification. Heaven is the sinner's right without any condition or preparation. How the ungodly will be pleased with the place and its exercises, is another question. Whether dying will take away their disrelish for devotional exercises is not explained. But there is no need of undergoing the sorrows of repentance for sin.—This the Universalists acknowledge. A writer before referred to, declares, “that there is not the least occasion for solicitude about salvation, neither is it in our power to promote or hin-

der it." We did suppose that the advocates of this doctrine would have pleaded for repentance, which is nothing else but a turning from sin to God, as useful to prevent evil in this life; but we find that in this we mistook their views, for the same writer asserts, concerning the evils that sin produces here, "that these consequences are inevitable and cannot be escaped, even by repentance." What these men can preach, or why they should at all, we do not see.

6. Upon this theory there is no need of religion of any kind; no connection exists between religion and salvation; between the man who loves and serves God, and him who hates him and despises his service. Atheism is as good as piety, idolatry and heresy as safe a way to heaven as truth and righteousness. The one thing needful is, to be fully persuaded that nothing is needful. If men are only informed that there will be no future reckoning, no condemnation of the wicked, no future punishment, they need know nothing else; and whether they believe it or not, all are in a safe way to heaven. We presume that the principal preaching of Universalists is on the single point, that the wicked have nothing to fear on account of their sins: for why should they disturb their hearers about believing or doing other things? But the benefits of this system will, in the future world be as fully enjoyed by those who oppose the doctrine, as by those who believe and preach it.

7. This doctrine encourages men to continue in sin, by removing all fear of future judgement and punishment. In this respect its tendency is as bad as atheism itself; for the most impious denial of a Divine Being cannot promise more to its foolish votaries than exemption from judgment and future punishment. This species of Universalism is fraught with the very worst poison of atheism. It tells the sinner that let him act as wickedly as he will, or as he can, there is no fear of future misery. Indeed, it is in some respects worse than atheism, for it not only promises exemption from punishment, but the reward of eternal happiness to the impenitent sinner. It says to the atrocious murderer and cruel assassin, "You need fear no evil hereafter; though you should die in the commission of the foulest deeds heaven with all its glory and happiness, is yours." Is not this shocking to every honest mind? and what must the effect be on profane, cruel, and abandoned profligates? How pernicious its influence in the hour of temptation! Suppose an inexperienced youth in a place of trust to have imbibed this doctrine. An opportunity occurs of defrauding his employer of a vast sum of money, with the prospect of escaping detection. Well, what shall hinder him from enriching himself at once? If the belief of a future judgment were now to rise in his mind, he would be ready, like Joseph, to say, "*How can I do this great evil and sin against God.*" But having no apprehension of any judgment to come, and sure of heaven let him do what he will, he is led into temptation and is deprived of every consideration which would lead him to resist it. Even the faint hope that there is no future punishment, has a powerful effect in leading corrupt men to commit atrocious crimes although this hope is contrary to all that they have ever been taught; but who can calculate the influence of a persuasion that there is no future punishment for the greatest crimes, derived from men who pretend to be preachers of the gospel? Doubtless a large portion of the most abominable crimes that ever were perpetrated, owe their existence to a secret belief or hope of the truth of the very doctrine which Universalists preach.

8. It is a horrible consequence of this doctrine, that it puts it in the power of the sinner to *set God himself at defiance with impunity*. The malignant, ungrateful wretch, instead of praising, may blaspheme the great Jehovah every day of his life, and may die with horrid blasphemies on his lips, and yet he shall be rewarded with everlasting happiness! Indeed as all the punishment of sin is supposed to be in this life, when a sinner commits some horrible crime in the last moment of his life, as in a late case where a man first shot an innocent person and then blew out his own brains, where or how will he receive his due punishment? His death is but the pang of a moment, and if there be no retribution for such crimes in the government of God, it cannot be believed that he is a righteous moral Governor.

---

ART. VII. *Poetry—Adrian.*

(For the Religious Monitor.)

Adrian, a Roman Emperor, who was born at Rome A. D. 76, ascended the imperial throne in 117, and died at Bajæ A. D. 138 in the 63d year of his age, and who, with many good qualities, was guilty of great licentiousness and many faults;—Composed, while on his death-bed, the following lines:

Animula, vagula, blandula,  
 Hospes, comesque corporis,  
 Quæ nunc abibis in loca  
 Pallidula, rigida, nudula  
 Nec, ut soles, dabit jacos.

The following verses were founded on the expression—“*Quæ nunc abibis in loca*”?—as addressed to his soul:—“where now, and in what place, will be your home”?

My soul on the wing, and death drawing near,  
 My throne and my crown to change for the bier  
 To stain all my glory, and tread it to dust:  
 How vain all my triumphs—how foolish my trust!

Kingdoms I've conquer'd; the world owns my sway,  
 Nations my mandates with reverence obey;  
 But now on my couch of anguish and pain,  
 Blest health, I cannot command back again.

Death laughs to scorn my titles and name;  
 The dust of the grave will soon cover my fame:  
 Mighty Adrian soon buried forgotten will lie;  
 Mighty Adrian! O mockery! I must die—I must die.

O death—hateful death—with thy shroud, and thy grave,  
 Wilt thou cover the monarch as well as the slave?  
 Through thy gates must all enter—the high and the low,  
 Born, but to perish at last by thy blow.

O death—hateful death—with thy herald disease,  
 Come to blast all my hopes, and my soul's life to seize,

From friends, and from pleasures, to bear me away,  
And hide in the darkness my mouldering clay !

You shall not yet slay me :—hasten and bring  
Astrologers, Diviners to rescue their King ;  
Go ; Search the stars, and their influence *command*  
To save me from death, and its dread power withstand.

Vain hope ! they cannot save themselves :—O Death  
To this thy touch arrests my laboring breath :  
Can nothing save me, and thy power control ?  
I die, I die, and whither goes my soul ?

No jesting in Eternity : Can it be so  
As these despised Christians tell ; that wo—  
Eternal wo will follow sin : and wrath—  
Unmingl'd wrath, for guilt, will follow death ?

Dread thought ! the damps of death is on my brow :  
My soul—my soul—*where* will your home be now  
If *this* be true, no refuge from the storm  
For thee—the prey of the undying fire and worm.

I die, I die ; I feel death's torturing dart  
Entering my viens, and piercing through my heart :  
I'm sinking : save me—*save me*—and the whole  
Of my broad Empire's yours :—My soul—My soul !

Look from that palace, and that bed of down,  
To you poor hovel ; none of earth's renown  
Surrounds that sufferer : no menials watch his nod,  
But angels guard him, as the friend of God.

He too is dying ; yet, no terrors melt  
His soul with anguish, though his heart has felt  
The grasp of death : in that appalling hour,  
He meets its stroke, as God's commission'd power.

Redeem'd by blood, even death he cannot fear,  
In death, he sees his best friend drawing near,  
To bear him, where, while endless ages roll,  
Eternal happiness shall bless the soul.

His soul's *Home* is prepar'd ; unlike that King,  
In triumph he can shout : "Death where's thy sting !"  
My Saviour died to save, in conquering thee ;  
The soul is safe—"O grave, where now's thy victory ?"

Give me through life, the Christian's rugged path,  
His happy death—his soul secur'd from wrath ;  
And take earth's treasures : to my soul be given  
Blest with the Saviour's love, a home in Heaven.

MAXTON.

ART. VIII. *Excommunication of the Burghers.—A Mistake corrected.*

MR. EDITOR—In an article in the Associate Presbyterian Magazine, bearing the signature, *Andrew Stark*, I perceive, that the "Appendix" to the "Narrative" lately published by a committee of the Presbytery of Cambridge is *erroneously* ascribed to that committee. Whether this was done designedly, or not, I do not undertake to say. The "Narrative" published by the committee bears their signature. The "Appendix" is without any signature, and was not published by the committee, but by an individual on his own responsibility. This statement is due to the committee.

Now, as to the matter on which the writer in the Magazine displays the peculiarities of his intellect, let us see, without any *quibbling* or *sophistication*, where the truth lies. It seems, Mr. Stalker had published in a pamphlet, that "The General Associate Synod excommunicated the Associate Synod;" or in more common phrase, that, the Anti-Burgher Synod excommunicated the Burgher Synod. Mr. Stalker is evidently speaking of these bodies as *Synods*, and not of the *individuals* composing them. For he says, "as the latter," nearly a century afterwards, "did not ask the sentence to be removed, they virtually assented to the justice of it." He cannot therefore be speaking of "excommunicated" *individuals*, for they had long before that time given in their "final account," but of an "excommunicated" *Synod*, which still survived at the time of the union of which he is speaking. The question then is, Did the Anti-Burgher Synod, as Mr. Stalker affirms, excommunicate the Burgher *Synod*? Unless this be true, his argument falls to the ground. The writer however of the "Appendix" denies this, and proceeds to show the falsity of Mr. Stalker's *premises*. He gives the only *act* of the Anti-Burgher Synod which related to the Burgher Synod, as a *judicatory*, as a *Synod*; which *act* in "the language of ecclesiastical discipline" is not as he says, called an act of "excommunication." With this act, the writer of the "Appendix" stops; as it was sufficient to overthrow the statement of Mr. Stalker. He might however, have proceeded further and stated, that some two years afterwards the said Synod did inflict the censure of excommunication on certain *individual ministers* belonging to the Burgher Synod after a regular process by libel, citation, &c. but not on *all* the members composing that judicatory. The Burgher Synod therefore as a *Synod* was never excommunicated, neither were all its component members in their individual capacity. But on the other hand, as the writer of the "Appendix" shows, the Burgher Synod did pass a sentence not merely of *excommunication* but of *annihilation* upon the Anti-Burgher Synod *as such*. The writer of the article in the Magazine surely must have known all this, but if not, as we understand he wishes to pass for a *gentleman*, we doubt not, he will make the *amende honorable*.

## FAIR PLAY.

P. S. If Mr. Stark be what he professes, he will retract the following unjust reflection made in the same article:—"I have no disposition to retaliation on Messrs. Anderson, Miller and Gordon, by reproaching them with the failure of their memories.—People's memories need not be blamed with forgetting what they never knew. It is a pity that ministers could not be taught the history of their own church, *at least*, before they should be ordained to teach others. This would help to keep

them from exposing themselves;" and also the statement made in a *note* respecting one of the "Synod's messengers;" as we know it to be entirely destitute of all color of truth.

F. P.

---

ART. IX. *A Pro-Slavery Argument considered.*

MR. EDITOR—David Meredith Reese, M. D. author of a late work, entitled "Humbugs of New York," has undertaken to prove from the Bible the lawfulness of Slavery. The following is a sample of his logic:—"God has not only permitted it [Slavery] but has legislated for its perpetuity.—The rights of the master or owner of slave property are acknowledge by the divine law. Nor do we need any other proof than the tenth commandment of the Decalogue, which is of universal and perpetual obligation; for there we read—'Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's *man*-servant, nor thy neighbor's *maid*-servant, nor any thing that is *his*;' and surely no one need to be informed that the word *his*, when the ellipsis is filled up, means his *property*; for it cannot possibly mean any thing else." (P. 147—8)

Truly this author is a very Nicodemus indeed, and understands the divine law or scripture doctrine about as well as his prototype did the subject of the *new birth*, when he exclaimed, "How can a man be born when he is old? can he enter the second time into his mother's womb and be born?" Christ's doctrine was a *puzzler* to Nicodemus, and it would seem, that the Doctor of "Humbugs" has got into the same fog, in attempting to prove the lawfulness of slavery from the divine law, and referring to the Tenth Commandment for proof. Is it not evident to all, who have been savingly taught by the Spirit of God, that such a man, though pretending to teach others, "needs himself to be taught, what be the first principles of the oracles of God?"

Now if we admit that the Doctor has proved from the Tenth Commandment the "right of property in man," the right to buy and sell, and own as property, *man-servants* and *maid-servants*, we can prove from the same commandment that a man has the same right of property precisely in his *wife*, his partner, his help-mate; and consequently may convert her into an article of merchandise. For the commandment says—"Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife," as well as, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's man-servant nor maid-servant."

If I understand the Dr.'s argument, it is this, "Whatever is a man's by virtue of any relation whatsoever, is *his* in the sense of *property*, absolute property, that which may be bought and sold or used in any way according to the owner's good pleasure." But his wife is *his*, and therefore his property, to be bought, to be sold, to be disposed of as any other article of merchantable property! The sophistry of the Dr.'s argument consists in this, that he makes no distinction between the different relations in virtue of which persons and things are *his*. Thus he makes his *wife* and his house and his *man-servant* and his *maid-servant* and his *ox* and his *ass* to be his by the same relation. And, therefore, as he has the right of property in his house, his ox, and his ass, to buy and to sell, so he concludes he has the same right of property in his man-servant and maid-servant, yea in his wife, to buy and to sell, for they also are *his*. He seems to think that whatever

may be coveted is disposable property; hence as his wife may be coveted, according to his own argument, she is disposable property, as much so as his ox or his ass, or any thing that is *his*. Now Quere? Has not the Dr. in his zeal to apologize for slavery, proved altogether too much, and therefore proved nothing, except that his argument is a mere "humbug"? P. M.

---

ART. X. *Miscellaneous Items.*

**THE LAW SUIT.**—Our readers being already aware that the law suit instituted by the New-school secession, against the Presbyterian Church, was ordered for trial before the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, on the 26th of November, will no doubt be anxious to hear what progress may have been made in the case. For their information we would state that the court of Nisi Prius, Judge Sergeant presiding, met and was duly organized in Philadelphia, on Monday the 26th ult., at ten o'clock, A. M. On the docket being read, it was ascertained that the case was placed first on the list, as a commonwealth case, that is, as one in which the commonwealth is directly interested, and which by the rules of court takes precedence of all other cases, although of much older date. When it was announced, therefore, as "*Commonwealth versus Green*," Judge Sergeant inquired why it was so represented on the docket? The counsel of the New-school very briefly remarked, that they regarded it in this light, from its general scope and bearings, or something to that effect. Judge Sergeant immediately replied, that the commonwealth, strictly speaking, had nothing to do with it, and therefore that it was not entitled to precedence. The case was thus thrown to the end of the docket, and after the docket was called over, it appears that its proper order was No. 13, of the cases ready for trial. In both instances, when this case was called, the counsel on each side responded that they were ready for trial. In consequence of the decision of Judge Sergeant, which was no doubt correct, it has now become a matter of doubt whether this case can be reached during the present sessions of the court, which continue only for three weeks. The witnesses in this case still continue to attend the court on the morning of each day; and will continue to attend until the trial takes place, or they are dismissed on the ground that it must be deferred. Patience must have its perfect work. The final result will be announced to our readers as soon as it occurs. The counsel for the defendants, are John Sergeant, Joseph R. Ingersoll, and F. W. Hubbell, Esqrs., and for the plaintiffs, Josiah Randall, Wm. M. Meredith, and George Wood, Esqrs.

P. S. Since the above was in type, the Church case has been deferred, by mutual consent of counsel, until the next term of the Supreme Court, which is to be held in February next.—*Presbyterian*.

---

**HIRING a MINISTER.**—This is a phrase very commonly used in various sections of our country, particularly in relation to the temporary settlement of ministers. A congregation, we speak not of all, for there are many, many honorable exceptions, make up an insufficient subscription to hire a minister for six months or a year: and when a candidate is,

fixed on they promise him a certain allowance either in produce or money on condition that he does a certain amount of preaching, visits the sick, baptizes their children, and attends funerals. The whole affair is looked on in the light of an ordinary bargain, with which kindness and affection have very little to do. We have more than once been distressed with the heartlessness displayed in these bargains, and have been led to inquire, whether there could be any proper sense of the nature of the ministry among those whose views in securing it are so mercenary. Why did Christ institute a ministry? Was it not to show his love for the souls of men? Did he not give pastors and teachers for the instruction, edification, and consolation of self-ruined sinners? And when these his chosen messengers come with his commission to impart spiritual gifts to the necessitous, they should not be regarded as hirelings and common laborers. If the character of their office was justly appreciated; if the love of the Master in sending them was considered; if the gracious and benevolent errand on which they come was regarded; they would be received cheerfully; their visit would be hailed with joy, and each one would be anxious, from a sense of gratitude to them and of love to their Lord, to do every thing in their power to minister to their comfort. We would hear nothing of the terms of a close bargain in which the services of the ministry were to be weighed against dollars and cents, but the Minister would be made comfortable in his worldly circumstances, not in payment of his services, for these when faithfully rendered, are beyond all earthly price, but as an evidence of their love to the Gospel, and of their gratitude in enjoying its stated ministrations. We apprehend that when vital piety is more prevalent, and the infinite importance of religion is generally felt it will not be regarded as a hard duty, but as a delightful privilege, to comfort and cherish the ministers of Christ. The sensibilities of God's servants will not be grated by the phraseology of the market, and they will not be left to suffer, as they now, in too many instances do, from the reluctant payment of stinted salaries. We sometimes fear that we do not even see the dawn of these better days.—*Presbyterian.*

**THANKSGIVING.**—On the day of the date of this paper, Nov. 29, 1838, the religious people of at least seven states will be engaged, at the summons of their respective Governors, in rendering public thanksgiving to Almighty God for the numerous mercies of the year, and in praying for the continuance of our blessings. Some of the proclamations refer very distinctly to the cause of freedom.—*Emancipator.*

Governor Kent, of Maine, says:

“As we assemble around the table of God's bounty, on this our annual festival, and remember in gratitude and with thanksgiving, his mercies to us as a people, and as individuals in our social and domestic relations, let us remember, in kindness and sympathy, the poor, the oppressed and destitute; let us cherish those kind and benevolent affections, which shall lead us to smooth the rough paths of life, regarding each other in the spirit of charity, as brethren of one common Father and bound together by the indissoluble ties of a common nature and a common destiny.”

Governor Jennison, of Vermont, says:

“And finally, let us pray that the mild and benign influence of the religion of our LORD and SAVIOUR, Jesus Christ, may be extended and diffused, till all vice and immorality shall be exterminated; till the

blessed practice of doing to others as we would that others should do unto us, shall be universally established among men:—then will have been heard the last groan of the oppressed; then will man have ceased to claim property in his fellow-man, and true peace and good will be found co-extensive with the whole earth; then shall go up from every land one great voice, exclaiming—‘Blessed is the nation whose GOD is the LORD: and the people whom he hath chosen for his own inheritance.’”

Governor Ellsworth, of Connecticut, says :

“Let us supplicate God to preserve our political and social institutions and bind in closer friendship the States of the Union:—that he would shed light in the paths of our rulers, and direct to the adoption of wise and patriotic measures;—that he would restore harmony and kindness; impart the love of truth, justice and religion; prosper our colleges and schools, and every effort to diffuse light and knowledge; give success to our efforts in behalf of the ignorant, the poor and the suffering; extend our commerce, and manufactures and agriculture; put a stop to intemperance, bondage oppression and crime; and finally awaken us to a just apprehension of the responsibilities of living at the present era, and of the scenes so soon to open upon us in eternity.”

**BETTING ON ELECTIONS.**—We have seen it stated, and we cannot doubt that the estimate is in the round correct, that more than half a million of dollars were staked upon the result of the Gubernatorial question in Pennsylvania! A more wicked, infamous tampering with the doctrines of morality and good sense cannot be shown on the page of the history of our State. Such indirect bribes must tend to remove the discussion of men’s fitness for office from an examination of their principles and fitness to the avaricious desires of the voter: and as the amount periled increases, so in proportion advances the determination of the gamester to leave no means untried to insure the success of the cause which so deeply involves his own pecuniary interest. He closes his own mind against any false doctrines that time may develop in the conduct of his candidate, and goes to the polls, not to deposite the vote of a freeman, but to add to the probability of his securing the spoils of the moneyed speculation. We hold it to be a rule sustained by sound logic that the man who bets on the result of an election, surrenders the dearest principle of freedom,—the moral qualities of an elector. He has sold his opinion for money, and is no more to be trusted with the privileges of a citizen, than is the card shuffler to be entrusted with the possession of his neighbor’s uncounted purse. The lenient may grade gaming as tipplers classify intemperance, and throw a different coloring over the conduct of the political gamester than that which they award to the frequenter of the billiard-table, the faro-bank, or the card-hell; but in the eye of strict morality there is no difference, and the citizen who brawls out his political preferences and backs them by a bet on their success, is steeped in as much infamy as covers the degraded professional black-leg, with his loaded dice and spotted cards.—*Pittsburgh Sat. Eve. Visitor.*

**MEDICAL MISSIONARY SOCIETY.**—Such is the title of a Society recently established in China. The object of it, as set forth in a pamphlet transmitted to us by the Corresponding Secretary, is to spread the benefits of a rational medicine and surgery among the Chinese, by

means of medical gentlemen who shall practice gratuitously under the patronage of the society. The *Medical Missionary* must be able to furnish full testimonials of thorough education in his profession, as well as of his piety, prudence, and correct moral and religious character. The object is truly benevolent. The Chinese are almost totally ignorant of medicine and surgery; and yet they are subject to disease in its worst and most malignant forms. Their sufferings, therefore, are almost inconceivable. If the Author of Christianity thought it not inconsistent with his divine mission to *heal the sick*, and if, wherever his religion has prevailed, Infirmaries and Hospitals have been reared in obedience to its humane spirit, this project should not be regarded by Christians as one which has few claims to their attention. Besides, it is well known, that the Chinese are more inaccessible to foreigners than any other nation: to penetrate into the interior of their empire is almost an impossibility; and those who visit them with the sole object of instructing them in the Christian religion find insurmountable difficulties in their way; but all their restrictions and prejudices seem to give way, when the skillful physician tenders his services to mitigate their bodily diseases. Pious physicians, and such alone this Society proposes to employ, besides the direct benefit which they may impart to suffering humanity may also prove effective pioneers to the heralds of the cross; nay, they, themselves may enjoy many favorable opportunities of holding up to the attention of this singular and interesting people, the cheering truths of the Gospel. Great liberality has already been displayed by influential foreigners, resident in Canton, in behalf of this institution, and not only has an Ophthalmic Hospital already been prepared, but arrangements are in train for departments for the treatment of other prevalent diseases. Co-operation from the United States is needed and expected, not only in the way of pecuniary contributions, but in medical men of the right qualifications.—*Presbyterian.*

ON PRIVATE PRAYER.—Thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy chamber, and shut the door. And the reason is plain. He who would pray, must first retire; the spirit of the world and the spirit of prayer are contrary the one from the other, and experience will teach any one that he cannot well pray in a crowd. Business, or pleasure, or even common conversation if it be about the things of this world, and continue for any long time, will strangely indispose the mind for devotion; and the soul, before she can take her flight to heaven, must plume and balance her wings by holy meditation: she must rally her scattered and dissipated thoughts, and fix them on the business she is going about: she must consider the nature of God, to whom she is to pray; of herself, who is to pray to him; and of those things for which she is to pray; she must know the sins she has been guilty of, to confess them and the graces she stands in need of, to petition for them. All this is not to be done but by deep meditation, which is the mother of devotion, is the daughter of retirement. They who do not meditate can not pray; and they who do not retire, can do neither.—*Bishop Horne.*

MALTA—*Conversion of Roman Catholics.*—The Journal of Commerce gives the following letter from a member of the Wesleyan Mission in that Island to his friend in this city:

*Valetta, Sept. 18, 1838.*

In Malta all goes on much as usual, but the partial liberty which has

been given to printing lately, has excited in many a great desire for reading. At present there are not less than five periodicals published by the three Maltese presses now established in Valetta. The censorship still continues, but it is by no means strict, and we hope ere long that it will be removed altogether. I presume you heard of the Posh Missionary to Tunis, who came to Malta about eight months ago and has joined our church. The thing caused a great disturbance in the town; three times was poor Signor Menna brought before the tribunal of Justice, and we had enough to do with the aid of the Police to preserve him from the *barbarous* mob. He is a Neapolitan, and for the present is connected with our Mission in the capacity of a translator from the Latin into the Italian, &c. His life has been very consistent, and I trust he will be made an instrument in the hands of God of doing much good. He is at present carrying on a correspondence with Canonico Pasila in regard to some doctrinal points of dispute between Protestants and Papists. To day a Dominican Missionary from Constantinople has taken pratique, and I have just had a conversation with him: to-morrow he intends to follow the example of Signor Menna and throw off his dress. We may expect a dreadful row, but may the Lord protect us and this poor man from the fury of these ignorant people.

**THE INFIDEL'S DEATH BED.**—Added to the many proofs of the folly of infidelity and of its incapability to sustain its advocate on his death-bed, is the following renunciation of this fatal delusion, by Micajah Woods, Esq., who died in the county of Albermarle, Va., on the 23d of March, in the 61st year of his age. We may cherish the belief that there is no God, while in health and strength, and while the hour of death is, in our apprehension, far distant; but when the grim messenger of death stares us in the face, when a guilty and awakened conscience sets our sins in array against us, it is then we shall feel and know there is a God.

The sketch is given by a minister of the Gospel through the columns of the Charlottesville Herald.

Mr. W., from his first settlement in life, had been industriously and successfully engaged in agricultural pursuits, and had in this way amassed an ample fortune. He possessed a vigorous and discriminating mind a kind and benevolent heart. Few men have enjoyed a larger share of the confidence and love of their associates and acquaintances. He had long and ably filled several of the most respectable offices—and at the period of his death, was the high sheriff of this county.

Ten days before his death, I was called to visit him. No apprehension was at that time felt of a speedy dissolution. He had no fever, and his mind was usually clear and vigorous.

When I entered his sick room, a scene of moral sublimity was presented which I can never forget. A venerable old black man—one of his own slaves—stood at his bed side grasping his master's hand, and pointing him to the Saviour. "There, Sir," said the sick man, "You see a faithful old servant who has answered the end of his being far better than I have—he is a Christian, I am a lost sinner, I would rather now be what he is, than what I am, though I possessed the wealth of the East Indies.—I have been a wretched disciple of Paine; and what is worse, I have endeavoured to make others as bad as myself. Will

you pray for me?" With this affecting request I complied, surrounded by his weeping family and friends.

During the afternoon and evening, he made many such remarks as the following; "What have I gained by all the deistical works of which I was once so fond? Nothing but the horror and distress of mind which I now suffer—they are the cause of my misery—now they seem to me as the poison of the serpent. I despise—I renounce them all." On the next morning he said, "when I am cold in the dust, tell the people from the pulpit all I have said to you—give them a full history of my case—tell them I have made full proof of infidelity—and that I found it when I came to die, as a basket without a bottom. It may do in life—but it will not do in death."

Two of his old friends and associates called to see him, who, he supposed, still entertained the sentiments he had just renounced. He was much affected at seeing them—addressing himself to them, he said, 'I hope you will not be displeased; we once held the same opinions—I hold them no longer, I renounce that creed, I cannot die an infidel: I beg you to renounce it also. He continued to speak to them with great penitency and force. When they left the room, he asked me if he had done wrong, if he had said any thing amiss, adding, 'I could not let so good an opportunity pass of trying to do them good. I pray they may never regret it.'

The open and unqualified renunciation of infidelity, was accompanied by symptoms of unaffected repentance. He was not overwhelmed with fear; indeed he very seldom alluded to the consequences of sin, but seemed to be wholly engrossed with its intrinsic vileness. A very common expression of his was, 'all that I can say is, God have mercy upon me, a poor, mean, vile sinner.' At another time he spoke substantially as follows: "I am aware that my acquaintances have also considered me a very upright moral man; a good citizen; and they love me a good deal more than I deserve. But had they known what a heart I had they would have thought very differently. With all my outward morality, I have been at heart a vile sinner." Smiting on his breast, he exclaimed 'here have rested thousands of sins which no eye has seen but that of God.'—*Middlebury Free Press.*

**RELIGION OF THE HEART ESSENTIAL TO SUCCESS.**—Religion is poor business, unless the heart be in it. My son, give me thine heart. If this be not given, nothing else will be given, unless reluctantly, and therefore unacceptably. But every thing will follow the heart; and where there is first a willing mind, and concern to please, imperfections in the manner will be overlooked in the motive; and if the deed be hindered, it will be accepted according to what a man hath, and not according to what he hath not. Yet there is much in the proverb, "Where there is a will, there is a way." Nothing often is wanting, as to efficiency, but resolution; and a fulness of resolution is most likely to arise from a fulness of inclination. Love gives ardour and boldness—love is strong as death; many waters cannot quench love, nor floods drown it. While the slothful sees thorns, and the coward cries, "there is a lion in the way—I shall be slain in the streets," purpose of heart, founded not in our own strength, but in the strength of the Lord, (and in a christian it is always so founded,) clears away difficulties, or is roused by them into greater vigor and strenuousness.

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,  
AND  
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

FEBRUARY, 1839.

---

ART. I. *A Review of the Associate Presbyterian Magazine.*

It is known to our readers, that, during the past summer, a Periodical was started in this city, entitled **THE ASSOCIATE PRESBYTERIAN MAGAZINE**, and "under the immediate superintendence of the Rev. P. Bullions, D. D." as **EDITOR**. The manifest design of this work was to vindicate the course of certain brethren, who had been subjected to the censures of the church, and, to assail and vilify the members and proceedings of those judicatories, which had any agency in the infliction of these censures. It will appear in the sequel how far the Editor has succeeded in the execution of either part of this design.

We have already notified our readers of the estimate, in which we hold this production, so far as it has yet made its appearance. Correspondents have also expressed their views in relation to it. And perhaps it may, by some, be thought, that any further notice of it would be giving it an importance, of which it is utterly undeserving. But others have suggested, that, although the work carries with it its own antidote, especially in the plentifulness and coarseness of its abuse, yet possibly a few well-meaning but uninformed people may be deceived and misled by it; and besides, that we are under some obligation to substantiate the assertions, which we have made respecting the nature of its contents.

We felt, at one time, some doubts of the propriety of reviewing the contents of this Magazine very closely, as the necessary effect would be to blast in a great measure the reputation of its editor. But these doubts have been removed, partly, by a declaration made to us by a special friend of the editor, that if there were false statements in the Magazine, "duty to the cause of truth required that they should be exposed," thereby intimating, that the claims of truth were paramount to all considerations of tenderness for the reputation of one, who had forfeited the regard of all its friends;—and, partly, by meditating on the conduct of our Divine Master in relation to the Scribes and Phari-

sees. His expose of the character and actions of those men, and which had the tendency to destroy their reputation with the more serious and reflecting part of the community, was not made simply on *their* account, or with any view to injure *them*, but only for the sake of truth, and on account of the immortal souls that were seduced and in danger of being eternally destroyed by their hypocritical representations and practices. And doubtless it was for the same reason, that the Apostle Paul exposed, as he did, certain characters in his day.

In addition to these considerations, the editor of the Magazine has arrogantly challenged us, in the No. for December, to a performance of the task we have now undertaken. He says "it is remarkable," although the Magazine has been more than four months before the public, that "neither we nor any of our correspondents have attempted to 'expose the glaring falsehoods and misrepresentations' in which it is said to abound:" And then in the language of defiance exultingly exclaims:—"We know that the assertions of the Monitor never can be substantiated, and that our statements never can be falsified in any material point."—Whatever effect, therefore, the following Review may have on the reputation of the editor of the Magazine, it must be ascribed, not to us, but to himself. Although he has made several personal attacks upon us, still we would willingly spare him, did not the cause of truth and the welfare of those whom his work is misleading require this service at our hands.

Whether Dr. Bullions be the real writer of all that appears as editorial in his pages, we undertake not to say; but, that he is the *responsible* author, he will not himself deny. The public holds him as such; and as such we claim the right to denominate and treat him. And as the chief part of his work, on which we intend to animadvert, is called "Remarks," &c. to avoid the too frequent use of his name, we will, with due respect, style him the *Remarker*.

Having made these preliminary statements, we commence our Review, by subjecting to the test of truth the leading article contained in the first number of the aforesaid Magazine, entitled "*Remarks on the decisions of the Associate Synod respecting the Presbytery of Albany.*" After stating, in a short introductory paragraph, that those decisions were "excessively arbitrary and presumptuous," "manifest a disregard to truth and honesty," and "show that men professing godliness will trample under foot all the claims of justice and equity," the Rev. Remarker says:—"Our readers may have learned from the minutes of Synod, that that court undertook to suspend from the exercise of their office and from the communion of the church, no fewer than six of its members, because they refused to submit to an unjust decision respecting the Presbytery of Albany." (p. 9.) In this sentence there are several deviations from matters of fact. The Synod did not simply "undertake to suspend," but *did actually suspend* the persons referred to, viz: Messrs. Stark, Bullions and Blair, ministers, and Messrs. Edwards, Crookshanks and Gilmore, ruling elders. But the Synod did not suspend them "because they refused to submit to an unjust decision." This allegation is highly slanderous. Nor is it true that "that court suspended six of its members." The editor of the Magazine knows well, that, as soon as the roll was called at the opening of Synod, an objection was made to *his* sitting as a member of the court, on the ground of his having been suspended from the exercise of the ministry by the Presbytery of Albany, and he also knows, that that objection

was sustained by the court. Indeed, none of the six properly speaking were ever recognised as regular members of the court; for they were not allowed, according to a resolution adopted, "to take any part in the business of Synod till the roll was made out:" and when the roll was finally made out, their names were omitted. How then can they be called "members of that court?"

The Remarker proceeds, same page, to say:—"The first notice taken of this subject in the minutes of Synod is in the following words, viz: 'Information has been given to this Synod, that there are reports from two bodies claiming to be the Presbytery of Albany.'" This is *not* the *first* notice taken of this subject in the minutes of Synod. For on the page of the minutes immediately preceding that from which he quotes, we have this record: "Notices were also given by two members claiming to be clerks of the Presbytery of Albany, that Dr. P. Bullions was suspended from the exercise of the ministry; Messrs. Martin and Campbell from their seats in Presbytery." Why does the Remarker quote from the minute of *Thursday*, as containing "the first notice of this subject," when he knows that the subject referred to was introduced and discussed at some length on *Wednesday*, immediately after the opening of Synod? Throughout the whole history of the case as exhibited in the pages of the Magazine, there is a studied concealment of the fact that Messrs. Campbell and Martin were "suspended from their seats in Presbytery," by that disorderly body which undertook to act as the Presbytery of Albany. It would never answer to have this fact, as recorded in the above minute, appear in the Magazine; for its appearance there, besides doing other mischief, would spoil one of the prettiest and most literary paragraphs in the whole book, and which is expressed in these terms:—"It is mentioned in Mosheim's History, that when Luther understood that the Pope was about to launch the thunder of excommunication at his devoted head, he judged it prudent to withdraw himself voluntarily, that he might thus render the bull of ejection a blow in the air. The [pretended] Presbytery of Albany in this instance thought it advisable to imitate the example of the great Reformer. When they perceived that this corrupt Synod were likely to imitate the example of his Holiness, they thought it advisable to withdraw from them voluntarily, and thus render their suspension a blow in the air—an exercise of authority without an object." (p. 27.) Now, if the Remarker, instead of concealing, had published the fact above noticed, his readers would not have failed to perceive a *rivalship* in regard to the honor of imitating "the great Reformer:" For Messrs. Campbell and Martin also, it seems, were imitators of that distinguished personage; for when the above mentioned disorderly body, "in imitation of his Holiness," were about to pass the resolution offered by Dr. P. Bullions for their "suspension from their seats in Presbytery," "they thought it advisable to withdraw from them voluntarily, and thus render their suspension a blow in the air—an exercise of authority without an object." But we shall be obliged to notice this matter more particularly hereafter.

On page 10, we meet with the following assertions respecting Mr. Webster's pamphlet:—"It has fully come to light, that the pamphlet was a conjunct concern between him and members of the Presbytery of Albany, and some of the members of the Presbytery of Cambridge." "The most active members of Presbytery [Albany] were deeply implicated in Mr. Webster's publication." "He then showed him a com-

munication in the hand-writing of one of the members of the Presbytery of Albany, in nearly the same words in which it was afterwards published in his pamphlet, in which reference was made to certain members of the Presbyteries of Albany and Cambridge, and to a certain professor of divinity, as being privy to and concerned in the same work." "This infamous pamphlet was proved to be false, and its authors proved to be false and malicious slanderers in a court of justice."

These assertions betray a great recklessness in regard of truth. It is not true, that Mr. Webster's pamphlet was a "conjunct concern" between him and members of the Presbyteries of Albany and Cambridge; and consequently no such thing has "fully come to light." The only light pretended to glimmers forth, it seems, from a "communication" which the late Mr. Irvine addressed to Mr. Webster sometime prior to the publication of his pamphlet. In that letter Mr. Irvine mentioned certain things which "common fame" charged upon Mr. Stark, and which Mr. Webster afterwards published in his pamphlet as "common fame." This is the sum total of the "light," which has led, or rather misled, like an *ignis fatuus*, the Remarker to make the above assertions. From this data who can honestly say, that Mr. Irvine had a "conjunct concern" in the publication of Mr. Webster's pamphlet, as one of its "authors," especially as it can be proved that he was not even aware that the thing was in progress till he saw it in print? But at the same time his letter proves that the charges taken from it did not originate with Mr. Webster: and hence, whether true or false, Mr. W. declared that he published them only as "common fame."

But further, it is not true that Mr. Irvine's letter contained any reference to "a certain professor of divinity, as being privy to and concerned in the same work." Mr. Webster has assured us that there was no reference to any professor of divinity, in any shape or way whatever, in the letter in question. And as it is supposed that Professor Beveridge is the person intended by the Remarker, we are authorized by him to use the following disclaimer made in a letter to us:—"I was so far from corresponding with any one about Mr. Webster's pamphlet, or furnishing any materials for it, or advising, or encouraging it, that I had not the least knowledge that such a publication was intended, till I saw a copy of it, sent to another individual."

Nor is it true that the letter in question refers to "certain members of the Presbyteries of Albany and Cambridge, as being privy to and concerned in the same work." That letter it appears, does mention the names of a *single* member in each of the Presbyteries named, but not in a way to identify them in any respect as conjunct authors with Mr. W. in the production of his pamphlet. And all this the editor himself of the Magazine very well knows, as it can be proved, that he has stated to more than one individual, that he believed Mr. Webster's pamphlet to be wholly his own production. Is it not amazing, then, that he should publish to the world the assertions above quoted, together with many others which reiterate the same unfounded accusation?

But again, it is not true that Mr. Webster's pamphlet has been "proved to be false in a court of justice." For there was no testimony taken to prove any such thing. The only witness that was sworn in the case, was the one that testified to Mr. Stark's good character and standing, although at the very time he was giving his testimony, Mr. Stark was under a sentence of suspension by the Associate Synod, on

charges deeply involving both his moral and ministerial character. The pamphlet, therefore, could not have been "*proved to be false in a court of justice*;" and the most that can be said of the matter is, that Mr. W. did not appear in court to *prove* it to be *true*, but let judgment go against him by *default*. The editor, therefore, had no just ground for this assertion; and much less for the other connected with it, that the "**AUTHORS**" of the pamphlet were "**PROVED** to be false and malicious slanderers in a court of justice."

After this plain statement of facts, in opposition to the groundless and injurious assertions of the Magazine, our readers will hardly be prepared for the following repetition of the same calumnies, and with increased *virus*, on page 12:—"The method pursued by the Presbytery was exactly such as might have been expected from interested persons, and who were themselves concerned in committing the offences on which they were to sit in judgment. Those members of the Presbytery who had been concerned in the pamphlet, came forward as witnesses, each to prove his own slanders, and after having done so, they sat in judgment on their own testimony. In this manner they proved their own slanders to their own satisfaction, and made such decisions as they might judge most advantageous in the premises. The Presbytery next proceeded to construct a libel against Mr. Stark, out of the slanders contained in Mr. Webster's pamphlet, and in which it is now certain that many of themselves were deeply concerned," &c. &c. A more libellous paragraph perhaps never was written; and if the editor, at the time, did not know that he was publishing to the world one of the grossest of libels, it will be all the better for himself in that day, when it will be "rendered unto every one according to his deeds."

Before proceeding further, it may be proper also to state, that Mr. Irvine never attended a meeting of Presbytery after the affair of Mr. Webster's pamphlet came to be acted on by that court. Sickness and death prevented his attendance: consequently he had nothing to do with any of the Presbytery's proceedings in that case; although the contrary is insinuated, and the uninformed reader is left to conjecture that he had the principal agency in those proceedings.

But to proceed, on the same page 10, the Remarker says:—"As the most active members of Presbytery were deeply implicated in Mr. Webster's publication, they endeavored to do all they could for him, and passed several resolutions in his favor. Among other things, they voted 'That the institution of legal proceedings by Mr. Stark against Chauncey Webster, is altogether unjustifiable, wholly subversive of the first principles of church order, and in direct opposition to the authority of Christ and of the Apostle Paul.' But as the Presbytery did not appear to be able to show any scriptural authority for the above curious vote, Mr. Stark did not pay any attention to it."—The "vote" here ascribed to the Presbytery is purely a fiction. They voted no such thing. The following is the resolution voted by Presbytery on that occasion: "*Resolved*, That it is censurable according to the word of God and the Discipline of this church, for a minister of the gospel to enter a civil suit against a member of his own communion for a supposed injury to his moral character, without first having submitted the matter to the adjudication of the appropriate church court"—and the minutes of Presbytery add: "Against this decision Mr. Stark protested for reasons to be given in, and Mr. Bullions joined him in his protest." This protest, with the "**conjunct**" Reasons of Messrs. Stark and Bullions

came before the next Synod. Now, however, Dr. Bullions sees fit to change both the language and character of the Resolution against which he protested, and attempts to father a thing of his own creation upon the Presbytery, and then sneers at it as "a curious vote!"

Besides the Resolution just named, the Presbytery, on that occasion, passed but *one* more, which bore on the case of Mr. Webster; and that one was moved by Dr. Bullions himself, and is as follows: "*Resolved*, That a committee be appointed to draw up a libel against Mr. Webster." Yet in the face of these facts, the man who has chosen for his motto the sacred words—*Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just*—has published, as above quoted, that the Presbytery at the meeting referred to, passed *several resolutions in favor* of Mr. Webster; and then publishes a *fictitious* resolution as one of them!

The next thing that engages the attention of the Remarker, is Mr. Webster's so-called "paper of retraction." He asserts, and repeats the assertion some twenty times, that Mr. Webster gave Mr. Stark a paper, in which he acknowledged that the charges made against Mr. Stark in his pamphlet, were wholly "unwarranted and unfounded." It is scarcely necessary to waste time in pointing out the falsity of this assertion, as it is very much doubted whether any person conversant with the history of the case believes it. And, indeed, whether even charity "that thinketh no evil," can allow that the editor himself believes it, is a nice problem.

Messrs. Campbell and Smart, who were present, and the only persons present, at the time the paper in question was put in the possession of Mr. Stark, have both declared under oath at the bar of the Synod, that Mr. Webster gave the "paper" to Mr. Stark with great "reluctance," and not till after Mr. Stark had "pledged his sacred honor that he would make no use of it whatever, and that it would be as safe in his hands as in Mr. Webster's own pocket;" and both these witnesses also testified, that they considered the "paper," after it was given to Mr. Stark, to be still under "negociation," and that "additions or alterations might still be made, at the suggestion of either party, as they had come to no agreement." In particular, we consider the following Interrogatory, with Mr. Smart's answer, as putting this matter forever to rest with all reflecting minds: "*Question*. Does the witness consider Mr. Webster's refusal to give the paper to Mr. Stark, satisfactory evidence that said paper was not assented to by Mr. Webster? *Answer*. I do, and for this reason, that the object of this paper was to stop civil process on the part of Mr. Stark against Mr. Webster; and I consider, that if Mr. Webster had made up his mind to abide by the contents of that paper, he had no reason to fear any improper use of it; because no improper use could be made of it. The reluctance with which he gave the paper satisfied my mind, that he feared, that, in the progress of the suit, a use might be made to his prejudice of a paper to which he had not fully assented; so that he did not give Mr. Stark the paper until he considered himself sufficiently secured against any contingency that might arise." (*See Narrative published by the Presbytery of Albany, p. 7.*)

In addition to all this, the minutes of the Presbytery which refer to this matter, most completely contradict the Remarker's assertions. Let the following extracts be carefully perused and the truth will abundantly appear: "The latter, [Mr. Webster] having a difficulty in relation to

the concession to be made to promote this end, [stopping the civil suit,] it was *Resolved*, That Messrs. Smart and Campbell be appointed to confer with him in order to remove this difficulty.—After conferring with Mr. Webster and calling upon Mr. Stark, the committee returned, and not having fully accomplished their object, it was agreed that Presbytery adjourn till to-morrow morning at eight o'clock." And in the minutes of the meeting held next morning the following record occurs: "Mr. Webster having declared his inability to make the concession required by Mr. Stark, Presbytery agreed to proceed," &c. The above minutes were framed by Mr. Smart, one of the committee, and were assented to by all parties, and even by Dr. Bullions himself. These minutes show that Mr. Webster had a difficulty about the extent of the concessions required by Mr. Stark—that a committee was appointed to endeavor to remove this difficulty—that said committee reported that they had not fully accomplished their object, that is, had not fully removed the difficulty from Mr. Webster's mind—that the matter was then left over, for reflection, till next morning—and that at the opening of the Presbytery next morning, Mr. Webster declared his inability to make the concessions required. Now, all these facts were well known to Dr. Bullions, and yet he publishes over, and over, and over again, that Mr. Webster *retracted* the charges made in his pamphlet against Mr. Stark, as "unwarranted and unfounded." And on this most palpable untruth are founded many of those slanders, which he has published against the Presbytery of Albany.

In relation to this "paper," the Remarker further states:—"He [Mr. Webster] afterwards affected to deny that this paper contained a full and complete retraction of the slander, but care had been taken to have exact copies of it made before witnesses, so that its contents can easily be ascertained. But the simple fact, that Mr. Webster seized the paper and tore it up, will satisfy every candid person, that it must have contained something that he was then desirous to conceal." The *truth*, however, is, that Mr. Webster never denied, nor "affected to deny," nor wished to deny, or even "conceal," that the paper in question contained a full retraction. This he has always admitted. But he denies and always has denied, that he gave that paper to Mr. Stark *as his retraction*, or in any other sense, than *as a paper still under negotiation*, and even that with reluctance, lest some improper use might be made of it. The above assertion, therefore, of the Remarker, is a mere *expedient* resorted to, in order to cover over the disgrace of the man, who multiplied copies of the said "paper" and distributed them among his friends, after "pledging his sacred honor that he would make no use of it whatever," and by means of such a pledge obtaining the possession of the paper in question!

As the next sentence is a tolerably fair specimen of the Doctor's logic and adds to the "light," through the medium of which he sees so clearly that Mr. Webster's pamphlet was a "conjunct concern," we will take the pains to transcribe it. Here it is:—"And the fact that he [Mr. W.] was permitted to do this [tear up the paper] by the Presbytery, without any expression of their disapprobation, has left an irresistible impression on the minds of all honest men, who are acquainted with these transactions, that the Presbytery must have been concerned in the infamous publication so often mentioned." Indeed! because the Presbytery did not hinder Mr. Webster, or censure him, for destroying a paper of his own, a paper which they had nothing to do with, and

which Mr. Stark had "pledged his sacred honor," the evening before, to make no use of, forsooth, "an irresistible impression is made on the minds of all honest men, that the Presbytery must have been concerned in the infamous publication!" One thing, however, is certain, that the tearing up of that paper made "an irresistible impression" on some minds, that the act was prompted by a strong feeling of indignation at what was considered *perfidious* if not *treacherous* conduct on the part of the individual who had been using that paper in defiance of a solemn pledge given to the contrary!

After making the above very plain and logical deduction to the injury of the Presbytery, as he supposes, the Dr. thus proceeds with his history:—"The Presbytery then proceeded to draw up a libel against Mr. Webster for publishing his slanderous pamphlet, and afterwards found the charges brought against him in the libel to be relevant. That is, they decided that the offences laid to his charge in the libel, and which it was proved that he had actually committed, were sinful and censurable. But instead of censuring him for his sins and offences, the Presbytery, in open violation of the laws of God, and in direct opposition to all the rules of church discipline, allowed him and assisted him to bring testimony to attempt to prove what he had already declared to be 'unwarranted and unfounded'—and by so doing, determined that it was lawful for him to justify his sins. Mr. Stark objected to this proceeding as a violation of all the laws of God and man," &c. Now for the truth.—It was the Dr. himself, after the affair of the "retraction" was dismissed, who moved and advocated the drawing up of the libel against Mr. Webster; it was the Dr. who framed the libel; it was the Dr. who, in opposition to the judgment of some others, maintained and carried the relevancy of all the charges in the libel; it was the Dr. who insisted on Mr. Webster's being put on *trial*, and either prove his statements, or be censured for making them; and it was the Dr. who, as *Moderator pro tem.* signed the citations for Mr. Webster's witnesses, and thus, it seems, "allowed him and assisted him to bring testimony to attempt to prove what he had already declared to be 'unwarranted and unfounded'—and by so doing, determined that it was lawful for him to justify his sins!" We do not mean to say that Dr. Bullions did all this alone; only, that he took the lead in this affair of the libel, and gave his hearty consent to that very procedure, which he imputes to the Presbytery as "a violation of all the laws of God and man."

But in the above extract there are two very gross departures from the truth—*First*, in representing the charges contained in the libel against Mr. W. as *proved*, before any proof was taken in the case, or in other words, before Mr. W. was put on his *trial*: finding the charges *relevant*, that is, *censurable if proven*, is made synonymous with actually *proving* them: an easy process this whereby to convict a person of crime!—And *Second*, in asserting that the Presbytery "determined that it was lawful for Mr. W. to justify his sins;" which assertion is again repeated on the next page—"The Presbytery agreed that Mr. W. should go on and justify his sin." Any person will see, without having another word said on the subject, that this assertion is destitute of even the semblance of truth.

In close connection with the above, we find the following very *charitable* remarks: "By these infamous proceedings, Mr. Stark became fully satisfied, that the design of the Presbytery in trying Mr. Webster, was

merely to do what they could for him, to prevent the truth from being known, and to conceal their own share in this nefarious business. He therefore interfered no further with the Presbytery than to protest against their illegal proceedings, and they agreed that Mr. W. should go on to justify his sin, in publishing his slanderous falsehoods, and to prove those things to be true that he had declared to be unfounded." (p. 12.) But here we will merely notice, with the view to correct it, the statement, that "Mr. Stark interfered no further with the Presbytery than to protest against their illegal proceedings." Let the reader contrast with this statement, the fact that Mr. Stark was present during almost the whole time of Mr. Webster's trial, and took a most active part in it, such as cross-examining witnesses, explaining testimony, &c., and that it was not till near the close of the trial, at least till all the matters in which he had a personal interest, were disposed of, that he left the Presbytery and "interfered no further with them," assigning also as his reason, not that which is here insinuated, but *sickness*. This is confirmed by a note which he addressed to the Clerk on that occasion, and which begins thus:—"Rev. Sir—In consequence of continued indisposition, I find myself under the necessity of being absent from the Presbytery, and have thought it best to return home."

From the libel against Mr. Webster, the Remarker proceeds to notice the one against Mr. Stark, which "libel," he says, "the Presbytery constructed out of the slanders contained in Mr. Webster's pamphlet," (p. 12) and a little afterwards, "The libel was confessedly founded on Mr. Webster's slanderous pamphlet."\* Now this is so far from being true, that the libel was chiefly "constructed out of the slanders contained" in Mr. Stark's Anonymous Pamphlets, and was "confessedly founded" on those "slanderous" pamphlets. (*See the Libel as given in the Narrative published by the Presbytery of Albany.*)

This libel against Mr. Stark was referred by the Presbytery to the Synod for trial; concerning which latter court, the Remarker is pleased to hold the following language:—"The Synod which met in Philadelphia, in May, 1836, consisted of about a fifth part of all the members, and so many of these were implicated in the affair of Mr. Webster's pamphlet, that there would not have been a quorum without them. Yet some of these persons, though so deeply implicated, were the principal actors in the indecent transactions of that Synod. All their proceedings seemed designed to screen the Presbytery from well-merited contempt. Nothing more unprincipled or unjust can well be imagined, &c." (p. 13.) The Synod thus blackly characterized, was composed of twenty-one ministers and eleven ruling elders. The Book of Discipline says:—"Any six ministers from different Presbyteries, with such elders as shall be present, shall be competent to form a Synod, and to proceed to business." And yet, according to the Remarker, so many of the above thirty-two members "were implicated in the affair of Mr. Webster's pamphlet, that there would not have been a quorum without them!" As there were four ministers who voted in Mr. Stark's favor, it would seem that all the rest, save perhaps one, were "actors" in "indecent transactions," and "were deeply implicated in the affair of Mr. Webster's pamphlet!" Now, will it be deemed too harsh, to

\* After the severe and harsh epithets employed by the Remarker against Mr. Webster's pamphlet, Mr. Stark ought not to think it uncharitable nor ungenerous, were Mr. Webster's defence before the Presbytery of Albany to be made public, together with ALL THE TESTIMONY taken in the case.

use the Remarker's own language as descriptive of his own conduct, in thus lampooning a court to which he had solemnly vowed respect and obedience?—"Nothing more unprincipled or unjust can well be imagined."

After publishing the "first charge" in the libel against Mr. Stark, and which charges him with the authorship of "certain anonymous pamphlets," the editor declares, that "*all* the other charges in the libel depended on it." (p. 13.) But this is not the fact. For any person, by referring to the libel, will find Mr. Stark charged with "slandering Mr. Webster in the Christian Magazine," and also with "lying" in denying the authorship of the "K. paper." These charges were as weighty as any in the libel; but they had no connection whatever with the "anonymous pamphlets."

But a still more fearful departure from truth immediately follows: "However incredible it may appear, this Synod found the libel proven in the absence of all testimony." (p. 13.) This is repeated, (same p.) "The Synod convicted him in the absence of all testimony." Again (same p.) "The Synod did in effect suspend Mr. Stark—for offences which they had not even attempted to prove." And on page 19, we find it again repeated: "The Synod found it [the libel] proven without any evidence." On this *outrageous conduct*, the Remarker, his moral sensibilities being deeply wounded, thus comments:—"Surely the court that could do this must have been given up to the most fearful infatuation;" and such conduct he pronounces "an outrage on all decency, and perfect mockery of all that men regard as sacred and holy." Some of our readers may now be ready to say, surely this charge against the Synod which is so often repeated, and on which the Reverend Remarker thus feelingly moralizes, must be based on solid truth. This, however, is far from being the case. The charge is utterly groundless. The Synod committed no such "outrage" as that alleged. This is manifest from the following extract taken from the published minutes of that Court:—"Proceeded with the business left unfinished in the forenoon sitting, viz: the libel against Mr. Stark, Mr. Clokey in the chair. The proof of the 1st charge in the libel, viz: 'writing and publishing pamphlets and letters of a mendacious, calumnious, and ribaldish character' was produced, viz: the recorded testimony of the Rev. P. Bullions, as taken by the Presbytery of Albany, on the trial of C. Webster, in presence of Mr. Stark. Also a note in the pamphlet, entitled 'The case of Dr. Bullions fairly stated, in corroboration of which the written testimony of the Rev. P. Campbell, and Messrs. John Law and Andrew Kirkpatrick, as taken in the case above mentioned, in the presence of Mr. Stark, was admitted and read as testimony.'" (Minutes of Synod for 1836, p. 34.)

Nor was the above all the *testimony* that was used on the trial of the libel in question: The "internal evidence" contained in the "pamphlets themselves" was exhibited to the court;—to establish the truth of a certain part of the libel, the testimony of Messrs. Irvine and Martin and Mrs. E. Wright, was also produced;—the "Christian Magazine" and a written admission of Mr. Stark proved another point in the libel;—and other points were proved by reference to the "minutes" of Synod, of the Commission at Salem, and of the Presbytery of Cambridge. And yet, the Editor of the *Associate Presbyterian Magazine* bewails the "infatuation" of the Synod in "finding the libel proven in the absence of all testimony!" The reader will now be able to judge

for himself, how much credit is due to the oft repeated assertions of the Magazine; and also, whether the editor's *comment* on the Synod's conduct, as quoted above, might not be used very appropriately to illustrate the character and import of his own conduct. But we forbear.

Passing over some other misstatements, we will now proceed to notice what is said in the Magazine respecting the late decision of Synod in "the case of the Albany Presbytery." But that the reader may have a better understanding of the subject, it must be premised, that shortly before the meeting of Synod in 1836, Mr. Stark sent in a paper to the Presbytery in which he absolutely refused to be tried by the Presbytery on the libel mentioned above, and protested against the Presbytery's "interfering with him in any way;" but after the Synod of 1837 had removed the suspension under which the Synod of 1836 had laid him, in order to a "review of that deed," he attended a meeting of Presbytery and claimed his seat; but was refused, for this reason, among others, that he had declined the authority of the Presbytery; and also when asked to withdraw his paper of declinature he refused to do it. Against the decision of Presbytery refusing Mr. Stark a seat, he together with Messrs. Bullions and Blair protested and appealed to the next meeting of Synod, and subsequently gave in their reasons of protest, which were answered by a committee.

But about a month before the meeting of the Synod to which they had appealed, the protestors did by management, and in the absence of the other ministerial members, thrust Mr. Stark into the seat from which he had been excluded. This, with the accompanying circumstances, occasioned that division in the Presbytery, with which all our readers, it is presumed, are more or less acquainted. At the last meeting of Synod, then, the question came up for consideration, which of these divisions should be regarded and held as the Associate Presbytery of Albany? And this question was finally decided in the words following, viz:

"Whereas it appears that Mr. Stark had been justly excluded from a seat in the Associate Presbytery of Albany, on the ground of his having declined their authority, which declinature he had also refused to withdraw; whereas the protestors against his exclusion, by withdrawing their protest, left his exclusion confirmed; and they had no right to review or reverse the deed of Presbytery; and whereas Mr. Stark's illegal admission to a seat vitiated all their proceedings: Therefore

*Resolved*, That the party of which he was a member is not the Associate Presbytery of Albany, but was irregular in their constitution and all their acts null and void.

"And whereas Dr. P. Bullions was under process for scandal, he had no right to accuse; and therefore the decision excluding from seats in the Associate Presbytery of Albany, Messrs. Martin and Campbell is null and void: Therefore

*Resolved*, That the body, of which Messrs. Martin & Campbell are members, is truly the Associate Presbytery of Albany."

In relation to the above decision the Remarker observes:—"The first and principal ground on which this decision rests is, that Mr. Stark had declined the authority of the Presbytery of Albany, and which declinature he had also refused to withdraw," and then adds, that "both of those statements are untrue." He begins with the former, and denies that "Mr. Stark had declined the authority of the Presbytery of Albany," adding:—"The paper dated 12th May, 1836, which he gave into that Presbytery was not a declinature."

This paper was published by the Presbytery of Albany in their "Narrative"; and every person who has read it can form his own opinion whether it was a declination or not. The following are a few extracts from it:—"I hereby give notice that I protest against their [the Presbytery's] interfering with me in any way, and that I shall hold as null and void and of no account whatever decisions they may make."—"The conduct of the Presbytery in the matter of Mr. Webster's trial, was such as necessarily to destroy their character for disinterestedness, impartiality and fair dealing."—"To me it appears quite evident that a court that could do this, could not act on the principles of truth and righteousness, and it would be perfectly idle to expect justice from it. If I were as innocent as my master himself, I could expect nothing else than to be condemned by such a court, provided it might suit its policy. Therefore a trial before such a court is, in my humble opinion, a very needless formality."—"I cannot honor the Presbytery so far as to be tried by them, till the Rev. Messrs. Campbell and Martin, James Geery, John Duncan, Mrs. Wright and Dr. Buckham, and all the others concerned, shall be brought to trial, and be made either to retract or establish their slanders, [the things they stated under oath.]"—"This fact alone, is, in my opinion, quite sufficient to destroy my confidence in the Presbytery."—"When church courts depart so far from the course of duty, they lose all just claim to that respect, to which otherwise they are entitled." Of such bearing and tenor is the whole paper, which winds up after the fashion of a genuine declination; the writer charging the Presbytery with a *departure* from the principles of the Associate Church, and declaring his intention not to follow them. His words are: "For my own part I intend firmly to adhere to these principles [of the Associate Church] and resolutely to oppose every departure from them, and therefore, I cannot in *any way* countenance the Presbytery in a course of backsliding, which if sanctioned must destroy the principles and discipline of the church. ANDREW STARK."

This paper was accompanied with no appeal to the Synod, or notice of his transferring his cause to that court for trial, as is usual in all cases of allowable declinations, where some special reasons exist for the removal of causes from the lower to the superior court. Let this fact be borne in mind, and we may safely appeal to the candor of every enlightened person, if the above paper be not a real declination of the authority of the Presbytery of Albany?

But the Remarker says, "Mr. Stark always denied that the paper in question was a declination." (p. 12.) Let Mr. Stark's own words on the subject be heard, and it will be seen that he *did* regard that paper, if not in form at least in fact, to be a declination. In his published Letter to his congregation, shortly after the paper in question was written, he says:—"I thought I could no longer place any confidence in them, (the Presbytery.) Accordingly, when they cited me to attend the meeting at which they said they were to try their libel, I gave them notice that I could not countenance them in *any way* till their own conduct should be investigated." Why then did he come back to the Presbytery, asking a seat, before their conduct was investigated? But again, in that strange communication, which he addressed to the Synod of 1836, (a sentence from which was commented on at the late meeting of Synod,) and which bears palpable marks of its being intended as a *finale* he thus writes:—"The subscriber, therefore, petitions and requests from Synod, as a matter of common justice, that it direct the Presbyte-

ry of Albany to take cognizance of the slanderous assertions [the oaths] of the Rev. Messrs. Campbell and Martin, and also of Messrs. Geery and Duncan, Mrs. Wright, Dr. Buckham, and of all the other persons under their jurisdiction who are chargeable with having committed the same offence—that these persons may be called upon either to retract or to prove their assertions, [the things which they testified as witnesses under the solemnity of an oath,] that by so doing *confidence* in the Presbytery may in some measure be *restored*; and then the subscriber will hold himself ready to yield that court all due honor and obedience.” The testimony of the witnesses here named bore very hard on the ministerial and moral character of Mr. Stark and in the opinion of many entirely destroyed it; but the way he takes to evade that testimony is to charge the *witnesses* with *slandering* him, and even to demand that they be called on either to *retract* their *testimony* or to *prove* it by other witnesses! And when the witnesses are made to do this, he will honor and obey the Presbytery as in duty bound! The reader, then, will perceive in this extract a distinct admission, that Mr. Stark had *ceased to yield obedience to the Presbytery*, or what is the same thing, had declined their authority, *aye and until* a certain *impossible* condition was performed: and he very plainly declares, what is likely to prove true, that not till “THEN would he hold himself ready to yield that court all due honor and obedience.” How perfectly absurd, then, is it to represent Mr. Stark as *always denying* that he had declined the authority of the Presbytery. Are the above declarations at all consistent with an acknowledgment of submission to their authority?

We only add here, that the communication just quoted from, was by order of Synod sent down to the Presbytery—in connection with the paper of Declinature, and certain Reasons of Protest relating to another matter, that Mr. Stark might be called to account for the same. This communication is now in our hands, and on examination we find that it winds up with a pretty distinct hint to the Synod, that if they did not take good care, Mr. Stark might decline their authority also:—“The conclusion to which he [the subscriber] has come, after fully considering the matter, is neither to abandon the *profession of religion* which he has made, nor yet to *submit to acts of oppression, tyranny and injustice*, which are alike inconsistent with truth and righteousness and with the whole tenor of our religious profession. *Andrew Stark, New-York, 20 May, 1836.*”

But the Remarker next states, that “the Presbytery did not regard Mr. Stark’s letter as a declinature,” otherwise “they would have dealt with him” about it and “deprived him of a seat.” (p. 19.) This reasoning is very inconclusive, because Mr. Stark was not present at the time *to be dealt with* and to be deprived of his seat. However, the very first time that he afterwards made his appearance in Presbytery, that court did deal with him and deprive him of a seat. But let us consider this point a little more fully. At the meeting of Synod in 1836, the Presbytery was highly blamed, in the remarks of members, especially those who took an active part in Mr. Stark’s favor, because they had not suspended him for having declined their authority in the aforesaid letter. Messrs. Heron and Brown will remember this. But the Presbytery did not attempt to justify their conduct on the ground that Mr. S. had *not* declined their authority, but on the ground of “the peculiar circumstances,” in which they were placed, and also because it was thought *safer* to be found on the side of lenity. Though they have

since seen and acknowledged that their lenity on that and some other occasions was sinful, and for which they, as a Presbytery, have received severe chastisement in the dealings of Divine Providence. It is true, that the Presbytery, as such, did not on the reception of the paper in question, make any *formal* decision that it was a declinature; but it is not true that the members did not consider it in that light. However, it was not long afterwards, that they published, as a Presbytery, their judgment concerning it, in the following terms:—"This paper, though not in form, was yet virtually a declinature of the authority and communion of the Associate Presbytery of Albany. This consideration, together with the fact that it abounded in vituperative and slanderous assertions and insinuations, would have justified the Presbytery in suspending him *instanter*.—But knowing the prejudices they had to contend against, and being desirous of exercising as much lenity and forbearance, as was consistent with duty to the Head of the Church, they were willing to waive the exercise of their own powers, to overlook his contumacy, to brook, *for the time being*, his insulting and contemptuous language, and refer the libel entirely to the adjudication of the Associate Synod." [See *Narrative*, pp. 13, 14.]

The Remarker next states, that, "even the Synod of 1836, which consisted chiefly of the libelling party, did not consider Mr. Stark's paper to be a declinature." (p. 19.) This is the very opposite of the truth. That Synod *did* consider Mr. Stark's paper to be a declinature: For on Saturday, May 28, 1836, they adopted a minute containing these words:—"To this course, [accepting the reference of the libel from the Presbytery of Albany,] Mr. Stark himself can make no reasonable objection. *Having declined the authority of the Presbytery*, there could be no other court but the Synod to try him." (See *Minutes*, p. 29.)

The Remarker thinks that Mr. Stark's admission to a seat in Synod on "Tuesday, May 31," and without any objection from the Presbytery of Albany settles the matter. But surely his admission to a seat in Synod, three days after the adoption of the above minute, could not be a reversal of the decision then made. Nor could his taking his seat without any objection from his Presbytery be considered as any evidence that he had not declined their authority; especially when it is recollected, that his taking his seat was in pursuance of a *notice* served on him *by order*, that his trial was appointed to take place that day; and also that he retained his seat only about the space of two hours; for when he found that the Synod could not be baffled by him to put off the trial till the next year, he withdrew and afterwards sent in a paper declining their authority also. (See *minutes*, pp. 25, 40.)

How much truth the above statement of the Magazine contains in another respect, when it represents the Synod of 1836 as "consisting chiefly of the libelling party," may be learned from the fact, that the "libelling party" was composed wholly and exclusively of members of the Presbytery of Albany. And from what has now been made to appear, the reader is left to say how much truth is contained in the following assertion. (p. 20.) "These statements, [respecting the declinature] are fully confirmed in every particular by the *Minutes of Synod*"!!!

We have thus examined the several reasons adduced by the Remarker to establish his position, that "Mr. Stark had not," as the Synod allege in their decision, "declined the authority of the Presbytery of Albany," and they are found to be utterly groundless. We are pained, indeed, to think, that reasons, so false in fact, should lead the Remark-

er to draw such a *sweeping* conclusion, expressed in such indecorous terms as the following: "The assertion made in this preamble, [which the Synod adopted] therefore, that Mr. Stark had declined the authority of the Presbytery of Albany, is a *sheer fiction*, is *entirely fallacious and deceptive*." (p. 20.)

But after all, it is a matter of little consequence, whether Mr. Stark's paper be denominated a *declinature* or not. The paper speaks for itself. And the main question is, could the Presbytery admit Mr. Stark to a seat as long as that paper, call it what you please, lay on their table? To say nothing about a *declining* of the Presbytery's *authority*, was it *consistent* for them, was it *right* to admit a person to Presbyterial fellowship with them, who had charged them, in the paper referred to, with the most villainous conduct, and some of them even with *perjury*? Let the reader turn back and examine the extracts before given from the said paper, and then let him answer, whether the Presbytery did not act most justly and scripturally in refusing the writer a seat with them in their deliberations, and especially as he refused to withdraw an instrument which was so well calculated to interrupt and mar any thing like brotherly love and christian fellowship between him and his brethren?

But it is pretended that the Presbytery had nothing to do with that paper, and that it was an act of *insubordination* in them to refuse Mr. Stark a seat on the ground of it, inasmuch as the Synod of 1837 by removing his suspension left him precisely where he stood "on 31st May, 1836, before the Synod began to try the libel against him." (pp. 14. 19.) It is fully admitted, and the Presbytery never thought of denying it, that the removal of the sentence of suspension did leave Mr. Stark where he was the day on which the Synod of 1836 commenced the trial of the libel against him. But where did he then stand? The Synod had on the preceding Saturday decided that he had declined the authority of the Presbytery of Albany, and had, in accordance with the reservation made by said Presbytery, transmitted to them the paper containing that declinature, together with two other papers, viz: certain Reasons of Protest, and a communication to the Synod itself, which we have before noticed. Thus the Presbytery had in their hands, "before the Synod began to try the libel against Mr. Stark," three different papers which were deemed actionable, and had also authority from the Synod "to deal with him respecting them." (*Minutes of Synod*, p. 32.) Was it not the duty of the Presbytery then, to *deal* with Mr. Stark for his paper of declinature, the very first opportunity? And how, we demand, could they be chargeable with "insubordination to Synod," in calling up that paper, when in fact they were acting in obedience to an injunction of the Synod? We do maintain, therefore, that the Remarker's charge against the Presbytery of "insubordination to Synod," is wholly devoid of truth, and can be made for no other purpose than to stigmatize the innocent with the same crime for which he himself stands branded before the community. On the whole, then, we feel perfectly safe, in leaving it to any man of common sense, who understands the matter, to say, whether the Presbytery did not act both dutifully and righteously in refusing Mr. Stark a seat on the ground of his paper of declinature; and especially as he refused to withdraw that paper?

That Mr. Stark refused to withdraw his declinature is also asserted in the preamble, which the Synod adopted, as containing the leading

grounds of its decision in the case of the Albany Presbytery; but the Remarker states, that this is not true. His words are:—"It is equally untrue that Mr. Stark refused to withdraw this fictitious declinature. In fact the Presbytery never required him to withdraw any declinature." And is it indeed *untrue* that Mr. Stark refused to withdraw his declinature? All who were present at last Synod cannot fail to remember, that it was distinctly admitted on all hands, that two members of the Presbytery (their names were mentioned, Messrs. Graham and Martin,) did ask Mr. Stark to take back the offensive paper containing his declinature, but that he refused to do it. And it will also be remembered, that this refusal was, by Rev. H. H. Blair justified on the ground that Mr. Stark had not been *Presbyterially* requested to withdraw his paper, that is, as he explained it, the Moderator, who was himself, had not formally presented the request to Mr. Stark. But all who know any thing about deliberative bodies, know that questions put by members to one another, are supposed to be put through the presiding officer. If the presiding officer does not arrest such questions, it is taken for granted that they have his sanction. Our own impression however is, that the Moderator, on the occasion spoken of, did reiterate the request, started first by Mr. Graham and afterwards renewed by Mr. Martin. But it is immaterial whether he did or not. It is sufficient that he and the other members all acquiesced in it. And even on the supposition that they did not, the fact that one or two of the brethren desired the withdrawal of the offensive paper, rendered it obligatory on Mr. Stark, if he were come claiming a seat in good faith and with the christian desire of cultivating peace and harmony in the Presqytery, to take back the obnoxious document, which, on account of its "cruel, unjust and slanderous statements," must continue to irritate the feelings and turn from him the countenance of his brethren. Accordingly, his refusal to withdraw the paper in question, even in this view of the case, not only justified the Presbytery in refusing him a seat, but is also sufficient to justify the Synod in the assertion made in their preamble. Now all this was well known to the Remarker and yet he deliberately tells us that the Synod has voted what was *untrue*, when it voted that Mr. Stark *refused* to withdraw his declinature. In bringing such a charge against the Synod, the Remarker has, we think most wantonly violated the truth. For it is a mere quibble and worse than a quibble to say, that "the *Presbytery* never required Mr. S. to withdraw any declinature."

But what is more suprising still, is the representation that the declinature was not assigned as a reason for Mr. Stark's exclusion from a seat in Presbytery and was not even thought of at that time. The Magazine says:—"For this course of proceeding the Presbytery did not assign any reason. But they have since asserted *untruly*, that they excluded Mr. Stark because he had declined the authority of the Presbytery and still refused to withdraw his declension." (p. 14.) Again, "The Presbytery, as will be seen by their own minutes inserted above, merely decided that Mr. Stark had no right to a seat, in direct opposition to a decision of Synod declaring that he had a right to a seat. When they found it might be difficult to justify their conduct, it would seem that somebody helped them out of their embarrassment, by contriving the story of the declinature." (p. 20.) It is not usual for church courts to embody in their minutes, the reasons of their votes. It is a rare thing indeed, if ever done, for them to record their reasons for *rejecting* a motion. But as the rejection of the motion, by Dr. P. Bullions, to "put

Mr. Stark's name on the roll," was *protested against*, the Presbytery recorded and sent up the reasons of their vote to Synod in their Presbyterial Report, where this affair of the declinature will be seen to be mentioned as once.

But the editor of the Magazine *knows*, that the "declinature" was mentioned on the floor of Presbytery as a reason for Mr. Stark's exclusion; he knows that it occasioned a long debate; he knows that we read certain portions of Mr. Stark's paper and commented on them, in order to show, in opposition to the position he took, that it *was* a declinature; he knows that Mr. Smart took the ground, that to admit Mr. Stark, with that paper lying between him and the Presbytery, would be to destroy presbyterial parity, and that for his part he would sit with no man there except he came as an equal; and he also knows that when he stated that Presbytery could only call Mr. Stark to account, according to their own reserve, for "the offensive matter" contained in that paper, Mr. Smart replied that Mr. Stark's *declining the authority of the Presbytery*, in that paper, was "offensive matter," and for that the Presbytery had the right, in virtue of their own reserve as sanctioned by Synod, to call him to account. Does the Doctor then publish the truth, when he says that "the story of the declinature was contrived by somebody afterwards, to help the Presbytery out of their embarrassment?" But if any doubt yet remains as to the Doctor's *veracity* in this matter, it will be completely removed by the following extract from his Reasons of Protest, which were written within ten days after the meeting of that Presbytery: "The ground," says he, "taken by some members of Presbytery, who voted with the majority, viz: that *Mr. Stark formerly declined the authority of Presbytery*, is wholly untenable in support of this decision." What will the reader now think of the "story of the declinature's being *contrived* by somebody afterwards, to help the Presbytery out of their embarrassment"! But besides all this, the editor, as if conscience-struck for doing such open violence to the truth, faintly concedes in a foot-note, that *something* was said by *somebody*, on that occasion, respecting the declinature; but in making this concession, which directly contradicts what is stated in the text, he commits as great an offence against the truth as any thing we have noticed. His words are: "A member of Presbytery, indeed, on that occasion, remarked, that if Mr. Stark would withdraw his declinature and submit to any thing the Presbytery might do, without appealing to Synod, he would be for admitting him to a seat." (p. 20, note.) A statement so absurd and barefacedly untrue needs no refutation.

The Remarker's conclusion in relation to the Synod's decision respecting the declinature is drawn in these characteristic terms: "This decision of Synod, then, so far as it relates to Mr. Stark, rests wholly on misrepresentation and falsehood." (p. 20.) But from what has now been made to appear, we leave it to the reader to say, whether this conclusion does not *rest* where its author, by a usual mistake, has put to rest the Synod's decision?

Respecting another item in the Synod's decision, the Remarker *gravely* says: "The late Synod, it seems, has given as its opinion, that if a Presbytery once make an unlawful decision, it has no right to review or reverse it." (p. 21.) The Doctor's warrant for making this strange inference, is simply the statement made in the preamble adopted by the Synod, that the "*protesters* had no right to review or reverse the deed of Presbytery," against which they had protested. And who ever,

save Messrs Blair, Stark and Bullions, supposed they had? If protesters can club together in the absence of the members against whose presbyterial deed they had protested, and reverse, *ad libitum*, the said deed, there is an end put at once to the presbyterian subordination of church courts. Indeed, if *protesters* can review and reverse presbyterial deeds, then, *minorities* must govern, and the practice of prosecuting appeals before a higher court must be a "useless ceremony." But how any person of sane mind could wring from this decision of Synod, the inference, that that court "had given as its opinion, that if a *Presbytery* once make an unlawful decision, it has no right to review or reverse it," is a question which necessarily involves a very unpleasant thought. Doubtless there is some moral perversity at work at the bottom of all this studied system of misrepresentation and calumny.

But to proceed. On pages 21 and 22 there is a *note*, in small letter, covering nearly a page and a half of the Magazine, the object of which is to render the Synod as ridiculous and contemptible as possible, by a bold stroke at caricature and lampoonry. But the whole tirade is built on two most glaring perversions of facts. The Synod is represented as being in a great "dilemma." "It must be decided, on the one hand, that the admission of Mr. Stark vitiated the constitution and proceedings of the Presbytery of Albany, and yet, the illegal exclusion of three members must not vitiate the Presbytery of Cambridge." This was the puzzle! And how was the Synod to surmount the difficulty? One proposed one thing and another another; but the difficulty still remained; till at length Mr. Martin stepped forth with his "sugar and arsenic argument," and lo! "what a mountain was removed by the very statement of this clear and convincing argument—the whole difficulty vanished in a moment," &c. &c. Now the whole *sport* of this representation is spoiled by the simple fact that the "sugar and arsenic argument" was not introduced till *four days* after the time the Synod is represented to have been in this wonderful dilemma! Mr. M. as a party concerned was not allowed to take any part in the Synod's discussion of the affair of the Albany Presbytery, which affair was brought to a close on *Saturday*, and it was not till the *Wednesday* following, on the trial of Dr. A. Bullions' case, that the "argument," or rather illustration, referred to, was employed. But the other falsehood on which this *funny* picture rests, is the allegation that "three members of Cambridge Presbytery had been *illegally* excluded from seats in that court." At the time fixed for the "dilemma" it was not known in Synod, that three members had been excluded from seats in the Presbytery of Cambridge. The papers referring to that Presbytery's matters had not then been read. Consequently there was no room for the "dilemma" spoken of. Besides it is not true that those "three members were illegally excluded," and yet this was also necessary in order to the existence of the "dilemma." But the Synod has not yet decided that their exclusion was *illegal*, and never can, without either altering or acting in violation of our Books of Discipline. But we have dwelt perhaps too long on this silly caricature. And yet it may be useful, as it will show to all who have a just perception of moral principles, that the person who can utter the most palpable untruths, for the sake of making a *laugh* at the expense of the reputation of a church court, would not be very likely to hesitate about uttering an untruth for his own supposed benefit, or for the real injury of those whom he denounces as his "persecutors." It will help also to show how much weight can be attached to

any of the statements contained in the Magazine which we are reviewing.

The second preamble in the decision of Synod, as given on a preceding page, is also converted by the Remarker into a theme on which to display the capacities of his mind for wit, misrepresentation and caricature. The Synod say: "Whereas Dr. P. Bullions was under process for scandal, he had no right to accuse, and therefore the decision excluding from seats in the Associate Presbytery of Albany, Messrs. Martin and Campbell, is null and void." The Remarker, after exhausting his wit on this resolution, says: "It was incumbent on the Synod to prove, that Dr. P. Bullions had actually brought some accusation against one or all of those members who retired from the Presbytery, and in consequence of which they were excluded from their seats. This is *most distinctly and unequivocally denied.*" (p. 23.) The Synod had before them the evidence that Dr. Bullions was under process for scandal. There was also before them the Doctor's resolution for the exclusion of Messrs. Campbell, Martin, and their elders, from seats in Presbytery, in which he accused them of "insubordination to Synod," in not having voted in favor of his *motion* to have "Mr. Stark's name put on the roll." It appeared before Synod, that just as those individuals, who affected to be acting as the Presbytery of Albany, were about to vote the said resolution for the exclusion of the brethren named, those brethren denied their authority and withdrew. And it also appeared to Synod, from the pretended presbytery's own journals of its own proceedings, that when the Dr. thought he had found a better ground of accusation against his brethren, he withdrew his resolution in which he only accused them of "insubordination to Synod," and had another substituted in its place, in which they were accused of the high crime of insubordination to him and his fellows, in having denied their authority as a lawful Presbytery. Although, indeed, it was not *expressed* in the minute which was read, that Dr. Bullions framed the *substitute*, yet there is reason to believe it was his production; as Mr. Stark would hardly be so *impolite* as to take the business out of his hands, which he had so auspiciously begun. But whether he prepared this second resolution, or not, is immaterial; since his withdrawal of the former to give place to it was equivalent to his adoption of it, according to a rule of parliamentary procedure. Hence the exclusion of Messrs. Campbell and Martin was properly declared to be "null and void," inasmuch as it was effected, so far as the Synod could judge, in "consequence" of a person under process for scandal being allowed to stand up as the accuser of his brethren. Indeed, all who have any correct knowledge of this affair, know, that had it not been for Dr. P. Bullions, the Presbytery of Albany would not have been brought, at that time, into such a disgraceful position;—that had it not been for him, the *protesters*, and therefore the *minority*, would never have thought of assuming the name and powers of the *majority*.

Again, the Synod's decision is thought to be "illegal," by the Remarker, because certain brethren were prevented from saying all they wished to say, by a call for the "previous question." "This," says he, "is supposed to be the first time, that this expedient was ever resorted to in judicial proceedings, and a decision made as a party measure, which ought therefore to be disregarded, as entirely illegal." (p. 24.) The truth is, this matter had been under consideration between two and three days, to the entire exclusion of all other business; members had

become wearied in listening to long speeches, which seemed to answer no other purpose than to kill time; all the members had had an opportunity of expressing their minds on the case, as the roll was called through from beginning to end; many considered that time had already been sinfully wasted, that no new light was to be expected, that there was a disposition manifested in a certain quarter, to speak against time, and that there was much urgent business remaining to be transacted; hence, when the "previous question" was called for, the Synod sustained the call. But to say, that this was "the first time that this expedient was ever resorted to in judicial proceedings," is saying what almost every body, who has any knowledge of such proceedings, knows to be untrue. And the Remarker well knew, at the very time he was bringing this complaint against the Synod, that at its previous meeting in Pittsburgh, his own party resorted more than once to the same expedient, and that too in "proceedings" equally "judicial"! Persons, however, must be hard pressed for reasons, when they are forced to bring up this for one to prove the illegality of the Synod's decision, and to justify their own rebellion.

And equally futile and groundless is the other reason mentioned on page 25, viz: That there was a number voted in the case, who were "more or less concerned in Mr. Webster's pamphlet, who were evidently parties, and could have no right to vote in making this decision." And what had Mr. Webster's pamphlet to do with the matter then before the Synod? This pamphlet seems to be haunting the imaginations of some people to this late hour. What a wonderful pamphlet that must be, the production of which called forth into exercise and gave employment to such a large proportion of the heads and hands appertaining to the Associate Synod! For besides the members of the Albany Presbytery, who were excluded from voting in the case, "there were a number of others concerned in it." Surely there must be some truth, one is almost tempted to think, in a thing which was the "conjunct" production of so many ministers and professors of Theology, and which ceases not to be continually dancing before the vision of the "persecuted party"! We find the Magazine, after it has reached the respectable age of No. 5, still thrown into *spasms* and foaming at the mouth on account of that terrible and convulsing pamphlet! But supposing there was a number concerned in Mr. Webster's pamphlet, which we have before shown to be a wanton calumny, how could this disqualify them for voting in the case of the Albany Presbytery, a case wholly disconnected with Mr. Webster and his pamphlet too? Not being deeply versed in *poetic lore* and therefore having no *stanza* at command to grace in a proper manner this profound argument, with the Dr.'s permission, we will use the one which he himself has furnished us: (p. 23.)

"As Solon said to one in judgment weak,

I thought thee wise until I heard thee speak."

Is it any wonder, then, after advancing such *true and weighty* reasons to convict the Synod's decision of illegality, the Dr. should trumpet forth his conclusion in the following *chaste and classic* style? "From all these reasons, it must be **ABUNDANTLY** manifest, that this decision of Synod is an outrage on all decency, a violation of the most sacred principles of justice, and a most daring attempt to impose upon the credulity of the public." (p. 25.) But the Remarker had come to the same *charitable* conclusion before, but expressed, in somewhat different words:

"It is, indeed, but too manifest, that these two resolutions of the Rev. Synod, finding the decision in question 'null and void,' and Messrs. Martin, Campbell, and Milmine to be 'truly the Associate Presbytery of Albany,' are mere gratuitous assertions, which can impose only upon the ignorant." (p. 23.) We have quoted this last sentence merely to let our readers have another specimen of the Remarker's facility in perverting the truth. The Synod never decided that "Messrs. Martin, Campbell and Milmine, were truly the Associate Presbytery of Albany." And yet this is repeated in the Magazine time after time in order to answer a purpose. Let the reader turn back to the Synod's decision and he will find, it is the "*body*" of which Messrs. Martin and Campbell are "members," that is declared to be "the Associate Presbytery of Albany." Nothing is said about Mr. Milmine. The Remarker's object, in this gross perversion, is to create the belief that it was a *minority* of the members of the Albany Presbytery that Synod declared to be the true Presbytery. But this was not the case. For at the time the decision was made the following ministers belonged to the "*body*" spoken of: Messrs. Laing, Campbell, Martin, Graham and Defreest; while connected with the other party there were only Messrs. Stark, Bullions and Blair; and the first of these being under a sentence of exclusion, had no right to act as a presbyter, and the second being under process for scandal had surely no right to accuse his judges, with the view to their expulsion from the court. Besides it may be proper to state, that the Remarker has carefully concealed the fact, though knowing it, that Mr. Robert Martin, elder from Albany, was present and co-operated with Messrs. Campbell, Martin and Milmine, in constituting the true Presbytery of Albany after the division so often alluded to took place. Hence the Remarker had as good reason for mentioning *his* name as that of Mr. Milmine in the sentence above quoted, but this would have been approximating too nearly to the truth to have answered the purpose intended.

After what has been made to appear, it will be unnecessary for us to enter on any more particular defence of the Synod's decision respecting the case of the Albany Presbytery. We have examined all the reasons the Remarker has adduced in opposition to the correctness of that decision, and have found them to be entirely false and groundless. It may, therefore, be fairly inferred, that the decision in question is in accordance with truth and righteousness. But if the reader be desirous of more light on the subject, we refer him to the plain and conclusive argument written by A TRANSYLVANIAN, and published in the January number of the Monitor, in justification of the Synod's decision in this case.

This decision of the Synod was followed by another, suspending the members composing the pretended Presbytery from the exercise of their office and from the communion of the church, which deed of suspension was chiefly founded on their declinature of the Synod's authority. Respecting this latter decision the Remarker says very little, but seems to think it hard, that the Synod should inflict this censure after the subjects of it had withdrawn, forgetting how he and his associates had treated Messrs. Campbell and Martin for only a *supposed* offence of a similar nature; which, to use his own words, "could have no other effect than to show the spirit and temper of the [pretended] court, and to expose it to derision." The Synod's decision of which we are now speaking is contained in the following preamble and resolution:

"Whereas, the conduct of Messrs. H. H. Blair, P. Bullions, D. D. and A. Stark, ministers, condemned in the resolution passed by Synod on Saturday, is not only irregular, but sinful and distracting to the church: And whereas, the paper of the said ministers, together with Messrs. John Edwards, Robert Crookshanks and John A. Gilmore, which purports to be some of their reasons of protest, and also their declinature given in this afternoon, offer a contemptuous opposition to the authority of this Synod: Therefore, *Resolved*, That said ministers and elders be suspended from the exercise of their offices and the communion of the church, and that they be referred to the Presbytery of Albany for the ultimate issuing of their case, either by returning to submission to the authority of the church, or by the infliction of her higher censures."

This sentence is said by the Remarker to have been "prepared by Rev. J. P. Miller." (p. 27.) But this is only a part of the truth, the other part would not bear telling so well. The motion for censuring these brethren was introduced by another person. While it was under discussion, Dr. Bruce suggested that it would not do to suspend them and then leave them, but that they should be referred back to the Presbytery of Albany for further dealing. Whereupon he and Mr. Miller were appointed a committee to draw up a resolution containing this suggestion. And we are authorized to state that Mr. Miller, as scribe, framed the preamble and resolution according to the dictation of the chairman, Dr. B., even to the "concluding sentence," of which the Remarker complains as being "more doubtful than any thing he ever remembers to have seen." (p. 28.) But it may be proper to add, that there can be no *doubt* about the meaning of that "concluding sentence," with any who are acquainted with matters of church discipline; nor is there any "doubt" about it in the mind of the Remarker himself.

The Remarker attempts to impress the public with the belief that two of the elders, whose names are mentioned in the above preamble, were unjustly censured, as they had no knowledge of "the offence laid to their charge, having left Philadelphia nearly two days before the paper was drawn up for which they had been excommunicated." (p. 28.) Now, the "protestation" given in on Saturday was subscribed by all these ministers and elders; on Monday morning the "Reasons of Protest" were handed in, signed by "H. H. Blair, Moderator, and Andrew Stark, Presbytery Clerk," and in the afternoon the "Declinature," signed after the same manner. Inasmuch, therefore, as the "protestation" was signed by the elders in question, the Synod had no reason to believe, that the subsequent papers signed only by the *official gentlemen*, had not been signed in good faith in behalf of the whole fraternity. If those *officials* had no authority for signing in behalf of their brethren, they should have told the Synod so. This surely was the course honesty would dictate. If the two elders referred to, therefore, have sustained any injury at the hand of Synod, they must blame those who pretended to act in their name in their absence, and also themselves for having been caught in bad company. But subsequent events have shown, that the two elders have not considered themselves unjustly dealt with by the *sentence* in which they were involved: For if they had, the evil could speedily have been remedied by their application to the Presbytery to which Synod referred them for further dealing. Let every candid mind, therefore, judge whether the Remarker's language in relation to this particular, be not something more than *hyperbolic*,

when he says :—"The whole matter would be only ridiculous, were it not for the impiety and inconsistency of men professing to act in the name of the Prince of peace, while they thus recklessly thunder out their anathemas, like 'a madman who casteth firebrands, arrows and death.'"<sup>\*</sup> (p. 28.)

We have now reviewed all the misstatements and perversions of facts, which we consider worthy of special notice, as contained in the first number of the Magazine; not that we have by any means exhausted the subject, as perhaps we have not animadverted on a *tithe* of the objectionable matter that presented itself; but our expose of the more fundamental and mischievous falsehoods, will, we hope, render all the rest comparatively harmless. It was our intention when we began, to proceed regularly through each succeeding number of the Magazine, and in like manner detect and expose its misstatements, but this we find would be almost an endless task, and therefore we will forbear. And, indeed, it is not very necessary to notice the assertions of the Remarker in those numbers in which he misrepresents the proceedings had in the cases of Dr. A. Bullions and Mr. Stalker, for the Documentary History lately published by a committee of the Presbytery of Cambridge, is every way sufficient to guard the cause of truth, order and righteousness on those points. Besides, it is a very disagreeable task, at least to us, to be thus exposing the obliquity of a man who claims to be regarded as a minister of the gospel. We have, also, frequently thought, since we began this review, of the advice, which a venerable elder of our church at the west gave us in relation to this Magazine, viz: *not to dirty our fingers with the dirty thing*; which advice we should most certainly have followed, feeling its force. had not a combination of circumstances imperiously demanded this disagreeable service at our hands.

As a *finish*, then, to that part of our work which consists in pointing out and refuting false statements and misrepresentations, we will notice, in order to show that the Remarker has not yet overcome his dread of Mr. Webster's pamphlet, nor his propensity to misrepresent facts, the following statement which occurs in a *note* to page 138, No. 5.†—  
 "Mr. Webster was charged with having slandered Mr. Stark, by publishing him to the world as having 'left his congregation in Shields without leave or license.'" Then follows an extract from the minutes of the Presbytery to which Mr. Stark belonged, setting forth that his pastoral relation to his congregation had been dissolved; to which the

<sup>\*</sup> The Remarker quotes but a part of the proverb; the whole of it runs thus:—"As a madman, who casteth firebrands, arrows and death; so is the man that deceiveth his neighbor, and saith, An not I in sport." (Prov. xxvii. 18, 19.) According to Matthew Henry, this Proverb admits of a far more appropriate application than that which the Remarker makes of it. Saith that Commentator:—"See here, How mischievous those are that make 'no conscience of deceiving their neighbors, they are as madmen that cast firebrands, arrows and death, so much hurt they do by their deceits; they value themselves upon it as politic cunning men, but really they are as madmen. There is not a greater madness in the world than a wilful sin. 'Tis not only the *passionate furious* man, but the *malicious deceitful* man, that is a *madman*; he doth in effect cast *firebrands, arrows and death* he doth more mischief than he can imagine. Fraud and falsehood burn like firebrands, kill, even at a distance, like *arrows*.—By lying and slandering in jest, men learn themselves and teach others to lie and slander in earnest; and a false report raised in *mirth*, may spread in *malice*; and if a man may tell a lie to make himself *merry*, why not to make himself *rich*, and so *truth quite perisheth*, and men *teach their tongues to tell lies*. (Jer. ix. 5.) If men would consider that a lie comes from the Devil and brings to hell-fire, sure that would spoil the *sport* of it; 'tis casting *arrows and death* to themselves."

† This No. 5. for *December*, perhaps, excels all its predecessors in its unbridled slander, and its reckless, determined, persevering and malicious perversion of facts. In this work of Satan, the editor has received a *new ally*, who shows himself to be well skilled in his vocation. But we have reasons for not at present exposing his name to the public.

Remarker adds—"Mr. W., by the testimony of Mr. Campbell, proved to the satisfaction of Presbytery, that Mr. Stark, who was loosed by a unanimous vote of Presbytery from the congregation of South Shields, left that congregation 'without leave or license.'" Now, in precisely the same way the Dr. might prove that he did not leave the congregation of South Argyle "without leave or license," for he can show from the minutes of the Presbytery of Cambridge, that his pastoral relation to that congregation has also been dissolved. But when? Some months after he left his congregation! From the papers laid before our Presbytery on the trial of Mr. W., it appeared, according to our best recollection, that as much as a whole year elapsed between the time of Mr. Stark's leaving his congregation and the dissolution of the pastoral relation. His Presbytery refused to dissolve that relation; the matter went before the General Associate Synod; that court ordered the Presbytery to proceed to dissolve the relation; the Presbytery then cited Mr. Stark to appear at their bar and answer to some charge they had against him before they could carry the Synod's order into execution; but Mr. Stark, as his manner is, refused to obey the citation and immediately embarked for this country; and *then* it seems the Presbytery was obliged to dissolve that pastoral relation! These are the facts in the case, as they were presented on Mr. W.'s trial, as nearly as we can remember. If we have not stated them accurately, our brethren who were present can inform us, and we shall be ready to make the necessary correction. And yet in the face of these facts the Remarker would have his readers believe that Mr. W., in the above instance, slandered Mr. S., and that the Presbytery of Albany not only "allowed him to justify his sin," but was very easily "satisfied in respect of testimony" offered in his defence.

Now let the reader remember, that all the foregoing deviations from truth, honesty and justice, which we have noticed, are to be found in a professed religious periodical, bearing on its title-page this heavenly motto:—*Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just.*

We will now proceed to notice a few of the many *inconsistencies*, (we designedly use a *soft* term) which contribute to give character to this "Associate Presbyterian Magazine."

And, indeed, the very name of the Magazine involves an inconsistency and deception. The editor and those immediately associated with him in originating and conducting this work, had declined the authority of the Associate Presbyterian Church, as exercised by her highest judicatory, and had, for their contumacy and other sinful conduct, been cast out of her communion, and yet they have denominated their periodical "*The Associate Presbyterian Magazine*," as if it were the advocate and organ of the Associate Presbyterian Church; when, in fact, it is only the mouth-piece of a small disaffected, disorganizing and schismatical faction. The name is, therefore, inconsistent, and appears to have been assumed, not for the purpose of defending, but of aspersing and lampooning the Associate Church, through her ministers and judicatories, and of imposing upon and misleading the ignorant and unwary.

It is also inconsistent for the originators of this Magazine to call themselves "the Associate Presbytery of Albany." There is a Presbytery of Albany in subordination to the General Assembly: there is an Associate Presbytery of Albany in subordination to the Associate

Synod: and the suspended brethren, it seems, also call themselves the "Associate Presbytery of Albany." But to whom are they subordinate? The Associate Synod, who has the power of erecting and dissolving Presbyteries, has refused to recognize them as a Presbytery—has expressly declared, that they were not "the Associate Presbytery of Albany." Now people may call themselves what they please; but certainly it is very inconsistent, nay, *childish*, for our suspended brethren to affect the name of the Synod's Presbytery of Albany, after all the hard things they say of both those courts. Do they intend it as a *mark of respect* to the Synod's Presbytery, that they call themselves after its name; or do they intend by this to practice a deception on the religious community?

From what has been made to appear in the preceding part of this review, it will be seen, how grossly inconsistent it is, if not profane, to use as a motto to the contents of such a Magazine, the text, *Whatever things are true; whatsoever things are honest; whatsoever things are just.* Did the editor intend to use this motto merely for the purpose of forming a striking *contrast* between the *outside* and the *inside* of his Magazine, he was happy in his choice. But if he intended by these "good words," (Rom. xvi. 18.) to deceive his readers as to the true character of the contents of his Magazine, *the Lord will not hold him guiltless.*

The Magazine very gravely charges upon the judicatories of the Associate Church, "the corrupt exercise of discipline." (p. 2.) Again, it says:—"A considerable party in the Associate Synod have adopted the most arbitrary and despotic principles in church policy." (p. 3.) These charges are made by men, who, professing to act as a judicatory, did, on the 18th April, 1838, undertake to *exercise discipline* on Messrs. Campbell and Martin, because they had at a former meeting been guilty of *voting* against a motion presented by Dr. P. Bullions in favor of admitting Mr. Stark to a seat in Presbytery! We leave the reader to muse on this *inconsistency* of the "persecuted" brethren.

In the midst of a highly inflammatory piece of declamation, the obvious design and tendency of which is to form a *party* in the church, to *alienate* brethren from one another, to *hurt* and *destroy* God's heritage, the editor breaks forth in the language of fervent prayer:—"O for the time, when there shall be 'nothing to hurt or to destroy in God's holy mountain.'" (p. 9.) Strange that he did not himself perceive and feel shocked at the glaring inconsistency of uttering such a prayer, while he was laboring with all his might to increase and perpetuate the very evils which he asks God to terminate!

The Remarker says, page 27—"As the Presbytery [meaning the suspended brethren] expressly declined the authority and further action of the Associate Synod, many might be disposed to think that the Synod would have desisted from all further attempts to injure them; [i. e. by church censure.] But those who may think so, are but little acquainted with the spirit of the prevailing party in that Synod." And in a few lines afterwards follows the story of the Great Reformer and the "Pope's bull of ejection." Now for the inconsistency. It was but a little more than a month before the time that the Synod thus showed its "spirit and temper, and exposed itself to derision," as the Remarker has it, that he and his coadjutors committed *nearly* the same "outrage" on Messrs. Campbell and Martin. For no sooner had these brethren declined their assumed authority and retired, than they manifested *their*

“spirit and temper” by “levelling their censures” at them. But as they had withdrawn, in imitation of the Great Reformer, “their suspension become a blow in the air—an exercise of authority without an object.”—To convince our readers that we are not imposing on their credulity in this matter, we will here insert a Notice which we received, dated “New-York, 1 May, 1838,” and signed “Andrew Stark, P. Clerk :”—“It is further my duty hereby to give you notice, that in consequence of your having declined the authority of the Associate Presbytery of Albany, at their meeting on the 18th ult., that court found it to be their duty to suspend you from your seat in Presbytery, till such time as you give satisfaction for this offence.”—Mr. Campbell also received a similar notice. It is not our intention to make any remarks on this procedure of Messrs. Stark, Bullions and Blair. Their *deed* betrays a consciousness of a want of just Presbyterial authority, or they would have inflicted a very different censure from a *suspension from a seat*, where no seat was asked, and where it was denied that any *Presbyterial* seat was to be had. We only, however, notice this procedure of theirs to show the flagrant inconsistency of which they are guilty, when condemning the Synod in the harshest terms for doing to them as they had just been doing to others! *Thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal?*

Messrs. Campbell, Martin and Milmine are blamed for not appealing to Synod and waiting the judgment of that court, instead of withdrawing from their brethren. (p. 21.) Now Dr. Bullions knows that they did offer to protest and appeal, but that he and his associates treated the offer with contempt, and would allow no notice to be taken of it whatever! Besides, he and his two brethren had themselves appealed to Synod in relation to the same matter, why did not they wait the judgment of that court, instead of deciding on the merits their own appeal? They had already waited ten months from the date of their appeal; could they not have waited one month longer?

The Remarker attempts to justify the conduct of Dr. A. Bullions in declining the authority of the Presbytery of Cambridge on two grounds; *First*, because the Presbytery declined “was only a fragment of that Presbytery.” “The fragment,” says he, “that remained, and which had unlawfully usurped all the authority, could not justly claim to be the Presbytery. The Dr. was, therefore, fully justified in declining their authority and action in his case, because they were not the Presbytery, but a fragment of the Presbytery only—not quite the one half of the Presbytery of Cambridge.” (p. 49.) Now, by some strange mistake, the Remarker here gives a true description of the state of *his own* Presbytery at the time Messrs. Campbell and Martin *declined their authority*: “They were not the Presbytery, but a fragment of the Presbytery only—not quite the one half of the Presbytery.” And nearly a moiety of that fragment had, before that time, been justly excluded from a seat; but notwithstanding this, fragment that it was, it unlawfully “usurped all the authority” of the Presbytery of Albany. The other ground on which the Remarker would justify “the Doctor,” is, because “this *Presbytery* had broken down and trampled under foot all the principles and rules of Presbyterian church discipline. “Protest and appeal,” continues the Remarker, “is the constitutional remedy provided in the Presbyterian Church, for obtaining redress of grievances. The Doctor had recourse to this remedy against a decision that he believed to be unjust, but this Presbytery had disal-

owed the privilege. It then became his incumbent duty to decline their authority." (p. 49.) This indeed is not true, as far as the Presbytery of Cambridge is concerned, but exactly true according to another application. For the man who thus writes was himself a "principal actor in those scenes," which were enacted at Albany on the 18th April, 1838, when Messrs. Campbell and Martin were "disallowed the privilege of protest and appeal," and were suspended from their seats in Presbytery, for doing what the Remarker calls an "incumbent duty" in such a case, viz. "declining their authority!" *The legs of the lame are not equal!*

The Remarker asserts that the Presbytery of Cambridge "set aside the right of protest and appeal; and in this way did all in its power to destroy Presbyterianism; for certainly," says he, "if the right of protest and appeal be once taken away, there will remain little else in Presbyterianism worth preserving." He further adds: "It is rather surprising that any body should be found so dull as to imagine that persons who could act as this Presbytery has done in this case, can have the least respect for Presbyterian church government." (pp. 42, 43.) The reader need scarcely be informed that this charge as brought against the Presbytery of Cambridge, is utterly destitute of truth. To use the Remarker's own language, "it is a sheer fiction." But our object in making this quotation, is to show the strange inconsistency of the Remarker, who, with his associates, while pretending to act as a Presbytery, did the very thing which he here falsely charges upon the Presbytery of Cambridge. For that pretended Presbytery did, in the exercise of its usurped authority, actually take away from Messrs. Campbell and Martin the right of protest and appeal, and "in this way did all in their power to destroy Presbyterianism." Surely, according to their own doctrine, to which we heartily subscribe, the Synod acted most righteously in declaring them no *Presbyterian court*, and "their acts to be null and void." They showed by setting aside "the right of protest and appeal," that "they could not have the least respect for Presbyterian church government;" and this, indeed, was one of the strongest reasons that influenced Messrs. Martin and Campbell to decline their authority and withdraw from them. The Remarker, therefore, gives us another instance of a man, *condemned out of his own mouth*.

How inconsistent in the Remarker is it, to charge others with acting *unjustly* and *dishonorably*, when he himself, after making a charge against a brother, and having its injustice proven to him, still continues to repeat it without the least syllable of explanation! Thus he charged Mr. Miller with having stated in a conversation with Dr. Savage of Argyle, "that the case of Mr. Stalker would end in suspension, and that this, with other circumstances, would end in a division of the Synod." (p. 36.) After making, or rather repeating this charge from Mr. Stalker, the Remarker was shown Dr. Savage's statement respecting the conversation alluded to, as follows:—" (Dr. Savage asks the questions, and Mr. Miller answers.) Q. 'Do you think the Presbytery now in session will silence the Rev. D. Stalker from preaching the gospel?' A. 'I think they will not.' And here Mr. Miller spoke favorably of Mr. Stalker, and said the Presbytery would have no difficulty with him, if he were left to his own judgment without advice. Q. 'What do you suppose will be the final termination of the difficulties now existing in the Associate Church?' A. 'I do not know. The probability is, that the Rev. A. Bullions, P. Bullions, A. Stark, D. Stalker and other dis-

affected persons may secede and become a separate body, or join some other denomination."—And yet the Remarker still continues to repeat this calumny against Mr. Miller, without the least allusion to Dr. Savage's testimony! He says in the Dec. No.—"Mr. Stalker objected to Mr. Miller because he had already, in some degree, prejudged the case, as appeared from his having stated that it was likely to issue in Mr. Stalker's suspension, and that it would end in a division of the Synod." (p. 144.) *Whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just.*

The Remarker is quite *positive*, that, "the simple fact of the members of the Presbytery of Cambridge publishing this pamphlet [The Documentary History] in their own vindication, proves beyond all controversy, that they have no confidence in the integrity of their own conduct; that they fear that the unbiassed voice of the public must be against them; and hence, this effort to bespeak the favor of the community by issuing this publication." (p. 105.) *Quere?* Was this the secret, impulsive cause that brought into existence the *Associate Presbyterian Magazine*, through the medium of which, the "persecuted" brethren promised the public "a full and impartial account of all the proceedings of the church courts against them;" feeling themselves "imperatively called to such an undertaking, by a high sense of duty to themselves and to their adhering congregations?" (p. 1.) If not, how inconsistent is it in the Remarker to charge upon others a consciousness and design which, he must know, can, with equal propriety, be charged upon himself? Is not this to be guilty of *judging them that do such things* and yet *doing the same thyself?* (Rom. ii. 3.)

The Editor is pleased to publish to the world that "the Presbytery of Albany refused to give Mr. Stark the extracts," ordered by Synod, when he knows that the Presbytery voted to give the extracts in question, but was arrested from doing it by a protest and appeal; the reasons of which protest, he knows, were placed in his own hand to be answered; but not being able to answer them satisfactorily, the matter was buried in his own self-constituted and irresponsible Presbytery, so that the protester heard nothing more of his Reasons, and the Synod was saved the trouble of considering the appeal. The minutes of the Presbytery of Albany, after stating that "Mr. Stark's request [for the extracts] was granted," adds, "Against the decision, Mr. Martin claimed the privilege of protesting and appealing to Synod, for reasons to be given in." This protest was admitted—and Messrs. Bullions and Brinkerhoff were appointed a committee to answer the Reasons." But notwithstanding Dr. Bullions failed to answer these Reasons, yet he tries to bespatter the Presbytery for not giving Mr. Stark the "extracts," when their hands were tied by *his* delinquency! Is this inconsistency, or is it worse?

When we think of the editor's motto, how inconsistent, also, does it appear for him to publish to the world a long article full of "raw and undigested scandal," from the pen of one who has rendered himself somewhat notorious in Synod on account of his recklessness, exaggeration and bluster, with merely this general expression of condemnation, that he "can not entirely concur in every sentiment expressed in it" (p. 149.) Justice to his readers, one would think, should have led him to specify at least, *some of the sentiments* (he means *facts*) from which he expresses his dissent. Or does he wish to save his own credit by this general impeachment of the accuracy of the article, and at the

same time have his readers believe the whole of the trash contained in it?

The Messrs. Gordons are charged with something like *ingratitude* for opposing Dr. A. Bullions, when *he was to be blamed*, whom his cousin of the Magazine calls their "benefactor." (p. 159.) But did he think of the inconsistency of making such a charge, when, he was, at the very time, abusing and slandering his own benefactor, the Associate Synod? If Dr. A. B. showed any kindness to the Messrs. Gordons more than almost any modest christian would do without ever speaking of it, we do not know it; but certain it is that the Associate Synod gave Dr. P. Bullions, and Mr. Stark also, *one hundred dollars* each, towards defraying their expenses in coming to this country. This was right in itself. It was proper for the Synod to give this sum, and every way honorable in them to receive it. We have received favors in a similar way ourselves. But how ungrateful is it to treat their "friend and benefactor" as they have done? Before they entered on this crusade against the Synod, they should have paid back that money.\* After Mr. Stark became wealthy, some who did not know him, thought surely, that (laying a portion of a certain legacy out of the question) he would at least pay back to Synod the *hundred dollars!* But such became convinced of their mistake, when they found him taxing the Synod with *nine dollars and fifty cents*, for the importation of a few copies of the *Testimony of Original Seceders*, for the Synod's use. It would seem, however, as if the two brethren excused their ungrateful conduct towards the Synod by looking on the "hundred dollars," not as a *benefaction*, but as a *bribe*, and as being an *evidence of a felonious intent* on the part of the Synod, of *putting its foot on their necks!*—It was for the purpose of illustrating the conduct of these men towards their benefactor, that a certain writer made use of the uncouth comparison of "a Hottentot knocking out the brains of his mother." The Remarker, then, is the wrong person to bring a charge of *ingratitude* against the Messrs. Gordons. *Thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege?*

We might thus continue at great length in pointing out the inconsistencies of which the Remarker is guilty, but we will only notice one more. On page 5, we meet with the following professions:—"So far as we know our own hearts, we have no desire to bring any groundless charges against our brethren who have treated us so unworthily. We trust we shall not so far transgress the law of Christ as to render 'evil for evil, or railing for railing.' It is our desire to repress every angry feeling, to bear with fortitude the injuries we have been called to suffer, and to leave the work of defamation and detraction to those who may think their cause requires it—conscious as we are that to revile is inconsistent with all christian duty, and is commonly resorted to by the most worthless, and practised upon the most deserving." So much for profession; let us now look at the practice. And here we might refer our readers, in general, to the matter, manner, spirit and temper of the Magazine, as a contradiction of the above professions, but that the thing may appear in its proper light, we will select a few specimens, and that with a special reference to the sentiment, that "*reviling is commonly resorted to by the most worthless and practised upon the most deserving.*"

---

\* It is believed, that upon examination it will be found, that neither of these brethren has ever contributed *one cent* to the Synod's funds. We may have occasion to speak of the conduct of their congregations hereafter.

Thus the Magazine, leaving "the work of defamation and detraction" to others, charges the Synod with inflicting censures "without any just cause and even without any plausible pretext;" and "who, under the influence of unchristian feelings and motives, acted this strange and sinful part." The Synod is charged as being guilty of "sinful proceedings," "ill usage and persecution," and of treating "ministers with much indignity and cruelty,"—also of a "corrupt exercise of discipline,"—"oppressive measures," "tyranny and oppression;" of "adopting arbitrary and despotic principles in church policy," and doing as "the Popes of Rome did to get the people to countenance them in the exercise of their usurped authority;" and moreover, as being guilty of "unjust and arbitrary proceedings," and of having to a "great extent abandoned the principles and corrupted the discipline of the Secession Church." Again, the Remarker says, that "the decisions of the Synod were excessively arbitrary and presumptuous," "manifest a disregard to truth and honesty," and "show the extent to which men professing godliness will go, in trampling under foot all the claims of justice and equity, in order to accomplish their designs." Synod was guilty of "indecent transactions"—"all their proceedings seemed designed to screen the Presbytery from well merited contempt—nothing more unprincipled or unjust can well be imagined;" "found the libel proven in the absence of all testimony," which "Mr. Stark justly considered an outrage on all decency and perfect mockery of all that men regard as sacred and holy." Synod settled the question respecting the Albany Presbytery, "but it is believed in such a way as no other court on earth, except only the Associate Synod, would have settled such a question"—"the iniquity of the whole transaction can be easily made abundantly manifest"—"at variance with truth and righteousness"—and "rested on preambles which were untrue, and introduced apparently with a view to impose on the ignorant"—and thus "an outrageous proceeding." The Synod's assertion is "a sheer fiction, is entirely fallacious and deceptive," and their decision "rests wholly on misrepresentation and falsehood," and is "based entirely on falsehood and misrepresentation"—"a mere sophism which can impose only on the most ignorant." Synod's "two resolutions are mere gratuitous assertions which can impose only on the ignorant"—"are mere unfounded assertions and entitled to no credit nor respect whatever." Again, "This decision of Synod is an outrage on all decency, a violation of the most sacred principles of justice, and a most daring attempt to impose upon the credulity of the public." "The Synod persisted in the determination to abide by their corrupt decision though fully proved to be founded in falsehood"—and did "recklessly thunder out their anathemas, like 'a madman, who casteth firebrands, arrows and death.'"

These *beautiful* specimens of the Remarker's *meekness* and freedom from the use of all *reviling* language is wound up after the usual manner with a *pious* exhortation and a text of scripture, thus:—"For ourselves, we feel more pity than resentment towards those who have perpetrated those outrages of which there is so much reason to complain, and if we might presume to counsel them, we would earnestly admonish them to attend to the discharge of their important duties, which certainly would be a source of more satisfaction to them in a dying hour, than the reflection that they have labored to injure the reputation of their brethren. 'He that will love life and see good days, let him refrain his tongue from evil and his lips that they shall speak no guile.'" (pp. 28, 29.)

We have thus clearly shown that there is an awful discrepancy between the Remarker's professions and practice, respecting the use of reviling language; such discrepancy as convicts him of the most glaring inconsistency. It may be proper to remark that the above "specimens" are all taken from No. 1 of the Magazine, and are applied to the Associate Synod. We have passed by the harsh epithets which are lavishly applied to certain Presbyteries and individuals. Were we to proceed through all the Nos. which have appeared, and cull with care, the above catalogue might be increased to almost any extent. But we have already given to our readers what will be a *surfeit* of such shameless trash. And yet the Remarker, who indulges so freely in such coarseness and vulgarity of style, affected to be horrified at the terms which we employed in a single remark touching the *characteristics* of his Magazine; the justness and accuracy of which remark we feel perfectly willing to leave to the candid and unbiassed judgment of the christian community, especially after our Review shall have been brought to a close.

Leaving the inconsistencies of the Magazine, we will pass to a consideration of the *misquotations*, *garbling of authorities* and *fulsifying of records*, with which it is interspersed.

In a former part of this Review we have convicted the editor of the Magazine of an *ecclesiastical forgery*, in palming on the Presbytery of Albany a fictitious resolution, instead of the one which they really passed.

On page 39, the editor makes Stewart of Pardovan say;—"An appeal made by parties should sist the execution of the sentence appealed from"—This, however, is but a part of the sentence, and is essentially modified by that which follows, viz:—"only while the appeal is duly and diligently prosecuted, and may thereby be determined, otherwise not." (Book iv. Tit. v. § 11.)

On the same page the Discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the United States is quoted, as follows:—"The necessary operation of an appeal is to suspend all further proceedings on the ground of the sentence appealed from." Here the editor stops, the words next following not answering his purpose so well:—"But if a sentence of suspension, or excommunication from church privileges, or of deposition from office, be the sentence appealed from, it shall be considered as in force until the appeal shall be issued." (Chap. vii. sec. iii. ¶ 15.)

On the same page, the overture for a new Book of Discipline in the Associate Church is made to say: "The effect of an appeal is to suspend all farther proceedings in the case, until the appeal be issued." This, however, is but a part of the rule, the remainder is as follows:—"From this general rule, however, edification requires that one exception should be made, viz: when the appeal is taken from a sentence of suspension, deposition or excommunication, which sentence shall be considered as in force till the appeal is issued. (ch. ix. § 9.)

The editor finding a rule in our own authorized Book of Discipline directly in the face of his whole argument, proceeds *first* to abuse it, and *secondly* to explain it away. (p. 39.) The rule referred to and partially quoted is the following: "When a protest and appeal is offered, the judicatory is to consider whether they will admit or reject them. If they admit, the cause is to be left to the judgment of the superior court; but if they reject they may proceed in the trial of it." It was according to this rule that the Presbytery of Cambridge acted, and

whose conduct in so doing is censured by the editor in the harshest terms. And because he saw that this rule justified the Presbytery in their procedure, he flies at it and abuses it to his heart's content, saying, "this rule is against the rules of Presbyterian Church government, and has a place in the discipline of none but the Associate Church." He admits that "the design of it evidently was to prevent a litigious defendant from protracting and embarrassing a trial by protesting unnecessarily at every step," but nevertheless, complains of it as being "against the rules of Presbyterian Church Government," and "unknown to the discipline of any but the Associate Church." And next he proceeds to explain it away, by saying: "It is manifest from the last sentence in this rule, that its application is only to protests against a 'part of the proceedings,' against an interlocutory sentence." But this explanation is directly contradicted by the remaining part of the rule, which reads thus: "The party may protest against the rejection of his protest; and if this is sustained, he may still bring the cause ultimately before the superior court; and if the *former protest was against* [not "a part of the proceedings" only, but] *a definitive sentence, he may require a review of the whole case.*" (Form of Process, Art. XII.)

The Doctor, having whittled down his authorities to make them suit, *sums up* in quite a triumphant tone, as follows: "The Presbytery of Cambridge, then, show by their own minute, not only, that in opposition to the rules of procedure in Presbyterian courts, they proceeded, in the case of Dr. B. after protest and appeal had been taken to a superior court, but, that without cause they rejected an appeal from a final sentence, and without the authority of their own rule, and against the letter and spirit of every other, they *proceeded to execute the sentence.*" (p. 40.)

On page 53, we meet with the following: "It has long been the established law in the Presbyterian church, that no Presbytery, unless it be a supreme court, possesses the power to depose a minister of the gospel in his absence. Dr. Bullions then has not been lawfully deposed." In proof of this assertion, we are referred to "Hill of Daily's Practice of the Judicatories of the Church of Scotland." But this proof, if true, will by no means support the above declaration, unless the Presbyterian church in all its branches be governed by the "established law" spoken of; but this is not the case with any branch of that church in this country, as every one of them allows a Presbytery to exercise the power of deposing a minister in his absence. We repudiate the doctrine, that a law said to be passed by the Church of Scotland in 1755 is "established law in the Presbyterian church" in these United States. But we do not believe that the Church of Scotland ever passed such an absurd law as that referred to. And if we could lay our hand on Hill's Practice, we should expect to find him treated as the other authorities above noticed have been, viz: *misquoted and perverted.*

On page 138, Durham on Scandal is referred to, in order to sustain the despotic principle that a church judicatory ought never to allow the accused to defend himself on a charge of slander, the relevancy of which had been determined. The particular place, indeed, is not specified, and we apprehend there was a good reason for it. We deny that that distinguished author ever held to the absurd doctrine, which the Magazine imputes to him.

An instance of a very deliberate falsification of the Minutes of Synod

occurs on page 147. The Remarker says: "We intended to have submitted some remarks on the decision of the late Synod respecting Mr. Stark, but on examining their minutes we find nothing on that subject but the following resolution, which we give in their own words, viz: 'Resolved, That the former deed of Synod in his case be affirmed.' As we were not present," continues the Remarker, "when this resolution was passed, and as there are several deeds of Synod, in what they are pleased to call the case of Mr. Stark, it is impossible for us, from this minute, to say which of them may be meant." Now the whole minute from which the above resolution, as being all the Remarker could find on the subject, is selected, reads as follows: "On motion, proceeded to the unfinished business of last year. Agreed to take up the case of Mr. Stark. Mr. Stark was called, but not appearing, the following preamble and resolution were adopted, viz: Whereas, at the meeting of the Synod at Pittsburgh, in 1837, the Synod, according to the request of Mr. Stark and others, agreed to review the deed of the preceding Synod, convicting Mr. Stark of various offences: And, whereas Mr. Stark has withdrawn from the present meeting, therefore, Resolved, that the former deed of Synod in his case be affirmed." We leave the reader to make his own comments.

The Remarker gives us on page 15, an incorrect minute of the facts which occurred on the 18th of April, 1838, when the division took place in the Presbytery of Albany. He makes the minute, among other things, say: "Members present, Rev. Dr. P. Bullions, Messrs. Stark and Blair, ministers; together with Messrs. Whitewright, Brinkerhoff and Black, ruling elders.—The roll being called, Dr. Bullions gave notice that he withdrew his protest against the decision of Presbytery, excluding Mr. Stark from his seat.—Messrs. Blair and Stark also intimated that they withdrew their protests. Messrs. Campbell and Martin, together with Mr. Milmine, ruling elder from Florida, appeared and took their seats," &c. But the true minute, now in our possession, written at the time by Dr. Bullions, with a pencil, and bearing palpable evidence of great *trepidation and haste*, reads as follows, (there being neither day nor date prefixed,): "Presby. met and was constituted by prayer by the mod'r. Rev'd. P. B. was appointed clerk P. T. in the absence of the clerk. Mr. B. gave notice that he withdrew his protest against the deed of Presby. refusing Mr. Stark and his elder a seat in Presby. Mr. Blair did so also. Members present, Messrs. Bullions, Stark and Blair; Messrs. Whitewright, Brinkerhoff and Black, ruling elders. Messrs. Martin and Stark came and took their seats."

As Mr. Stark appears to have been the all absorbing subject, both of thought and action, with the clerk P. T., he did Mr. Campbell the indignity of inserting, in his great hurry and confusion, Mr. Stark's name instead of his. The minute should have been, "Messrs. Martin and Campbell came and took their seats." The reader will perceive some considerable discrepancy as to facts between the true minute and that published in the Magazine. According to the latter the absurdity was committed of making Mr. Stark a constituent member of the court at its opening, and afterwards proceeding to constitute him a member a second time by the withdrawal of protests; but according to the former, the absurdity was committed of admitting him to a seat upon the withdrawal of protests by Messrs. Bullions and Blair, while his own protest was not withdrawn. For it was not till Mr. Martin afterwards asked, Whether Mr. Stark had also withdrawn his protest? that Mr.

Stark arose and said. "Moderator, I now withdraw it." Our only design, however, in noticing this discrepancy, is to show that no dependence whatever can be placed on the statements of the Magazine respecting *facts*. For according to either way, and indeed every way that the matter can be viewed, it is perfectly absurd and ridiculous to suppose that the mere withdrawal of protests annihilated the deed of the Presbytery against which they had been entered, some ten months before.

In the minute which the Remarker publishes, the following is given as the resolution which Dr. Bullions took from his pocket and offered on that occasion: "Whereas the Rev. Messrs. Martin and Campbell have acted in opposition to a decision of Synod, in depriving Mr. Stark and the elder from his congregation of their seats in Presbytery, therefore, Resolved, that they be excluded from their seats in Presbytery, till they submit to the authority of Synod." The *real* resolution, however, which Dr. Bullions, who was under process for scandal, and to be tried that day, *did* offer, was simply as follows: "Resolved, that Messrs. Campbell and Martin, together with their elders, be suspended from seats in Presbytery, because of their opposition to the Associate Synod." On reflection it was found that it would never answer to publish this resolution to the world, not only on account of the *indefiniteness* of the charge brought against the individuals named, but also, because, as it happened, the elders to be disciplined were not the same that voted for Mr. Stark's exclusion, and besides Mr. Martin's elder had not as yet appeared to claim his seat. Hence to avoid these absurdities the resolution has been moulded into a different shape—a *Preamble* containing the crime, and a *Resolve* the punishment. And what is the *crime* in its more *definite* form? Simply this, a voting against a motion made by Dr. P. Bullions on the 28th June, 1837, to have Mr. Stark's name put on the roll of Presbytery! Messrs. Martin and Campbell did not *deprive* Mr. Stark of a seat in Presbytery. They only *voted* along with a number of other members against the motion just specified! Dr. Bullions, however, who was to be tried that day, probably thought, that as these brethren had been wicked enough to vote against his *motion*, they might be guilty of voting against *himself*; and therefore, that the best thing that could be done in the premises, was to *suspend them from their seats in the Presbytery*, together with their unoffending elders also!\*

---

\* The true history of the proceedings of those individuals who affected to be acting as the Presbytery of Albany on the occasion referred to, not only shows, that Mr. Stark and his elder were admitted to seats contrary to common sense and established order, under the *sham* of withdrawing protests in order to nullify the deed against which they had been entered; but also, that this disorderly constituted court, in the most tyrannical manner, suspended the right of protest and appeal; and did, moreover, undertake to eject four members from their seats, for no other reason assigned or assignable, than that they had not on a former occasion *voted satisfactorily*. Now, taking all these things into the account, and also that the liberty of speech had been virtually taken away, how could the Synod have possibly decided otherwise than they did, viz: that a body thus constituted and thus acting could not have been a regular Presbyterian court; and that the other "body, of which Messrs. Campbell and Martin were members, was truly the Associate Presbytery of Albany!" Had the circumstances of this case been fully understood in Synod, it is believed that there would not have been more than two or three dissenting votes. After specifying all the above circumstances, the minute of the transaction as recorded in the Presbytery's Book, concludes as follows, and to which every honest-hearted Presbyterian will cordially respond: "When these two brethren [Messrs. Campbell and Martin] saw, that it was useless to reason with men who seemed to be madly bent on disorder and injustice; and considering that it would be unfaithful and sinful in them to acknowledge such a disorderly constituted and violent body to be the Associate Presbytery of Albany, they declared that they could not regard them as a lawfully constituted Presbytery, protested against them, and gave notice that they would retire to another place and constitute the Presbytery of Albany, and transact such business as might come before them,"—which they accordingly did; and the Synod has decided, and every sensible and unbiassed mind must also decide, that **THEY DID RIGHT.**

We had intended to have noticed particularly the dangerous principles, which are either *doctrinally* or *practically* set forth in the Magazine; but we find our limits will hardly permit us to do any thing more than merely to state some of these in the briefest manner possible.

It seems to be a principle running throughout the Magazine, that our submission to the decisions of church courts must be determined by our own good pleasure.

The editor of the Magazine has obviously given his sanction to the infidel principle, that church courts ought to be regarded and treated as assemblages of selfish, corrupt, wicked, unprincipled and designing men, who commit the greatest outrages under the garb of zeal for righteousness and truth. (pp. 3, 82.)

He also advances the principle that it is Popish for church courts to claim respect and obedience to their decisions; and that to admit such a claim would be a renunciation of Protestantism. (pp. 4, 71.)

He adopts the principle that it is Popish for a church court to inflict censure on any of its members for insubordination and contempt. (p. 71.)

Contrary to the doctrine of the Secession church, the Magazine justifies the principle that an act of mal-administration will warrant a rebellion on the part of the aggrieved; nay, a separation from the fellowship of the church. (p. 26.)

The Remarker lays down the novel principle in discipline, that finding a charge *relevant*, (i. e. censurable if true,) is equivalent to its *probation*. (pp. 11, 138.)

He also maintains the despotic principle, that a person charged with publishing slander ought not to be allowed the privilege of defence. Such a principle may answer for the meridian of Rome, Constantinople, or St. Petersburg, but not for the Associate Church in North America. (p. 138.)

The Remarker practically adopts the principle of the Jesuits, that the frequent repetition of a falsehood may at length induce some to believe it. It is only on this principle, that we can account for his repeating some twenty times the same falsehoods, and that too after they had been most amply refuted.

He, in like manner also, adopts and acts on the principle of the French atheists, that by casting plenty of dirt on an opponent some of it will be apt to stick. Hence the unsparing hand with which he scatters filth at those whom he denounces as "enemies and persecutors."

He has also practically adopted the principle that "all is fair in politics." Hence his taking advantage of unguarded expressions, his intrigue, his appeals to national feeling, his flattery of partizans, his wholesale slanders, &c. &c.

Such are some of the disorganising and destructive principles which are to be found in the Magazine, either shamelessly avowed or secretly acted on. We have not time to be more explicit, at present, in the proof and illustration of them. And it is but justice to state, that probably the Remarker may disavow some of them, since they are not expressly asserted by him, but only legitimately inferred from his reasoning and the nature of his acts.

One thing, however, will appear obvious to every person that carefully peruses the Magazine, that its editor, from an apparent dread of Popery, has gone off into the opposite extreme of Independency,—and Independency too of the laxest kind, even bordering on wild confusion and absolute anarchy; while at the same time, in some things, he goes

beyond even the worst of Popery; as for example, attempting to discipline members of a court for giving unsatisfactory votes.

And by the way, as to the charge of Popery, which the Remarker so frequently and so unblushingly brings against the Associate Synod, no person seems to regard it in any other light than as "a matter of course." About three months since, being in conversation with a venerable father and long tried friend of the cause which the Remarker and his associates have abandoned, he said to us, that he had attended the meetings of the Associate Synod regularly for more than thirty years, and that this was not the first time the cry of Popery had been raised against the Synod. For when Mr. Campbell (the father of Campbellism) was deposed for heresy, he charged the Synod with Popery; when Mr. Duncan was deposed for certain errors, he raised the cry of Popery; when Mr. Kirkland was deposed for his misdemeanors, he too raised the cry of Popery; and hence, said he, it was to be expected that the lately suspended brethren would, in like manner, raise the cry of Popery against the Synod. Being so accustomed to hear the cry of Popery raised, he seemed to take it quite easy; and his remarks did not fail to convince us, that this indeed was the common resource of all our "modern martyrs of discipline."

Before closing there is one other point which requires some notice from us, viz: the process conducted against Dr. P. Bullions before the Presbytery of Albany. The charges involved in this process are published in the Magazine, (p. 24,) and are as follows:

"1. Insubordination; in having preached, as admitted by himself, in the First Associate Congregation of New-York, when both it and its pastor were acting in opposition to the authority of the Associate Synod.

"2. Misrepresenting and slandering this Presbytery, in a communication addressed to the Associate Synod, and marked No. 24, in the published minutes of Synod for 1837.

"3. Misrepresenting certain facts, connected with the case of Mr. Webster, in a paper given to Mr. Stark, which has been published, and which was also read in Synod at its last meeting; thereby injuring both the cause of truth and individual character."

These charges, the editor of the Magazine says, were "contrived against him by a party in the Presbytery, because he refused to countenance them in their sinful proceedings." He states further, that "these charges were considered by the Presbytery, after Messrs. Campbell and Martin retired on the 18th April, and found to be altogether inadmissible. The first, because it stood opposed to the commandment of our Lord Jesus Christ, to 'preach the gospel to every creature.' And the other two, because they contained merely vague assertions, without any specification, and against which it would be utterly impossible for any person to defend himself. After this the papers referred to, and on which it was alleged that the charges were founded, were read and examined, and found to contain only statements that were well known to be true." (p. 24.)

The notice which the Remarker thus takes of this affair will surely justify us in presenting to our readers a correct state of the case, although his character may suffer by our so doing.

On the first charge little need be said. The facts charged are all admitted. Mr. Stark was lying under a sentence of suspension, pro-

nounced by the Synod; he had also declined the authority of the Synod; his congregation adhered to him, and also disowned the authority of the Synod; they refused to admit to their pulpit the ministers sent to them by the Synod, to intimate the aforesaid sentence of suspension, and to preach the gospel; the Presbytery of Albany had judicially declared said congregation to be in a state of rebellion; and moreover, the Presbytery, only a few days before the offence charged was committed, had unanimously, in the presence of Dr. Bullions, expressed their judgment, that for any of our ministers in present circumstances, to preach in Mr. Stark's congregation would be inconsistent, disorderly and offensive. But notwithstanding of all these facts and circumstances, Dr. Bullions went and preached in said congregation, and that too, as we were informed, in such a manner and style as was calculated to countenance and encourage that people in their schismatical and disorderly course. Could the Presbytery, then, feel otherwise than aggrieved at such conduct on the part of Dr. Bullions? Were they not justifiable in dealing with him for the same? And had he not *justified* his conduct, when first spoken to on the subject, the Presbytery would probably have let the matter drop. But having put himself in the attitude of defence, the Presbytery agreed to let the matter lie over for further consideration; and at the next ensuing meeting it was put, along with other matters, into the hands of a committee, who reported a minute embracing the foregoing charges, which was adopted by the Presbytery; and Dr. Bullions not being present, it was agreed that he should be cited to answer to said charges on the 18th of April, 1838.

The Dr. in his great wisdom so managed it as to have a Presbytery so constituted at the appointed time, as to secure him, if not a *just* and *honorable*, at least a *certain* acquittal. Accordingly, after Mr. Stark and his elder had been admitted to seats, and Messrs. Campbell and Martin and their elders thrust from theirs, the *court* (!) decided that this first charge was "altogether inadmissible, because opposed to the commandment of our Lord Jesus Christ, to 'preach the gospel to every creature.'" It was by this "commandment" that the Dr. had attempted to justify his conduct before the Presbytery when the matter was first called up; but the court, as *then* constituted, was of the opinion that he was guilty of putting a forced construction upon it. This "commandment" is unquestionably subject to many limitations. The gospel is to be preached only to *human* creatures, and who are living on *earth*, and to whom Providence gives the opportunity. Besides, the gospel is only to be preached to people, when it can be done in a *regular* way—in a way consistent with good order, and not in open violation of the divine ordinance of government and discipline. There are some from whom ministers of the gospel are to "turn away;" against some they are to "shake off the dust of their feet for a memorial;" to some the Spirit forbids the gospel to be preached. But we are dwelling too long on this point, as we can scarcely believe there are any who will coincide in opinion with the Doctor's court, that this first charge is "altogether inadmissible."

The second charge was founded on the following notice, which appeared in the published minutes of Synod for 1837: "No. 24. A complaint by the Rev. Peter Bullions against the Presbytery of Albany, for withholding certain testimony, which he deemed necessary in order to enable him to prosecute an appeal which he had taken from said Presbytery."

As soon as the minutes of Synod were published, the Presbytery, perceiving that Dr. Bullions had been misrepresenting and slandering them before the Synod, if the above notice were correct, immediately called him to account. He said, that the Clerk of Synod had not fairly represented the nature of his communication to the Synod, and promised to get a copy of it and show it to the Presbytery. Whereupon the matter was laid over till next meeting; at which meeting, the Doctor having failed to present a copy of the communication in question, the Presbytery referred the matter to a committee, as above noticed. And the reader will perceive that the charge could not be made more *definite* than it was, as it was based upon the *notice* published in the minutes of Synod; all the Presbytery desiring was, that Dr. Bullions might exonerate himself from the misrepresentation and slander which appeared on the *face* of that notice. The Presbytery have since, however, been furnished by the Synod with a copy of the communication referred to, and it is found beyond all gainsaying to establish the charge brought against Dr. P. Bullions of "misrepresenting and slandering the Presbytery of Albany." With the exception of two or three sentences at the close, the communication complained of is as follows:

"To the Associate Synod of N. America to meet at Pittsburgh on the 4th Wednesday of May, 1837.

"The representation and petition of the subscriber humbly sheweth— That on the trial of Chauncey Webster before the Associate Presbytery of Albany, for slander and defamation, a protest and appeal was entered by the Rev. A. Stark, in which he was joined by the subscriber, against some parts of the procedure of said Presbytery and against some of their decisions, as in their judgment a violation of order and justice; that this protest and appeal was not prosecuted before Synod, because a copy of testimony deemed important for that end, though solicited, could not be obtained; particularly testimony going to show that Mr. Webster in publishing his slanderous pamphlet was influenced by bad advice; that application was made by Mr. Stark to Synod last May, to obtain through Synod from Presbytery, the testimony referred to without success; that the subscriber applied to the Presbytery of Albany at their last meeting, requesting as a favor to be permitted still to prosecute his appeal, which the Presbytery did not see fit to grant. In this way the grievances of the subscriber, with the course of procedure, and with several of the decisions of Presbytery, remain as they were, without, as he thinks, any neglect on his part, &c.

"ALBANY, May 5th, 1837.

P. BULLIONS."

That the Presbytery of Albany is misrepresented and slandered in the above document will appear when the following facts are considered:

1. Mr. Stark never protested against any decision of the Presbytery, as is here stated by Dr. Bullions. After the first decision was made by the Presbytery in the case of the libel against Mr. Webster, the minutes of Presbytery say: "Mr. Stark asked leave to protest, *if he see cause*, against this and any subsequent decision in the case. This was granted." But Mr. Stark *never saw cause* to enter a protest against any of those decisions.

2. Dr. P. Bullions entered no such protest as he speaks of in his letter. Two days after Mr. Stark had "asked leave," as above, and when the whole libel was gone through with, the minutes state, that "Mr. Bullions asked permission to protest against any of the above decisions

he may deem proper. This was granted." But he never deemed it proper to use the permission thus given him.

3. It is, therefore, as wide of the truth as any thing can be, to assert as the Doctor does in his letter, that he *joined Mr. Stark* in his protest and appeal. About two months before the time referred to, he protested jointly with Mr. Stark against a resolution of the Presbytery in relation to the "civil suit;" which resolution is given in a preceding part of this Review. And this was the only *joint protest* that was entered in the whole matter, from beginning to end.

4. Mr. Stark had no reason to complain of a withholding of testimony from him, as he would not enter, according to a requisition of the Presbytery, any specific protest against any of their decisions. The minutes of Presbytery, towards the close of the same meeting at which he asked leave to protest, if he should see cause, contain this record: "In relation to a request of Mr. Stark for extracts of the minutes and a copy of the testimony in the case of Mr. Webster, as far as he, Mr. Stark was concerned, which request has been already granted, but Mr. Stark not having entered his protest against any of the decisions of Presbytery in a specific form—Therefore, Resolved that the above grant be suspended, as far as a copy of testimony is concerned, till he state the particular decisions against which he may protest." Now any person will see that Mr. Stark could not have felt himself very strongly aggrieved by the decisions of the Presbytery, if he did not know which of them to protest against, without first having the privilege of conning over the testimony, in order to see whether he could find ground sufficiently strong to bear a *quibble*. If he did not know what decisions to protest against, surely the Presbytery were not bound to come to his aid by offering him the use of the testimony in question. But notwithstanding of the above resolution, the clerk on his own responsibility *did* furnish Mr. Stark with, as he supposed, all the testimony in the case relating to him personally. It appeared afterwards, however, that the unimportant testimony of two or three witnesses had not been furnished. Again,

5. It is not true that Dr. Bullions asked for a copy of any testimony given on Mr. Webster's trial, till at least eighteen months afterwards. Now,

6. After all this, is it not a great departure from the truth, to represent the Presbytery as withholding a copy of the testimony, and thereby *preventing the prosecution of an appeal* which, in fact, was never taken? This surely is misrepresenting and slandering the Presbytery; and especially when they are complained of for withholding "testimony going to show, that Mr. Webster in publishing his slanderous pamphlet was influenced by bad advice." Not a particle of any such testimony was ever withheld; because no such testimony was ever in the power of the Presbytery to give.

7. When Dr. Bullions asked leave, about a year and a half after Mr Webster's case was settled, to prosecute his appeal, he was distinctly informed that he had never taken any appeal from any decision in that case; and besides, all the foregoing facts were at that time brought particularly before him, and he acknowledged that he could find no fault with the Presbytery for not then granting his request; and yet two days afterwards he sits down and writes the foregoing letter to the Associate Synod! And he gravely tells the Synod that it was "not owing to any neglect on his part that his grievances remained!" Oh no! **The Presbytery is to blame for his not protesting! The Presbytery is**

to blame for withholding testimony which he never asked! The Presbytery is to blame for withholding testimony they never had in their power to give! The Presbytery is to blame for not allowing him, at the expiration of eighteen months, to do what no court could consistently allow to be done! We may now surely leave it to the candid reader to decide, whether the foregoing letter does not most abundantly prove this second charge, brought against Dr. P. Bullions, of "misrepresenting and slandering the Presbytery of Albany?"

The third charge against the Doctor was founded on a letter written by him to Mr. Stark, which Mr. Stark first published, *anonymously*, (finding it to answer his purpose well,) and afterwards presented to Synod, May, 1837. The letter is without date, but was written, it seems, in December 1836, immediately upon the appearance of the Presbytery's Narrative, and apparently designed to counteract the testimony of Messrs. Campbell and Smart, as published in said Narrative.

After inserting Mr. Webster's "paper of retraction," prefaced by the remark that he had *copied* it at Mr. Stark's request, (though it had been given to Mr. Stark under the solemn pledge, that *he was to make no use of it whatever*;) the Doctor writes as follows:

"The above was in the hand writing of Ch. Webster, and the passage inclosed in a parenthesis was interlined, and indistinctly written. On the morning of the 10th after the opening of Presbytery, Mr. Stark stated to Presbytery that the above retraction, he was happy to say, was entirely satisfactory to him, and that he would consequently withdraw the civil suit against Mr. W. He then read it and handed it to the Clerk of the Presbytery, requesting it to be recorded in the minutes. The Rev. Mr. Smart had the paper in his hand, and was either reading it or speaking about it, when Mr. Webster came into court, took the paper out of the hands of the clerk, saying the Presbytery had no business with it, as it was a private paper, and then went to his seat and tore it in pieces. He afterwards rose and said that though he gave that retraction to Mr. Stark the night before, yet after he reflected on it through the night and sought the best counsel he could get, he could not make a retraction so full as that was; that he resolved to come into Presbytery and state the matter, and throw himself on the Presbytery. He then stated, that the retraction as first written was not so full; that he had written it first, 'containing *some* statements injurious to the character and standing of the Rev. A. Stark of New-York, which are hereby fully withdrawn;' that as this was not satisfactory to Mr. Stark, it was altered to its present form. Being asked whether the alterations were made with his consent, he distinctly and expressly admitted, that they were, saying, 'I admit that too,' and added some remarks which I did not understand and do not now remember.

"The above is a true statement, to the best of my remembrance, and which I am willing to confirm by oath, if called to give testimony respecting it.

"P. BULLIONS."

Now the charge against the Doctor is, that, in this letter, he has "misrepresented certain facts, to the injury of the cause of truth and individual character." Let us see whether the charge can be substantiated.

1. He asserts, and intends to have it so understood, that the so called "paper of retraction" was *in the hand writing of Ch. Webster*; whereas, according to the sworn testimony of the committee, Messrs. Smart and Campbell, that which contained the very *gist* of the retraction, was

in the hand writing of Mr. Stark, and had never obtained the assent of Mr. Webster, viz: the word *all* interlined instead of the original word *some*, making the sentence read "all the statements injurious to the character and standing of Mr. Stark," instead of "some of the statements, &c." as Mr. Webster had written it. Besides this, according to the testimony of the above named witnesses, there were other interlineations, not in Mr. Webster's hand writing.

2. The Doctor represents Mr. Webster as acknowledging in the morning that he had given the paper in question to Mr. Stark the night before, in good earnest, as his *retraction*; and consequently that his taking it back was a violation of his faith and honor; whereas the above witnesses declare that said paper was given with *reluctance*, and as a *paper still under negociation*, which might be *altered or amended by either party*; and consequently that Mr. Webster had a right, if he chose, to recall it and do with it as he pleased.

3. Mr. Smart testifies, that Mr. Webster took the paper from off the table where Mr. Stark had laid it; but the Doctor asserts, that he took it out of Mr. Smart's hand while he "was either reading it or speaking about it."

4. Mr. Webster intimated that he had laid the matter before the Throne of Grace, and felt persuaded that he would neither be doing justice to himself nor the cause of truth, to give so general a retraction as that contained in the "paper" spoken of; but Dr. Bullions so states this circumstance as to favor the calumny, then put in circulation, that a certain member or members of the Presbytery had *counselled* Mr. Webster during the night to withdraw the said paper, when the Presbytery would come together in the morning.

5. After stating, that Mr. Webster replied to a certain question by saying, "I admit that too," the Doctor adds: "and he added some remarks which I did not understand and do not now remember." But these "remarks" he should have "understood and remembered," as they modified and put an entirely different face on the *admission* referred to. It was ourself that put the question to Mr. Webster: "Were not those interlineations made with your consent?" To which he replied, "I admit that too, because the paper was a *paper under negociation*, and those interlineations were permitted that they might be taken under consideration." Hence this *suppressio veri* (this keeping back of a part of the truth) on the part of the doctor, is tantamount to a misrepresentation of an important fact in the history of the case before us.

Now it need scarcely be added, that the above misrepresentations were calculated to "injure both the cause of truth and individual character." If they were believed, not only would they injure the character of Mr. Webster, but more especially that of the witnesses, Messrs. Smart and Campbell, nay, of other members of the Presbytery of Albany. The Presbytery, therefore, were under obligation to notice the above statements of Dr. Bullions, especially as he had professed a willingness, apparently with the view of giving them the greater effect, to confirm the truth of them under the solemnity of an oath.

It may be necessary to state further in relation to the above charges, that Dr. Bullions not appearing before the Presbytery after being cited three several times, that court entered upon the consideration of them, found them proved, added to them the additional offence of *contumacy*, and for the same, *in cumulo*, suspended him from the exercise of the

ministry and from the communion of the church, till he shall have given the requisite satisfaction.

Now let our readers examine carefully the nature and proof of the above charges, and decide for themselves, how far the editor of the Magazine is deserving of credit, in saying: "This process was neither more nor less than some vexatious and inadmissible charges contrived against him by a party in the Presbytery, because he refused to countenance them in their sinful proceedings. The papers referred to, on which it was alleged that the charges were founded, were read and examined [by the pretended Presbytery] and found to contain only statements that were *well known to be true.*" And let them also decide upon the *justice* and *honesty* displayed in the following sentence, which is given by his correspondent, as proof of the mildness and excellence of the "Rejected Resolutions;" "The conduct of Messrs. Campbell and Martin in forming themselves into a presbytery, and suspending Dr. P. B. for preaching the gospel on a Sabbath day, in Mr. Stark's congregation, &c. &c. were to be passed over without formal rebuke." (p. 154.)

In addition to the foregoing letters of Dr. P. Bullions, it may be proper to introduce in this place another, which he addressed to his friend Dr. A. Bullions, and which was also presented and read in Synod, May, 1837. It is as follows:

"ALBANY, May 4th, 1837.

"Dear Sir—In answer to your enquiry, whether I think the testimony given by me is sufficient proof that Mr. Stark is the author of the Anonymous Pamphlets ascribed to him—I answer; that testimony is the foundation of the *opinion* expressed by me on that occasion, yet it might be very unjust to Mr. Stark to convict him on that testimony; for an opinion may arise from circumstances very insufficient to prove a matter before a court. The opinion I had of Mr. S. being the author of the 'K. paper' was equally strong with that of his being the author of the Pamphlets; but from what I have learned since, I am now satisfied that the former opinion was wrong, and that he was not the author of the K. paper."

"Yours respectfully,

P. BULLIONS."

"Rev. Dr. BULLIONS.

On this singular communication a few things must be said. If properly considered, it must appear to every person not only as a *crooked* but also as a *curious* affair. Here we have Dr. A. Bullions, who, as a member of Synod, was a *judge* in the case, appealing to the *witness* for an opinion respecting the sufficiency of his testimony towards convicting the accused! And here we have the witness sitting in judgment on his own testimony, and sending his verdict up to the court, with the view of enlightening the judges and warning them against laying too much stress on said testimony! But further, both the interrogatory put to the witness and his answer are based on an exceedingly erroneous supposition, viz: that the testimony of said witness was *all* the testimony that was presented in the case. This is so far from being true, that even without the testimony of this witness there would have been sufficient for the conviction of Mr. Stark. The internal evidence contained in the anonymous pamphlets, and especially the evidence arising from a certain "note," confirmed as it was by the testimony of Messrs. Campbell, Law and Kirkpatrick, was every way sufficient to convince the unprejudiced that Mr. Stark was the author of the pamphlets re-

ferred to. Indeed, laying Dr. P. Bullions' testimony entirely out of the question, who doubts that Mr. S. was the author of those infamous pamphlets? Dr. Bullions' testimony, however, has put the matter not only beyond the reach of doubt, if any remained, but beyond the reach even of a *reasonable cavil*.

The Doctor states in this letter, that he had testified to certain facts which were sufficient to *convince* him, or give rise to the *opinion* in his mind, that Mr. Stark was guilty; but he gravely admonishes the judges in the case, that "it *might* be very unjust to Mr. Stark to convict him on that testimony." As, however, it was not the *opinion* of the witness, but the *facts* given by him, that the court was concerned with, let us hear what they were. And they may be summed up in a single sentence, as follows: "I received," says the witness, "the manuscript copy of one of the Anonymous Pamphlets in the hand writing of Mr. Stark, accompanied with a letter from him, requesting, I think, that it should be published, which was accordingly done; I myself paying one dollar towards defraying the expense of publication." Now, if the witness did not perjure himself, how could it be "very unjust to Mr. Stark to convict him on that testimony?" Could any thing be more plain and positive? And yet, by this letter, an endeavor is made to create a doubt in the mind of Synod as to Mr. Stark's guilt?

With respect to the remaining part of this letter, relative to the "K. paper," language fails to describe our abhorrence of the witness's conduct in the attempt which he makes to destroy his own testimony. His testimony, given in under oath before the Presbytery of Albany, and which, in this letter he would have us discredit, was as follows: "I received a letter from a gentleman stating that he had a piece, [the K. paper,] which if I thought proper to insert in the Monitor, [being the editor at that time,] he would send on; and that he did not think there would be any objection to publish it, as there was nothing personal in it; but that it would be forwarded only on condition that his concern in it should not be known to the public. I acquiesced in this, and if the paper was not personal, and I thought proper, I would insert it. I thought that the best way to comply with the condition was to send a transcript. [viz: to Mr. Webster, the publisher.] I gave the original copy to Luke F. Newland to be transcribed. The transcript came to the publisher through the post office. I believe that the original copy of the paper and the letter were both in the hand writing of the Rev. A. Stark."

When Mr. Stark was thus proved guilty, and was lying under the odium of a wilful falsehood, in having repeatedly denied the authorship of the "K. paper," the story was invented that that paper had really been *written* by a person who shortly afterwards left the country, and that Mr. Stark had merely transcribed and forwarded it to Dr. Bullions, who was at that time the editor of the Monitor. But this story cannot be true, because it stands directly opposed to facts, which all the ingenuity of man can never set aside. In the above testimony it is declared that Mr. Stark wished to have *his concern* in the "paper" *concealed*. What other *concern* could he refer to than the *authorship*! It could not be the concern of *transcribing* it; for that he himself could easily have avoided by sending the original copy, which, being in the hand writing of a stranger, the publisher could have known nothing about; and this would have saved the trouble of a *re-transcribing* in Albany, as there would have been no necessity for this in order to "conceal Mr. Stark's

concern in it!" Besides, if according to the story, the real author was a foreigner and soon after left the country, how came Mr. Stark, as was proved by three different witnesses, to attempt to create the impression that the author of that paper was no other than Dr. P. Bullions himself? Again, how could that strange gentleman have begun the "K. paper" with the same sentence with which Mr. Stark had begun a sermon which was not at that time published? Moreover, if this new fangled story have any truth in it, it presents Mr. Stark in no very enviable light; for, according to the testimony above given, it must present him in the light of a *plagiarist*—of a person playing a gross imposition upon the editor of the Monitor, who was led to believe that Mr. Stark was indeed the author of the paper in question! But who can believe, if Mr. Stark had only been the transcriber of that paper, that he would not have given his friend the editor some hint of the fact?

Now with all these facts before him, facts which are incontrovertible, and which must convince every person of common sense that Mr. Stark was the author of the "K. paper," the Rev. Dr. P. Bullions, in opposition to his own testimony, declares in his letter that he is *now satisfied that Mr. Stark was not the author of the K. paper!*

We confess that we were much surprised at the decisions of Synod in 1837, respecting the case of Mr. Stark, but after receiving and duly considering the above three letters of Dr. P. Bullions, which were presented and read in Synod, our surprise in a great measure ceased. For honest minds, who were comparatively unacquainted with the case, must have been greatly perplexed and misled by those letters, coming from one who was supposed to be a principal witness, and who, after having given his testimony under oath before his presbytery, does, in this informal and *unsworn* manner, volunteer statements which are calculated to throw over it an air of suspicion and doubt.

We cannot account for the last of the above letters of Dr. Bullions, unless it be, that his conscience having thrown him off his guard while giving his testimony, he happened to tell too much truth, and that he wrote this letter with the view of recalling or at least weakening the force of the more important parts of it. For let it be recollected that he occupied about two hours and a half in giving his testimony, which, had he been of a "willing mind," might have been given in less than one-fourth part of that time. A considerable portion of the time alluded to was spent by the witness in giving *evasive* answers, or refusing to answer at all, to the questions put to him by the court; and it was not till after long and close dealing with his *conscience*, by reminding him of the nature of his oath, of his obligation to tell *the whole truth*, of the Being in whose presence he stood, of his fearful responsibility, &c., that the court obtained from him what they supposed to be the truth in the case. But now, it would seem, he repents of his conduct in allowing the Presbytery to *draw* out of him so much truth to the injury of a *colleague*, and therefore the Associate Synod must be informed, that he has *changed his opinion*, at least in one important point; or to use his own language, that "he is now satisfied that his former opinion was wrong, and that Mr. Stark was not the author of the K. paper;" and with regard to the Anonymous Pamphlets, Synod must also be told, that it *might be unjust*, notwithstanding his testimony, to convict Mr. Stark of their authorship!

In closing our Review, we think that we are entitled to say, that we

have now made good and established beyond all doubt the correctness of the opinion formerly expressed by us in relation to the contents of this *Ass. Presbyterian Magazine*, viz: "That they harmonize most completely with the contents of Mr. Stark's Anonymous Pamphlets,—and contain an uninterrupted tissue of falsehood, misrepresentation, slander, Jesuitical sophistry, and pitiful quibbling, which probably has not been far surpassed by any infidel or Popish writer since the era of the Reformation."

It is supposed, that some of our readers will conclude that the editor of the Magazine will surely retract the misstatements and slanders which we have proved upon him; but we have no such confidence in his honesty and candor: On the contrary we suppose he will treat us as he has done our correspondent, "A Transylvanian," viz., select a few unimportant statements, call them the *most important*, and then *assert*, without any shadow of proof, or at best without any more than a quibble, that they are *falsehoods, wilful falsehoods*; and at the same time interlarding the spontaneous effusions of his mind, as usual, with an abundance of hard and ribaldish epithets. But we are determined to keep him both to the *point* and to the *proof*.

We expect that some who are under the influence of prejudice, or at least possessed of *great sensibility*, will blame us for exposing as we have done the editor of the Magazine. This, however, we cannot help; especially as we have long since found, that there are always some weaklings in society who think it less a crime to falsify, than to expose the falsifier to the gaze of an abused and justly indignant community.

On a re-perusal of a former part of this Review, we think it probable, that an attempt will be made to create the impression that we have been justifying all that Mr. Webster published in his pamphlet. This, however, we disclaim. Nothing was farther from our intention. Indeed, Mr. W. himself, shortly after he had published his pamphlet, became convinced that there were a few things in it which he could not prove, and in the most candid manner he offered to retract them; but Mr. Stark would not accept of this, but insisted on a retraction of those things which both parties knew to be true; and because Mr. W. could not in conscience do this, he had to pay Mr. Stark *four hundred dollars* as the *price of his character*.

Finally, in answer to those who may charge us of being guilty of "answering a fool according to his folly," it is sufficient to say, that we have endeavored to act according to Matthew Henry's view of the Scripture referred to. After stating that there are cases, in which it would be wrong to "answer a fool according to his folly," such as—"If he tell one great lie, do not thou tell another; if he calumniate thy friend, do not thou calumniate his; if he banter, do not answer him in his own language, &c."—"Yet in other cases," says he, "a wise man will use his wisdom for the conviction of a fool, and when by taking notice of what he saith there may be hopes of *doing good*, or at least *preventing further mischief*, either to himself or others. If thou have reason to think that thy silence will be deemed an evidence of the weakness of thy cause, or of thine own weakness, in such a case *answer him*; and let it be an answer *ad hominem*; beat him at his own weapons, and that will be an answer *ad rem*, or as good as one. If he offer any thing that looks like an argument, answer that, and suit thine answer to his case. If he think, because thou dost not answer him,

what he saith is unanswerable, then give him an answer, *lest he be wise in his own conceit* and boast of a victory." (See *Henry's Commentary on Prov. XXVI. 4, 5.*)

#### ART. II. *Partiality of God.*

If Universalism be true, the following shows how unjust and partial a being God must be. The argument it embodies, never has been, and never can be fairly met. It places Universalism not only in an absurd, but a most ludicrous position. The writer is the Rev. Mr. Hall, of Portsmouth, N. H.—*Zion's Herald.*

The partiality of the Ruler of the world is evinced also, according to Universalism, in the happy removal of the wicked from earth to heaven, while righteous survivors are still subjected to many sorrows.

The more profligate a man becomes, the more does he shorten his life. According to an inspired proverb the wicked do not live out half their days. They die and are borne to heaven, if Universalism may be credited. Having finished their course with joy, having run a race of glaring iniquity, having contended not against the enemies of the soul, but against the cause of holiness and the servants of God to the last moment, having won the crown of public infamy, having become meet for an inheritance with the devil and his angels, they are ushered by the ministering spirits to the abode of the blessed. The glories of heaven beam around them; the bliss of heaven fills their bosoms; the Holy one lavishes upon them the warmest commendations. But where are the miserable survivors, the devout men whose peace they loved to disturb, whose piety they love to deride, whose beneficent plans they love to embarrass? They are doomed to remain in this vale of tears, to breast additional opposition from the replenished ranks of the enemies of godliness. They must weep and struggle for many a tedious year, before the time of their release shall come. They may yet out-live another annoying generation of the ungodly, before they can be discharged from their earthly imprisonment.

Thus the antediluvians were hurried from a life of insufferable wickedness to a heavenly home; and as they looked down from heaven, with what feelings did they observe the faithful Noah as he pursued his lonely voyage over a buried world? With what emotions did they witness his subsequent misfortunes? They could thank God that they were now safe and happy in heaven, while the inmates of the ark were doomed to spend on earth additional years of perplexity and sorrow. Is this justice?

According to Universalism God shortened the lives of the men of Sodom and removed them prematurely, or rather by a fortunate providence, to the abodes of the blessed. At the same time he prolonged the existence of the faithful Lot, under the most painful circumstances. The unhappy man survived the destruction, or rather the salvation of his daughters, the mournful, or rather the happy end of his wavering wife, the loss of his property and the ruin of his town. Was it an equitable procedure to transfer the vile inmates of that polluted city from earth to heaven, while the aged Lot was left to roam in desolation and grief, a wanderer on earth?

Was it just to doom the favored Israelites to a prolonged life amid the burning sands of the desert, while the pursuers, the Egyptian host, were relieved from the work of malignant persecution and transferred to heaven? In a few minutes the latter were drowned, and then their happiness was complete—for forty years the Israelites bore the sufferings of a sojourn in the desert.

Let a man serve God with pious care, and in ordinary circumstances, he will outlive the abandoned voluptuary. His piety will be rewarded by a long exclusion from the joys of heaven. He must stay on earth till he has seen his fondest hopes crushed a hundred times; he must endure separations that will wring his heart; he must live till he becomes an incumbrance to his friends, till he stands a solitary trunk, stripped of its branches; bowing and trembling under every blast; he must endure neglect; he must witness the unconcealed avidity of eager heirs to gain possession of his property; perhaps he outlives his reason and remains a helpless wreck, and his dotage exhausts the patience of all around him. At last death removes the superannuated burden from the world.

Let a profligate young man run into vicious excesses. In a fit of inebriation, or in the hope of concealing crime, he commits a murder; the laws of the land doom him to die. Or, in other words, a kind providence thus favors him with a speedier discharge from the woes of earth. Instead of dragging out a long life, he is borne to heaven, ere he has attained mature age. He is blessed with an earlier release from the perils and vicissitudes of earth than the pious man. But where is the equity of this procedure? In all such instances Universalism charges the Almighty with a flagrant disregard of justice.

We do not affirm that the righteous always outlive the wicked, but when they do, the fact furnishes ground for the charge of partiality, upon the principles of Universalism.

---

### ART. III. *Missionary Intelligence—Madagascar.*

The only intelligence we have lately received from this interesting field of Christian labors and sufferings, comes to us in the Boston Daily Advertiser, from Cape of Good Hope papers to October 10. These papers contain extracts from the letters of a Missionary and several native converts in Madagascar, and also a narrative of the cruel persecutions under which these converts are suffering. We give the abridged account furnished by the Advertiser.

It appears that this persecution is carried on under the express orders of the Queen. The person first sentenced to death was a woman named Rafaravavy. But one of her companions, Rasalama, spoke so boldly in defence of Christianity, that she incurred the anger of the Queen, and was ordered to be put to death. She was severely flogged for several days successively, before she was put to death. She however continued steadfast in her faith, to the end, and met death with calmness and tranquillity. Her companions were valued and sold, and their property confiscated. About a month after, Rafaravavy was informed that the wrath of the Queen had abated, since the death of Rasalama, and that her irons might be taken off. She was however placed among those reduced to perpetual slavery.

After this the remaining Christians began to assemble in the night, at the house of Rafaralahy, where they read together the words of eternal

life, conversed together on spiritual things, and united in prayer and praise. This indulgence continued but a short time. They were betrayed to the government, Rafaralahy was put in irons, and every effort was made to extort from him the names of his companions. But he remained inflexible in his resolution not to betray his friends. After being kept in irons two or three days, he was taken to the place of execution and speared to death. The calmness with which he met his death made a deep impression on the minds of his executioners. He spoke to them on his way to the place of execution, of Jesus Christ, and how happy he felt at the thought of seeing in a few minutes Him who loved him and died for him. At the place of execution, a few moments being granted him at his request, he offered up a fervent prayer for his persecuted brethren, and commended his soul to Jesus. He then with perfect composure, laid himself down, and was immediately put to death. He was 25 years of age, and of a respectable family. He was not baptized, and did not take a prominent part in the promotion of Christianity, until after the commencement of the persecutions.

After this execution, the persecution was pressed with still greater rigor. The government determined, if possible, to secure all the companions of Rafaralahy. Several of them were seized, and afterwards made their escape. Many incidents, showing the distress to which the Christians were reduced, are related. A large number were obliged to conceal themselves in the houses of their friends, some in the forests, numbers were sold to slavery, and some were in irons. The Queen proposed to the chief officers to put every one of the Christians to death—to destroy completely all the roots, that no sprout might spring up hereafter. But some of her officers advised her against this, saying, “it is the nature of the religion of the whites, the more you kill the more the people will receive it.” Six of the Christians, finding there was no means of safety in the island, unless they renounced their religion, were endeavoring to make their escape. But this it was difficult to accomplish. A plan was concerted, however, by which it was hoped they would effect their escape to Mauritius.

---

#### ART. IV. Notices.

The Review published in the present No. has excluded almost all other matter. It is of greater length than was anticipated. If any other *apology* for its insertion be required than what is stated in the introduction to it, it may be found in the fact, that we have of late been called upon from different sections of our church, to vindicate her judicatories from the foul aspersions cast upon them by the editor of the Magazine. We have been told that, as the professed organ of the Associate church, she claimed this service at our hands; that some of her members were shamefully imposed upon; that there was danger of the mischief increasing unless met by the application of a suitable remedy; that we must not be contented to deal in *generals*, but must condescend to *particulars*, &c. &c. Hence, much as this kind of business is repugnant to our feelings, a necessity has been laid upon us to write and publish the aforesaid Review. We could indeed have gladly drawn a veil over the “multitude of sins” which we have exposed, had such a course been consistent with the claims of truth, the interests of a much abused church, and a sense of duty. We hope that if again called on to notice these disagreeable matters, we shall be enabled to use greater brevity.

☞ The Communications and *Letters* lying on hand will all be attended to as soon as practicable—perhaps in the next number.

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

MARCH, 1839.

---

*ART. I. A Word of Admonition and Warning to Congregations.*

To make a choice of one to be a pastor, is one of the most important transactions to which a christian people can be called. The account which the scriptures give of his work is sufficient proof of this. To "preach the unsearchable riches of Christ"—to "teach them to observe *all things whatsoever Christ has commanded*"—to "perfect the saints and edify the body of Christ, till they all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God"—is a work most honorable indeed, and it is also most holy and pure. He that toucheth it should be holy in his faith, his motives and conversation;—faithful as a steward of the mysteries of God;—giving to every one his portion of meat in due season;—It is his constant duty to "take heed to himself and to his doctrine," every thing depends on it—"for in so doing he shall both save himself and them that hear him." He must be "crucified to the world and the world to him." His leading desire must be "to know nothing among them save Jesus Christ, and him crucified." He must be incessant in prayer—and "instant in season and out of season, reproving, rebuking, and exhorting with all long suffering and doctrine." He is bound to show himself a pattern in all things, "in doctrine showing uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity, sound speech that can not be condemned." He must endure the hardness of a good soldier;—and finally, he must deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow his Master whithersoever he goes. Surely, to choose according to this model, is no slight or trivial matter. It is not the time to gratify taste or please the fancy.

The solemn charges which are given to the man, proceed upon the awful import of his work. It will extend even to the day of judgment, and affect its proceedings. After writing a whole epistle of charges and directions to the pastor, the inspired Apostle concludes in this solemn manner: "I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all

things, and Jesus Christ, who before Pontius Pilate, witnessed a good confession, that thou keep this commandment without spot unrebukeable until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ." (1 Tim. vi. 13.) And a second epistle concludes in the same solemn manner; "I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom, preach the word, be instant in season, out of season, reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long suffering and doctrine." (2 Tim. iv. 1, 2.) Titus receives in substance the same charge, to "speak the things that become sound doctrine."—"In all things showing thyself a pattern of good works, &c."—"Holding fast the faithful word as thou hast been taught;" and all this he was to do, "Looking for the blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ."

With his eye upon the judgment seat ought the pastor to go through all his labor—under the solemn impression that it must be reviewed that day by him whose eyes are as a flame of fire. And by nothing that is less solemn ought the minds of the people to be impressed when they proceed to call him to this work.

The exceeding greatness of the promise too, which is made to him who is called to the work, strongly implies that the giving of the call ought to be a matter of weight and seriousness on their minds. "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." "My presence shall go with and I will give you rest." What affront do you offer to the infinite Holy Majesty that would call a man to come to you in the confidence of these words to gratify a taste for fine speaking? Must not that necessarily be consonant with the divine wisdom, and in harmony with all the perfections of God, to which he will thus pledge his supporting presence?—"Teaching them to observe *all things whatsoever* I have commanded you." Will you have your minister to do any thing *less*, or any thing beyond this, in hope that Christ will still say, "Lo, I am with you?" No, certainly. Had Moses fallen in with the views of the multitude, and faced about to Egypt, or had the Apostles ventured to propose things of their own device, this great promise would instantly have become as great a threatening, and consuming wrath would have met them at every step. "If we, or an angel from Heaven, preach any other gospel than that we have preached, let him be accursed." Christ's very promise to support his servants, his faithful servants, becomes a sword to fight against them in every thing in which they depart from his commands.

How highly necessary, then, must it be to a people that they have "those things which Christ has commanded," neither more nor less, as the end of their call? As they value Christ's promise to themselves and their pastor, and as they dread his displeasure, let "these things," and only these, be all their purpose and desire in the matter.

The man who stands in the pastor's place, whatever his special views may be, occupies a commanding station. In the pulpit, he has the opportunity of addressing the community at large on all the concerns of the eternal state. And it is to be expected that as is the priest so is the people. They will imperceptibly form after his model. He has access to put forth all his influence upon the leading principles in every circle of society, from the family to the highest and largest association. He has a vote in all the great questions in the ecclesiastical court, which are to affect the interests of religion over the church. He touches all things affecting the welfare, not only of his cotemporary generation, but the suc-

ceeding and unborn, either directing them to the strait gate or the broad descending path to destruction—holding up the true light in the church or beguiling her into the ways of apostacy which end in utter darkness. His influence is immense, and when very popular, the confidence that is placed in him is unbounded. When he belies the hopes of a confiding people, and falls from his integrity, the shock is tremendous. It is like the main pillars of a building giving way—the mind is filled with terror and dismay, and knows not which way to turn for safety. As when the ark of God was taken, the heart of the godly is stricken with grief and sorrow, and the uncircumcised triumph. How grave a matter, then, is it for a people to choose a man for this place? What need to have the mind enlightened by the glory of Christ, and the heart established in the love of the truth?—To have the whole soul ascending in prayer for the accomplishment of that promise—“I will send them pastors according to my heart, which shall feed my people with knowledge,” when they come together to perform this grave act? What need is there to be not hasty—to make close and painful inquiry after his true sentiments—manner of life and particular conduct—to take the utmost heed to his strain of doctrine and the savor of his daily conversation—how vast is the importance to themselves, and the whole church, to ascertain with precision his understanding and attachment to the peculiar principles of the profession—that all these things be weighed in the balance of the sanctuary? Let not a first impression carry the judgment. This were to trifle with one of the most weighty and sacred matters. Many things concur to make a first impression fallacious. The first appearances of a candidate are generally more guarded, and his first discourses more highly embellished. The curiosity of all is strongly excited to hear the new man, and he is unwilling that they should go away displeased or disappointed. If he is young, the fancy of the young is taken with him on that account, and their influence on a vote, though indirect, is frequently great. A young preacher does not always know his own views—his mind has not been brought to bear on many questions of great interest. It is only future trials and incidents that bring forth the whole man to view—therefore, beware of first impressions, they are not to be trusted.

But for a christian people, professing to be Christ's witnesses, and looking forward to the judgment seat—deciding upon the man that is to prepare them for it, by his personal appearance, his graceful air, his fine voice, rhetorical gestures and eloquent speaking—how shall I express the enormity of their trifling with eternal things! It is foolish madness! horrible guiltiness!

When there is a keen relish for the sincere milk of the word, and an ardent desire after Christ, such things will have no power to fascinate. In vain will you offer the finest dish to a child at the breast of its mother, and in like manner will all such exterior ornaments be esteemed by a people that is thirsting for the word of God. The preacher who puts them not out of conceit with themselves—who makes not the light of the sun of righteousness shine into the depths of their hearts—and discovers not the monstrous iniquities that lie concealed there from human view—who sends them not away loathing themselves—longing for evangelical holiness—and in love with “the Chief among ten thousand”—is not the man of *their* choice. The man that palliates their iniquities, and flatters their pride and vanity, that they may in their turn flatter his, excites their pity and their prayers, but never their admiration.

But, unhappily, christian congregations are not always in this good

condition. They frequently lose their appetite for the manna, and long for the flesh pots, the onions and the garlic. At such times, a man of a much lower tone will suit their taste. And when it is a time of general decline, and love is waxing cold, and the heart is warm towards the world, those qualifications which are of greatest concern to the soul are never brought into view. The deciding questions are like the frame of the heart which formed them. Is he a popular speaker?—moving and pathetic? Is he likely to fill the seats?—*raise the salary?*—and gather a large and popular congregation?

It happens often in such a low time, that congregations conceive an idea that there is something peculiar in their case requiring a very choice and peculiar man to suit them—a man of rare qualifications, that will catch the fancy and please the taste of their vicinity—a great man, able to preach to great people. Such an idea soon gathers weight as it circles round, and decides the public mind; and they *must have such a man or none*. And when they have espied him, or think they have, they will compass sea and land to obtain him. *Money in figures* loads the subscription paper; a splendid church, and crimsoned off, must be built. A private anti-Presbyterial embassy must be sent to negotiate. 'Tis well if it stop here, but I forbear the rest.

Perhaps they do not succeed then, because not sustained by right principles; their hopes are dashed to the ground; and in a fit of despondency they give up the whole matter. At least, this will be the case with many individuals. Whereas, had all been right in their motives and desires, they would say to this effect: God is sovereign in sending a fixed dispensation to a particular congregation, as much as in sending the gospel to the Gentiles at first—I will wait with my soul for God. If the vision tarry, it is for a set time. The time set will come. And Zion shall be built.

Perhaps they succeed, and get their supposed great man. And it may be this will be the greater disappointment of the two, and the beginning of sorrows. They are now so big with expectations that it is not possible for man, encompassed with infirmity, to meet them. Mankind in general are easily flattered, and ministers are not invincible. The very winds will whisper in the ear of this pastor elect the people's soft insinuation. It touches all the springs of his soul, and they move in willing accordance to it. He is a great man and expects a great people, and mutual disappointment can scarcely fail to follow. Still this is the least of the evils. The tongue cannot utter either the multitude or magnitude of the wickedness and woe that have arisen in the church from beginnings like this.

Is this great man a modern Judas? For pieces of silver he will betray his Master (the people or the cause, or both) with a kiss. Is he a Diotrephes and *loves* the pre-eminence? he will soon begin "to prate with malicious words," instead of preaching Christ. Is he "proud?" he will presently "dote about questions and strifes of words." Is he a Demas? he will love the world in some shape better than the church: And she must go with him and conform to the world, or he will leave her to shift for herself. Is he a Pope? he will claim to be worshipped. What can hungry souls expect from such? At the very most—"nothing but light food, and their soul is dried away;" and perhaps the "waters are so bitter that they cannot drink at all, and they who drink die." The life and power of faith is gone—love and humility, meekness and confidence, with all the sister graces, ashamed at the conduct of their pattern

and leader, are unwilling to stay behind. Public spirit faints at the sight clean away. And none laments, not a tear is shed. Then cold civility and hypocritical compliment, party purposes and selfish aims, occupy their places.

And now, christian reader, how do you think the Lord Jesus Christ will look upon all this? He has been highly dishonored. A worm has been put in his place. A worm whom his favor and bounty distinguished. How has he been slighted! the shining of the glow-worm has been preferred to the splendor of the sun. His authority in the thing which he has commanded has been disregarded, and the promise of his presence has passed for nothing in forming this unhallowed relation. His bride hath basely violated her engagements and taken up with another lover. His ordinances have been prostituted. The wall of his vineyard has been broken down—the sheep of his flock scattered and torn.

These are heavy charges doubtless. On whom do they fall in this case? On this man, say the people. Right, but are the *people* clear? Nay, verily. They are partakers with him in all this guilt and shame. Did he “love the pre-eminence?” they raised the platform to let him up. Has he betrayed his Master? They promised him money. Is he proud, they flattered him. Has he loved the world and debauched and ruined the church? they followed and gave him countenance.

Let none be so deluded as to expect from Christ a blessing on this work. As soon may you expect from him his *throne*. And neutral He *cannot* be. Listen to the *awful* words that break from his lips—“These things saith the Son of God, who hath his eyes as a flame of fire, and his feet like unto fine brass. I know thy works—behold, I will cast her into a bed, and them that commit adultery with her into great tribulation, except they repent of their deeds. And I will kill her children with *death*, and all the churches shall know that I am He that searcheth the hearts and the reins, and I will give to every one of you according to your works.” Terrible things! and they are threatened on those who commit fornication and adultery, and eat things sacrificed to idols. And they who put a man in Christ’s place are guilty of them. They have been often executed since they were first uttered. And still they are threatened. Often has his blasting word fallen upon the much admired talents as it did upon the barren fig-tree, and dried them up by the roots. Consider this and be afraid, ye that overlook, supplant, betray him, lest he tear you in pieces and then there is no deliverer.

A word or two to the serious and I have done.

What has the church to expect from ordinances, unless Christ’s presence be in them? You will probably say, nothing—no water to the panting soul, no refreshment to the hungry, no strength to him that is ready to faint, nothing conducive to the preparing of the soul for glory. And this is true. But then it is not all the truth. If his presence be not in them, they are *deadly*—the mind is puffed up, the heart is hardened, and the people sit down content with the form of godliness, and deny the power of it. And when the great day of reckoning comes, all the talents of God’s creation cannot balance their loss.

Again, if Christ’s presence is in his ordinances, what will be wanting to make up the comfort, the peace, and growth in grace of the believer? You will plainly say, nothing. His presence makes every word of truth to be food—darkness to be light—every bitter thing to be sweet. I do not say that it will make bad grammar to be good, or awkward gestures to stand with the rules of rhetoric, but it will make them invisible. You

will be like the captive princess, who saw not Cyrus for looking at the man—her husband, who offered his life for her liberty.

Now, in a word—What sort of men have they *generally* been, whom Christ has called to the work, and whose labors he has most remarkably blessed? Turn to the 1st chap. of 1 Corinth. 26th verse :—“Not many wise men after the flesh—not many mighty—not many noble are called. But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and God hath chosen the *weak* things of the world to confound the things that are mighty. And base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen—yea, and things that are not, to bring to nought things that are, *that no flesh may glory in his presence.*”

A. G.

---

**ART. II.** *Further Reflections on the Treatment of our Colored Population.*

**MR. EDITOR**—I come now to speak of our common guilt in reference to our treatment of the unfortunate African race. Before entering on that subject, I wish very briefly to notice your remarks contained in the September No.

You say I am still in the dark on the subject of slavery. The truth of that proposition I feel no disposition to controvert, and cannot but entreat others who are more enlightened, to dispel the gloom with which I may be surrounded. The only boon I crave is, that I may be permitted to lay my complaint fully before them, that their prescriptions may prove radical and complete. This I speak not in ironical bitterness, but in the simplicity of my heart. While, however, professing a willingness, as her votary, to drink at every fountain opened by truth, I must proclaim my resolution, as her enlisted soldier, to fight wherever I see her banner wave. Candor and plainness becomes the importance of the subject, and the perilous condition of our common country. The action of this generation touching the subject of slavery, may not only affect our future happiness, but on it may depend our existence as a nation. It becomes the christian, then, to put on his armor and assume his station in the front of the embattled host, not to urge furious factions to deeds of carnage and destruction, but to point out the path of duty with that firmness, meekness, and abiding confidence, which a righteous cause and a clear conscience never fail to inspire.

I must be singularly unfortunate in the use of language, as it seems I cannot make myself fairly understood. To speak of slavery as an institution of God, has never been my purpose, unless a tolerated evil may be so regarded. Since comparisons are considered well adapted to convey ideas distinctly, I shall introduce one to illustrate my sentiments and views. Suppose a person was to do some unlawful deed, by which all the members and functions of his body became infected with a paralyzing and loathsome disease, would his suffering under that disease be sinful? Would it be sinful in him if he failed to use such limbs as had become impotent, before they were restored to strength? Duty would require him to resort to every proper means to have his health restored, that he might attain a perfect use of all his members, in their various and

complicated functions, and wherein he failed to do so, he would be culpable. This may serve to illustrate our moral condition. Slavery among mankind, in all its phases, may be regarded as a part of this disease, and ought undoubtedly to be eradicated; but in the body social, as in the body physical, much injury may be done by the application of violent or improper remedies, so it is highly imprudent to make, or attempt to make, a diseased limb perform the functions of a sound one.

But am I 'certainly mistaken' in supposing that tyranny and oppression are not essential to slavery. I think I can not be mistaken. The Jews were permitted to buy *persons*; these persons were declared to be their money, and were subject to their control. Long before this permission was given, the slave trade was regularly carried on. Now, were those persons not slaves when their masters owned them as property, and exercised authority over them as persons? Free men they could not be, and I know of no neutral ground on which to place them. That they were not precisely in the same condition with our slaves may be admitted, for perhaps no two people ever held slaves exactly in the same way. Now God surely will not, surely he cannot, give a written permissive grant to a creature as a rule of action, which is essentially morally wrong. This argument appears to me, at least, to be conclusive and invulnerable. The divine law, so far as I know, grants no permission to sell a man, and herein is its beauty and benevolence manifested. We may buy a man in the exercise of the kindest feelings and noblest sentiments of our nature, but if we sell one, the promptings must come from the very fountain of mischief itself. But can we not imagine a case in which it would be an act of mercy and benevolence to *enslave* a person? It is well known, that among men in a rude stage of society, it is the law and the usage, too, to slay all captives taken in war; even the Jews were allowed to do this, if the enemy refused the first offer of capitulation. Now, suppose a chieftain more humane than his fellows, instead of killing his captives, would take them into his family and service, and treat them kindly, would he be guilty of a breach of the divine law? Surely he would not. In his conduct towards them he might not come up fully to its injunctions, (who does do so) but he would be manifestly reaching forward to those things that are before. Our great sin in this land is, not that we have slaves, but that we are not striving with laudable and enlightened zeal to benefit them. We are sinning in fact against light and knowledge, and instead of going forward we are going backward, drawing the chain of bondage tighter and tighter.

Were not the directions and admonitions of the sacred writers, given as a rule of conduct for servants, addressed to persons bound in involuntary servitude? Have there not been in all ages of the world a large portion of the human family in that condition, and can we suppose that a compassionate God has entirely overlooked them? It is clearly evident, then, that the directions referred to have special respect to such persons, or they have been altogether neglected. On which horn of this dilemma those doctors choose to hang, who insist that the relationship of master and slave is sinful, is for themselves to determine, but on one of them hang they surely must. Voluntary servitude is a strange conception. Rational men will not engage to do service without compensation, and if they do so for compensation, they exercise an unquestionable attribute of freedom, the obligations being mutual and reciprocal betwixt the parties contracting, one engaging to do one thing and the other engaging to do another thing. If they can be called servants at all,

they must be servants to each other. What there is in the condition of persons thus exercising the high functions of free men, which calls for sympathy and condolence, it is difficult to conceive.

I am slow to believe that I misinterpret the Synod's late act. If Synod did not intend to dissolve the relationship of master and slave within the bounds of our communion, it is difficult to conceive what was the object in view, and should this bond be dissolved, I am at a loss to see how the consequences pointed out could be avoided. I must think that A—B—in my last communication occupies the scriptural ground on which a slave-holder ought to stand; he gives his slave full compensation for all his labor, the extra labor spoken of being that which he performs for his master, when not tilling his allotted field, the master performing for him the combined office of protector, guardian and overseer. It is true there is nothing said about dissolving the relationship of master and slave, for the very obvious reason, that it cannot be done without the action of the commonwealth. In fact, in the present situation of the country, such a dissolution, if practicable, could operate only to the disadvantage of the slave, without conferring a solitary benefit. It is well known to those who are conversant with the laws of the slave-holding States, that the slaves have no legal existence as persons, that they cannot appear as parties in any law-suit before the lowest courts of justice, nor can they acquire, own, or convey the most insignificant piece of property, nor sustain an action for personal abuse. Hence the necessity of a guardian and protector. 'A writing declaratory of his freedom,' would convey to the slave neither right nor privilege; indeed, for any thing that is good, it would prove entirely nugatory, though for harm it might not be so. Could any honest, conscientious master make such a solemn declaration, whilst his relation to the slave remained in other respects unchanged? In what an awkward predicament would it place him? How could he, after having done so, appear before the law tribunals of the land, and aver that this person whom he declared to be free was *his slave*, and that the property which he had earned was his property. This he would be compelled to do, in order to protect the person of the slave and the property which was in his hand.

Such declaration could not even secure freedom of action for one hour, nor his domicile from continued inspection, because it would be unjust to require protection and exact accountability, where there was no authority to control. Let us point out precisely what the condition of this person would be after this solemn declaration had been made. He would not have the control of his own person; if assaulted, he could obtain no redress; he could neither earn, own, or convey property; he could collect no debts; he could make no contracts; his house would be continually open to the inspection of another; himself and family, and the property in his hands, would be subject to execution and sale, to pay the debts of his master; himself and family would descend *as slaves* to the heirs of his master, at his master's decease; he could enjoy no right, nor exercise any privilege, civil or political! Is it not perversion of language, as intimated in my last, to call such a person a *free man* in any sense whatever? On these points, however, I must not enlarge, but turn to the subject proposed for consideration.

Here, I doubt not, my views will be stoutly controverted by many a proud, hardened sinner, and perhaps they will be so dealt with, even by some who are meek and lowly saints. To excuse ourselves, and lay blame on others, is an old device of Satan, and bespeaks us the genuine

offspring of our original apostate progenitor. It is painful to notice the many conclusive evidences which daily present themselves to our eyes, that thousands living in the non-slave-holding part of our country regard the guilt of slavery as resting entirely on the heads of the slave-holders, and that they themselves are guiltless. At almost every political meeting, we hear the sentiment iterated and reiterated that slavery is a subject in which the slave-holders alone are interested, and that of course it ought to be left entirely to their management and control, and that for others to meddle with it bespeaks a disposition to interfere with things that do not concern them. Even the religious part of the community seem unconscious of the existence of a stronger plea for the steps which they take in opposition to slavery than that of benevolence to the unfortunate, and the preservation of ordinances in their purity. The idea that they have incurred guilt, and that a sacrifice is due, that atonement may be made, appears never once to cross their minds. While this condition of things endures, what can we expect to accomplish? Conviction of sin must precede works that are meet for repentance, and assuredly, so long as we, Pharisee-like, stand by clothed with garments deeply stained with guilt and say to our brethren, come not near me, 'I am holier than thou,' we need never look to Heaven for a blessing on our efforts.

We of the free States, by denying any participation in the guilt of slavery, not only do injustice to our own souls, but we cast from us the most efficient weapon we can use in behalf of the bond man. While we inculcate this idea, well may the slave-holder upbraid us with officious intermeddling, and in derision point to the millions in every land suffering from cruel tyranny, as equally fit subjects of our sympathy and care. But were we to approach them, acknowledging that we participated in contracting the guilt, that we have lent our aid in sustaining the odious system, and that we fear the wrath of offended Heaven if justice be not speedily extended to the oppressed, far different might be the reception of our expostulations and entreaties.

I shall argue, and I trust, shall prove our community of guilt, from three sources of evidence, viz: from the manner in which it was incurred, from the manner in which the system has been upheld, and from the nature of those judgments which are likely to be inflicted on this land on account of it.

As brevity must be consulted, we can only glance at the volumes of evidence which crowd upon us at every turn. Indeed, were it not that the position assumed is so generally either flatly denied or carelessly overlooked, it would seem to be labor spent in vain, to prove a point already written in sunbeams on every page of our country's history. It is not necessary to analyze with philosophic nicety, the sentiments and feelings of the age in which the poor Africans began to be transported from their native land to our continent, and chained in cruel bondage. After all that may be said of the rudeness of the period in which it was done, after all that can be plead of its barbarous ignorance and the little knowledge then attained as to civil rights and religious liberty, it must ever remain a dark, a bloody page, disgraceful to the christian name. That Protestant England followed so closely in the footsteps of the mother of harlots, in filling up a chasm which she had made by her cruelty in one continent, by barbarously transporting colonists in chains from another, redounds nothing to the wisdom of her counsels nor to the glory of her arms. At such a time and under such circumstances, as an integral part of the British empire, these States emerged from that obscurity which had enveloped

their history in all former ages, and it is melancholy to reflect, that although the light of science burst upon the nations with a radiance perhaps never equalled, that although the rights of man and the liberty of conscience became well understood, yet it brought no mitigation to the suffering and helpless African. Although a burning and a shining light might here and there arise, pleading, as an angel of mercy, the cause of weeping humanity, it was but to become extinct amidst a moral gloom which its own light had rendered more visible. Mammonism, that moral madness of the soul, had become the epidemic of the day, and humanity, with all her soothing eloquence, and religion, with all her benevolence, with all her hopes, with all her fears, were impotent to move the human heart.

That we, as a component part of the British nation, partook of this odious traffic to the extent of our means, both as sellers and buyers, will not be doubted, and the only point that admits of question is, whether any part of the guilt rested on our heads, inasmuch as the ruling power of the commonwealth was in the mother country, and we were at that time in a state of colonial vassalage? But whatever plea of justification might be urged in our favor, on account of our not being permitted to participate in acts of sovereignty whilst in our nonage, it must forever vanish when we reflect that, on arriving at the age of maturity, and taking full possession of our patrimony, we confirmed to the utmost extent, and fully acknowledged as our own, these iniquitous transgressions of our guardian. Not only did we continue to hold in bondage those who had already been transported to our shores, but, as if it were the purpose of Heaven to leave us without the shadow of excuse, the traffic for a time was carried on with the utmost avidity. Nor was it the work of this or that State over which others could properly exercise no control, but it was the work of all. From New Hampshire on the north to Georgia on the south, all appear to have participated in the unholy deed, some as kidnapers, some as slavers or carriers, some as sellers, some as buyers.

Here then is evidence, clear as the noon-day sun, that the north and the south stand deeply implicated in guilt, but it may be questioned whether the free States in the interior stand reeking with the blood of their fellow beings. It is true, indeed, that if the inhabitants of those States had come from regions where such traffic was unknown, and where the rights of man were not trodden under foot, an exemption from the contraction of this guilt might be plead with plausibility, but how the mere change of our local habitations could purge us from moral impurities, it would be difficult to divine. This guilt attaches not to our mountains, to our valleys, to our rivers, nor to any other feature of external nature around us, but lies deep within, and must there remain until deep repentance, accompanied by the exercise of justice and kindness, shall give evidence that it has been removed.

(To be continued.)

---

### ART. III. *Inceptum occultare proditores.*

MR. EDITOR:

In glancing over the pages of the new periodical which has recently

appeared among us, entitled "The Associate Presbyterian Magazine," my eye accidentally fell upon the following words:—"Unavailing efforts for peace."\* Such a title, in such a publication, I had not looked for; the thing appeared incredible; and I was almost on the point of suspecting some visual illusion. The glasses were removed, and yet the same words met the naked eye; the handkerchief was freely applied to those faithful friends of the eyes, when they were replaced, and lo, the same words still appeared! *The editor of the Magazine engaged in unavailing efforts for peace!*

Having satisfied myself that I had read correctly, I was compelled to refer the mistake to the editor, when the title prefixed to this paper immediately suggested itself as a suitable correction; or if that be thought too strong, the reader may substitute—"An attempt to conceal iniquity." For such is believed to be the true character of the article entitled, by a strange misnomer, "Unavailing efforts for peace." This is my deliberate, and I hope, unbiassed judgment. And I hope to prove, by an appeal to facts, that I have not erred in judgment. For I would not, knowingly, inflict injury upon any man living, much less upon any who profess to love our Lord Jesus Christ; and if the following pages contain errors, I call upon the friends of truth to correct them. But if they shall be found to contain nothing but what is according to truth and righteousness; if the facts be true; if the principles and the reasoning be according "to the law and the testimony," the purity and prosperity of the Associate Church, the spiritual interests of her members and their children, imperiously demand that they should be acted upon by the Synod.

This article sets forth that a majority of the late Synod:—

1. "Manifested opposition" to the peace and edification of the church.

2. That "it is admitted ON ALL HANDS" that our "difficulties arise not from error in doctrine, or immorality of conduct in ANY"—but from "a spirit of contention" and "unceasing persecution."

3. That "there was no peace in the words, none in the actions," of a majority of Synod.

4. That "they resolved to exercise power in rending and destroying more and more."

5. That they manifested their impiety by rejecting a proposition to set apart a day "for the exercises of prayer and fasting."

6. That "the elder from Allegheny was insulted and embarrassed by the sneers and levity of some members" while delivering a "feeling address."

7. That "war, even to extermination was in their hearts!"

And what do you think, reader, is the evidence adduced to prove these heavy charges? Simply the rejection of six resolutions which they say were "prepared by the Rev. J. Rodgers,† with the concurrence of other western ministers." And what were these talismanic resolutions, that were, as by magic, to restore peace to a suffering community, and the rejection of which manifested war in the heart, even to extermination? All that is important in these resolutions is contained in the 2d, 5th and 6th, as the reader may easily discover by referring to them in the Maga-

\* See Associate Presbyterian Magazine for September, 1838, p. 80.

† It is due to Mr. Rodgers to say, that the writer has been informed that these resolutions were not prepared by him: he can, however, speak for himself. It is a matter of no consequence who prepared the resolutions; it is with their pernicious principles that we contend.

zine. The 2d provides that "Messrs. Stalker and Stark, and Drs. A. and P. Bullions, be considered in good standing in their respective Presbyteries; that all proceedings pending in their case be stayed, and all censures removed." The 5th provides that "all parties concerned in these unhappy difficulties above referred to, be admonished, in future to avoid agitating the subjects which have brought on these difficulties." The 6th provides that "the bond for covenanting be read, and the obligations recognized by the members of this Synod."

It is proposed to make a few remarks, *first*, upon these resolutions, and *secondly*, endeavor to show that the *reviling accusations* of the Magazine, founded upon their rejection by the Synod, are utterly groundless.

And respecting the resolutions, let it be observed that they propose to stay all proceedings, remove all censures, stop the mouths of every member of Synod against the moral delinquencies of the four brethren therein named, however aggravating and flagrant their conduct may be. In a word, they propose to *abrogate* the discipline of the Associate Church in the case of these brethren. What a reproach, what ignominy, can atone for the crime of a majority of the Synod in refusing to *abolish* rules of discipline which they had solemnly covenanted to God and with their brethren, to maintain "in all places and through life!"

But in order to understand the true character of these resolutions, it will be necessary to notice the peculiar relation in which the four brethren stood to the Synod at the time they were offered.

The first named, Mr. STALKER, a member of the Presbytery of Cambridge, had "denied the right constitution of that Presbytery"—had accused them "of a want of brotherly love, of acting *solely* from a spirit of suspicion and cruel jealousy," and had declared his determination to support Dr. A. Bullions "in his disobedience to Presbytery," &c. And when arraigned before Presbytery to answer for this conduct, he declined their authority, for which he was deposed. For a full statement of the case, see the Presbytery's published Narrative.

The *second*, Dr. A. Bullions, had been deposed by the same Presbytery, on a great number of charges, such as slander, deception, and giving currency to anonymous slanderous letters, one of which contained a forged post-mark, was addressed to himself, in his own hand writing, and contained a foot note, which was also in his hand; and had finally declined their authority. For particulars in this case, see also the above named Narrative.

The *third*, the Rev. A. Stark, had been charged by the Presbytery of Albany, in 1836, with "writing and publishing pamphlets of a mendacious, calumnious and ribaldish character"—with "defaming and slandering church courts"—and "the character of individuals"—with "lying" and "injurious misrepresentations"—with publishing pamphlets breathing an infidel spirit, of an infidel tendency, and containing profanations of God's holy word"—and with "employing scurrilous and ribaldish language." And after he had been cited three times, he declined their authority, without an appeal to Synod, in the following words:—"My absence need not hinder the Rev. Presbytery from doing just as they please with their libel, because I do not think that in present circumstances I can in any way countenance their proceedings, and I hereby give notice that I protest against their interfering with me in any way, and that I shall hold as null and void, and of no account, whatever decisions they may make." The Presbytery then referred the libel *simpliciter* to Synod, reserving the right, however, to deal with Mr. Stark for his de-

clinature and for language used in it.\* The Synod of 1836, accepted, tried, and found the libel proved. Mr. S. declined their authority: he was suspended. (See Rel. Mon. vol. 13, p. 40.) Through the *ex parte* statements of his friends, and in the absence of those who *knew all the facts*, the Synod of 1837 agreed to *review* the deed of suspension, and admitted him to a seat without reviewing. He returns, claims his seat in the Presbytery of Albany, (while he distinctly refuses to retract his former declination,) which of course was refused. And in 1838, he declines the authority of the Synod, and abandons the communion of the church, because the Synod sustained the Presbytery of Albany in excluding a man from a seat who persisted in declining their authority! And in this, he has been joined by others, who are now actively engaged in the charitable and christian work of calumniating their former brethren! This is the true state of the case. Let the editor of the Magazine and his coadjutors mystify and misrepresent, and lurk behind technicalities, and present false issues, as they please, this is the true state of the case; and the facts here exhibited have become matters of historical record.

The *fourth* named brother, the Rev. Dr. P. Bullions, had been charged with "insubordination"—"misrepresenting and slandering his Presbytery"—"misrepresenting facts in a paper given to Mr. Stark and published in one of his pamphlets." This paper contains statements false and slanderous respecting Mr. Webster, and was read in Synod in 1837, when Mr. W. was not present to vindicate himself.

Now the above enumerated charges, which lie against the four brethren, are either true or false. If false, why have they uniformly refused to abide a trial in violation of their ordination vows? Mr. Stark told the Synod, that he did not wish to be tried by any ecclesiastical court! Would honorable men rest under such imputations? Would they not *demand* a trial? But it is of no consequence what men would or would not do; the Synod had no alternative left them. They must either demand a trial or abandon their profession. They chose the former. But if these charges *are true*, and their refusal to be tried furnishes us with a warrant to assume their truth, then their reproaches and slanders are trivial in comparison with the calamity to the church, that must have attended their continuance among us. I can say in reference to their separation, in the language attributed to the Rev. A. Gordon, "*I am truly thankful for it.*"

But the sixth resolution proposes a new species of covenanting, heretofore unknown in the Secession Church. It has always been customary in the secession to introduce solemn public covenanting work, with a humble, full and public *confession* of sins, and then to *swear* and subscribe the bond. But here we have a proposition first to *conceal* iniquity, then *read* the bond, and call upon members to recognize its obligation. In what manner this obligation was to be recognized, whether by swearing, subscribing, or a simple nod of the head, the resolution saith not. It must have been a most heart-rending calamity to these pious brethren, not to be permitted to covenant in this summary manner with

---

\* Without impeaching the Presbytery or Synod, the reference by the Presbytery, and acceptance and trial by the Synod of this libel, has ever been regarded by the writer as a serious error, which more than any thing else, enabled Mr. Stark to raise a party against the discipline of the church. Accordingly, we find that Mr. Stark, or the editor of the Magazine, now taunts them with this false lenity. The course pointed out by the Book of Discipline should have been followed.

dear brethren who manifested war in the heart, war, even to extermination!

Again: The adoption of these resolutions would have been to confound all distinction between the guilty and the innocent—to “condemn the righteous and justify the wicked.” “All parties concerned” were to “be admonished to avoid agitating the subjects which brought on these difficulties.” That is, those persons who had had things laid to their charge which they knew not, were to be admonished not even to declare their innocence. They were quietly to acknowledge themselves guilty of any crime which the malicious might choose to fix upon them, however conscious they might be of innocence, and however strong might be the evidence against their calumniators! And not only so; they were to “stay all proceedings” and “remove all censures,” against fraud, deceit, lying, slander, open and concealed, the circulation of anonymous letters with forged post-marks, addressed to the person who put them in circulation in his own hand-writing, and of pamphlets of an infidel tendency! Any church court which could for a moment so far lose sight of its high and responsible duties, as to adopt such a resolution, would indeed be unworthy the confidence of children.

This has been a favorite resort with our delinquent brethren. When called to account, by the constituted authorities of the church, for their aberrations from the path of duty, they have acknowledged “acts of indiscretion”—“unchristian feelings and motives”—“a spirit of contention and persecution.” (For, say they, “it is admitted on *all hands*, that there is at least as much that is worthy of blame on the *one side* as on the *other*.”) But then the principles of church policy, which we have indeed sworn to maintain, are “despotic”—contrary to “civil and religious liberty”—lead those who adopt them to “imbibe a persecuting spirit”—and “extinguish all generous sentiments” towards our sins. When we made a solemn profession of these principles of church policy, we never intended that they should be applied to us. We only intended them as a rod to be held over the heads of such as might refuse to yield us that respect and deference, which we judge due to our superior merits; or who might have the temerity to expose our schemes of personal aggrandizement!

But then we are willing to confess “indiscretion,” if you will only do the same. Though we have slandered our brethren, they ought to acknowledge themselves as equally guilty with us! Though we have professed obedience to church courts, they are fallible; they have erred, and may err again; therefore we insist that they shall confess themselves guilty, and then we will acknowledge *our* guilt for having declared *them* guilty! *Mirabile dictu!* It was actually proposed in the Presbytery of Cambridge, by his brother-in-law, to vote Dr. A. Bullions clear of a certain charge, and then rebuke him! Rebuke him for being innocent!

To illustrate the inconsistency of these views so much insisted on by our brethren, let us suppose a familiar example. An individual is arraigned before one of our civil tribunals on a charge of slander. He comes into court, acknowledges his indiscretion; but then courts of justice are fallible; they have erred and may err again; I propose to stay all proceedings, remove all penalties; and that all the parties concerned, court and jury, and all the members of the bar, and all others, be “admonished to avoid in future agitating the subjects that brought on these difficulties;” and if you refuse to adopt this rule, I will publish you to

the world as enemies of civil liberty, adopting the most despotic principles of civil policy ; as contentious and persecuting persons, with war in your hearts, even to extermination ! And suppose the court treat such a plea with merited contempt, could they become liable to the charge of persecution ? Would the person making such a plea be able to excite public sympathy, and raise a party to rally round him as large as that which has already rallied round these schismatic brethren ? I suppose not. Men act like rational creatures in almost all things else, except religion. But when any attempt is made to maintain rules of common justice, and common sense, which ought to regulate every body of men, whatever be the object of their association, in our ecclesiastical courts, the cry of persecution is raised, though these courts profess nothing more than a moral power—nothing but the power of judging of their own members. Defamation supplies the place of argument ; ignorance the place of knowledge ; falsehood the place of facts ; prejudice the place of judgment ; and passion the place of piety ; confusion and anarchy the place of order and justice—the church is broken into fragments, and infidelity and immorality become rampant through the land.

We have already noticed the principle charges brought against our separating brethren in the church courts ; but there are other facts which have been brought to light during this controversy, and which it is necessary to notice, in order to justify the title prefixed to this paper. And here, as in the former case, the writer courts an investigation of the facts in any scriptural and peaceable manner. He labors for truth. But hopes that the mere assertions of interested individuals may not be permitted to usurp the place of well-founded evidence.

We begin with the testimony of Rev. Dr. P. Bullions, taken on the trial of Mr. Webster. For the full testimony, the reader is referred to the Narrative of the Presbytery of Albany, published in 1836. And respecting this testimony we remark :

1. That it was given with extreme reluctance and after long dealing, by the Presbytery ; which may be accounted for, from the fact that he was then and still is, acting with Mr. Stark.

2. Respecting the K paper, published in the fourth volume of the Religious Monitor, and ascribed to Mr. Stark, but denied by him ; he says—“ I saw the manuscript from which it was printed ”—“ have an opinion concerning it ”—“ *founded on the fact* that it looked like the hand-writing of Luke F. Newland.” Here the matter rested. This appeared to be all that he had to tell the court on that point. But after a considerable lapse of time, he adds—“ I gave the original copy to Luke F. Newland, to be transcribed.” He then testifies his belief that the *original copy* of the paper was in Mr. Stark's hand-writing.

3. Respecting one of Mr. Stark's pamphlets, he says—“ the manuscript of that letter was sent to me, I did not wish to have any thing to do with it, and gave it to another to do with it as he pleased. That individual asked me to examine a proof sheet and I did as I have stated. I believe the manuscript was sent to me by Mr. Stark, and to the best of my remembrance, it was in Mr. Stark's hand-writing. In speaking of that letter and the other pamphlets, Mr. Stark has always spoken of them as the work of the Observer. It may be that he left the disposal of it to myself, but I think he requested it to be published. I myself paid one dollar to the person to whom the manuscript had been given towards the expense of publication, but do not know by whom the balance was

furnished. I gave the manuscript of the 'Letter' to John McDonald, Esq. of Washington County."

Now the reader is requested to compare the above testimony with the following letter, which was laid on the table of Synod, 1837, and contributed largely to the strange votes passed by that Synod.

"ALBANY, May 5th, 1837.

"Dear Sir—In answer to your enquiry, whether I think the testimony given by me is sufficient proof that Mr. Stark is the author of the Anonymous Pamphlets ascribed to him—I answer; that testimony is the foundation of the *opinion* expressed by me on that occasion, yet it might be very unjust to Mr. Stark, to convict him on that testimony; for an opinion may arise from circumstances very insufficient to prove a matter before a court. The opinion I had of Mr. S. being the author of the 'K. paper' was equally strong with that of his being the author of the Pamphlets; but from what I have learned since, I am now satisfied that the former opinion was wrong, and that he was not the author of the 'K. paper.'

"Yours respectfully,

"P. BULLIONS.

"Rev. Dr. BULLIONS."

It is with extreme reluctance that I offer any comment on this strange testimony, and still more strange letter. But there are certain points which deserve notice. The testimony asserts that the manuscript of one of Mr. Stark's pamphlets was sent to him, and that it was in Mr. Stark's hand-writing. It also asserts the same thing of the "K. paper." The letter calls this *testimony an opinion*; and thinks "an *opinion* very insufficient," &c. And from what he has learned since, he is now satisfied that Mr. Stark was not the author of the "K. paper." Was ever such a commentary given by a witness upon his own testimony, eighteen months after that testimony was given? Is he now satisfied that he swore false? If so, why not condescend to tell us what it is that led him to give false testimony *against* a friend whom he labored hard to screen before the court? I know a story is in circulation, but of its foundation I know nothing, that a young man, whose name is not even known, wrote the "K. paper," who has since gone to Scotland, and that Mr. Stark transcribed it for him, and sent it to Dr. Bullions to be retranscribed before given to the printer, that he, Mr. Stark, might not be known in it! Alas! for such a story! And if this be not the cause which led Dr. P. Bullions to contradict his own testimony under oath, he ought to inform us what produced such a remarkable change. If he declines doing so, he must rest under an imputation which I would not bear for the wealth of the Indies. But, suppose the story about the young man were true, have men a right to transcribe and inculcate slander, and be innocent? Our civil law does not condescend to ask the holder of counterfeit money who made it. He must show how he came by it. Is it not then perfectly puerile to say that Mr. Stark transcribed from the pen of another? Is it not treating men as though they were idiots or children? For who does not know that his hand-writing makes him responsible both in the eye of human and divine law? Besides, there was other conclusive corroborating testimony, which any one may see who will take the trouble to examine the Narrative published by the Presbytery of Albany.

Again: the pamphlets contain conclusive internal evidence of their paternity. Their style and manner are perfectly *sui generis*, no less pe-

cular than the features of their author's face. Let a single sample serve as an illustration. In his first pamphlet, p. 40, speaking of an act of Dr. A. Bullions, he says:—"It is a mere matter of taste, and according to the proverb—'*De gustibus nil disputandum.*'" The same phrase applied to the same person, occurs in an acknowledged article of his in the Rel. Mon. vol. XI. p. 43. Indeed, one of his warmest advocates, who protested or dissented against almost every vote of the Synod of 1836, in his case, declared that he believed Mr. Stark to be the author of those pamphlets, *as much as he believed any thing.*

Now let the question be put to every man's conscience, was not a resolution to stay all proceedings and remove all censure, and gag the members of Synod, in circumstances like these, *an attempt to cover up iniquity?* But the subject must be resumed.

## SIMPLEX.

ART. IV. *Free Communion—Thoughts on Rev. ii. 14, 15.*

"But I have a few things against thee, because thou hast there them that hold the doctrine of Balaam," &c.

A false charity which rejoices in error, as well as "the truth," which in a very literal manner, "covers a multitude of sins;" and a disposition to *free communion*, or what is designated by the modern term of *Latitudinarianism*, are evils with which the church has been infected in every age, to a greater or less degree. Men so easily lose sight of this important idea, which should ever be most conspicuous, that the church is the house of God, and that its rules and privileges are limited and prescribed by himself. Would men but accord to Jehovah the same independence and discretion, in determining who should enjoy the hospitality, the favors of his house, which are granted to the proprietor of a mansion, or head of a family, the church would never have suffered from intrusion into membership of unworthy characters. What person, having any sense of propriety, would open wide his doors, and invite the honorable and virtuous, together with the suspicious, vile characters of infamous life, to the high privileges of his family enjoyment? Would he not much rather, as master of his own house, establish his own domestic rules, and require a conformity to the same of all admitted to his intimacy? Then, since God has established the rules by which his house is to be governed, and delineated with great particularity the characters deemed worthy of its privileges, is it not daring in the steward of his house to disregard these? But how often do we see them, eager to make a display of their spurious charity, and forgetting that holiness is the boundary, the channel in which his love flows, invite to his holy table, even such as have not "a wedding garment," and the leprous! They set wide open "the gates" of admission, so that not only "the righteous nation may enter," but also the unrighteous.

Correct views on this subject are of the greatest importance to the purity and prosperity of Zion. There are many circumstances which give a special interest to this at present. There is, perhaps, too much reason to fear that the popular sentiment, which abhors restriction, and approbates open, general communion, be<sup>h</sup> in hearing the word, and in

sealing ordinances, is gaining on the affections of some ministers, as well as private members in the Secession Church. Also, the evident disposition in the Associate Reformed Church to approbate this favorite scheme, considering the laudable stand which they have taken for truth, makes it a present duty to investigate our principles anew on this subject. Likewise the liberal spirit which pervaded the late Convention at Pittsburgh, composed of delegates from several Reformed branches of the Church, highly respectable for orthodoxy, renders it incumbent on the Secession Church, as being invited to unite with them in their efforts to promote a general unity in Church communion, to weigh well such measures, and calmly view the principles involved. But what gives to this subject a present interest and greater importance than any thing else, is the present State of the Presbyterian Church, and its very remarkable history for some years past.

The public is familiar with the elaborate "plea" in favor of free communion, made by the late Dr. Mason, and the general approbation it received among the Presbyterians. At that time, as if a flood of light had unexpectedly been poured in upon the long benighted intellect, and as if the channels of the great deep of christian benevolence had then for the first time been discovered and fully opened, they made wide their doors of admission, and folded in their loving embrace many holding Arminian and Hopkinsian doctrines. They were all love. In their temple they were not careful to have inscribed, "Holiness to the Lord," but there was to be seen in legible characters this only sentiment, "*charity, open fellowship,*" which was continually re-echoed with the loudest peals of acclamation far and wide.

And, because Seceders protested against such measures, as being calculated to fill the church with corrupting errors, and heretical unworthy members, they were denounced by their Presbyterian brethren as "narrow-minded, bigotted, and as keeping back the Millenium." This spurious overgrown spirit of charity prevailed among them for several years; their church took ricketty growth, springing up like Jonah's gourd; and like some diseased bodies, though vitally affected within, yet become corpulent with an appearance of health. It is often observable in the political arena, and in movements of war, that a present advantage proves a real lasting injury. Such were the effects of the measures referred to above, so soon as fully developed. Errorists becoming identified with that body, once justly held in high estimation for purity in doctrines, aided in maturing their liberal schemes, and industriously disseminated their principles, which, becoming incorporated with that church, proved a fruitful source of discord, an appalling corruption.

At length, after the destruction of much fraternal love, and peace, and truth, the friends of true Presbyterianism were compelled, by dire necessity, to take the same stand for which they had previously contemned the Seceders with so much acrimony, in excluding from their fellowship such as were not cordially united in sentiment with them. This was done at their last Assembly in May, when racked with sad division. A return to the *restrictive system of exclusive measures*, bearing a faithful testimony against prevailing errors, is their only alternative; the only means of rescuing their branch of Zion from the flood of corruption, emitted from the Dragon's mouth, which has threatened to drown her in perdition.

This brief history affords the best comment on the practical influence

of *free communion*, and to the candid observer must have the conviction that the scheme is not less impolitic than unscriptural. We are here naturally reminded of that remarkable epistle to the Church of Pergamos, recorded in Rev. ii. 12–17, in which the mind of the Holy Spirit is expressed on this subject in the plainest manner. She had in her much worthy of high commendation. Being located in a place of great wickedness, “where Satan had his seat,” and iniquity its throne, they maintained a faithful adherence to the truth, amidst the storms of persecution, in the rage of which “the *faithful* Antipapas fell a martyr.” But she had her defections, for which, though many, she is reproved by God in these mild terms:—“I have a *few* things against thee.” The ground of his complaint is, “Because thou hast there them who hold the doctrine of Balaam.” The history of this man you have in Numbers, 25–31st chapters. His doctrine or instruction to Balak was to induce Israel to “commit whoredom with the daughters of Moab,” which was naturally calculated to lead them into idolatry. This proved a “stumbling block” to many, by which they were stained with the basest crimes, which rendered them obnoxious to the divine displeasure.

The charge brought against this church for having in her bosom such characters as held to this “doctrine,” and were stained with such vices, while it refers primarily to the vicious sect then existing under that name, can also be understood in a spiritual sense, and as pointing not only to some persons of scandalous life, but also to errorists, and such as are infected with dangerous heresy, who, by their insidious plots, seek to lead the church into spiritual fornication and idolatry. The heritage of the Lord, is, in our times, filled with such Balaamites, who corrupt and prove a disgrace to religion, and whom faithfulness would require to be excommunicated.

The reason why the church of Pergamos is here subjected to censure is, because she retained in her communion such vicious, heretical characters. She had been intrusted with the key of discipline, in virtue of which ecclesiastical rulers bind and loose with the delegated authority of heaven. And the courts of Zion are bound to enforce discipline as an ordinance of divine appointment, for cutting off from her fellowship those whose doctrine and practice are not according to godliness. The omission of this duty is a crying evil, for which God will hold a controversy with his people. Jehovah will have his sanctuary purged by his ordained ministry, or else he will do it himself by fearful judgments. The church of Pergamos had adopted a policy, too fashionable in our times, seeking an increase of numbers and popularity, screening from judicial censure the rich and noble, seeking the aggrandizement of Zion by worldly pomp more than by chaste purity. But God will not suffer unchastity nor vileness in his spouse, without tokens of his displeasure. He has erected a wall around his heritage to keep out the “wild beasts.” Holiness should be inscribed on the doors of admission, as well as “the thrones of judgement which there stay.” “Without are dogs,” the unworthy; and such should be kept without, and when found within, should be ejected.

In this respect this church was defective; and in the 15th verse, we find another pungent reproof of a similar nature, administered to her, for having fellowship with “them who hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I hate.” This was a sect, founded, perhaps, by a deacon named Nicholas, which flourished in the commencement of the christian era. Eating things offered to idols, adultery, uncleanness,

characterized its advocates. Such were unhappily tolerated in this community. Christ hates sin in every form, but especially when he sees his commissioned servants receiving into his holy and beautiful house such characters, whose only or chief recommending quality is the pomp of worldly riches and honor. Such carnal policy every christian should reprobate. And all church courts should testify against such a course, as an evil which, in the language of their divine Head, they "*hate*."

The mind of God is so plainly expressed in this portion of sacred writ, that "he who runs may read." Any one, unbiassed by prejudices in favor of some popular system, must admit this doctrine, taught in the plainest terms, in the 14th and 15th verses,—that—

*A pure church should maintain a distinct separate communion.* We have noticed the severe reproof administered to the religious community of Pergamos, for having in its embrace such as the Balaamites and Nicolaitans. Lax professors always abhor restriction. And the voice of public sentiment now sounds loud and long the enchanting words of "benevolence, charity, universal love," &c.; the pious aim of which seems to be to extol God's mercy, so that the lustre of its glory would conceal his holiness and jealous regard to his sacred truth. Accordingly, the chief emulation of noted man is to excel in decrying creeds and confessions, used by the church in reforming times as tests of purity, as being of too contracted a spirit for "*this age of improvement*." And those are now held in estimation in proportion as they throw contempt upon lifting faithful testimonies for the truth, and against error. The syren voice of fame now greets such as are most successful in devising schemes for amalgamating distinct societies into one, for removing all the "old land-marks," and walls of reparation, and for making the house of God a city of refuge for modern Balaamites, Socinians, Arminians, and Hopkinsians. And in the exercise of this brotherly love, they throw the broad mantle of their charity over the corruptions of these, and literally *hide* a multitude of their sins. They endeavor to build the house of God out of all kinds of materials, and to make her a great temple, in which all people may congregate.

But should their endeavors be crowned with seeming success, this capacious house might be great indeed, like the "tree" in Nebuchadnezzar's dream, "under which the beasts of the field dwelt, and upon whose boughs the fowls of heaven, clean and unclean, had their habitations," but like the image in his vision, composed of materials of different natures, the "iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold" thereof shall be "broken to pieces." Truth and error can never cement in any modification. By such measures many may be added to the church; for carnal motives will prompt many to unite with an association so numerous and popular. Multitudes will be found saying, "we will eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel, only let us be called by" this respectable "name, to take away our reproach." By the present improved system, we are not required to "deny ourselves," and do "violence" to our feelings, and be "hated of all men;" nor need to incur the wrath of man by protesting against fashionable errors and vices.

Such latitudinarian schemes may build up a great common asylum almost in a day, but, alas! "with untempered mortar." They are more liberal than any ever suggested by the Holy Spirit. Inspiration teaches that the church is "a peculiar people," whom God "hath chosen out of the world." And, when heresies prevail, he calls upon her as a "wit-

ness," and requires her to "display her banner because of the truth." His character of her is "my love, my dove, my undefiled, is but one," of one heart and one mind. Unity in the church is desirable above all things; but this must be a unity, not of persons, or different denominations merely, but of doctrines and worship. And unless different branches of the church can form a union of spirit, a oneness of sentiment, in a way of faithfully maintaining the whole truth, a separate stand in defence of the faith is more honorable to Zion's king, who ever abhors those unhallowed compromises, in which union and peace are obtained at the sacrifice of truth. Rather let Judah be against Ephraim; and if iniquity be found in Benjamin, let the tribes of Israel contend with their brother, and wipe off this stain, that they be not participants of their brother's sin.

The admission of corrupt professors, or corrupt denominations into the pure church, is like setting up Dagon in the temple of God. This temple is holy, and will not permit any idol of false doctrine to remain within its sacred precincts, without the testimony of God's wrath against it, any more than Dagon which was prostrated before the ark of the Lord. And those who congregate in this temple must all "speak the language of Canaan." The Philistine, and "they who speak the language of Ashdod," are aliens from the commonwealth of Israel. Jehovah was made to "abhor his own inheritance," because his people mingled among the heathen, and learned of them their way."

Christ says to his flock, "I will not that ye should have fellowship with devils," and again, "if any man defile the temple of God," which is done by admitting those who corrupt its doctrines and worship, "him shall God destroy." And if men of perverse minds infect the church with the leaven of error, this must be purged out as the only remedy; for every error in doctrine or practice is at war with heaven, makes God a liar, and is dishonoring to all his perfections. She cannot therefore hold communion with such as are thus infected; "for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness?" Every error is darkness, and originated from the prince of darkness, while truth is the pure light from heaven. What communion, then, can this divine light have with darkness? "And what concord hath Christ with Balaam? Or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? Or what agreement hath the temple of God with idols?" Here is restriction—imposed by divine authority. (See 2 Cor. vi. 14–17.) Here the popular schemes of free communion with all respectable societies are in direct opposition to the command of God, given verse 17th, "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord." And when the majority of any religious society becomes corrupt, and refuses to reform by works of righteousness, the injunction upon his faithful few is, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sin, and that ye receive not of her plagues." (Rev. xviii. 4.) And a pure church can not be faithful to her Lord but by excommunicating heretics, and refusing to unite with such denominations as remain defiled with corruptions. She must promote his honor, by maintaining her own purity, or else he will himself purge her by sore judgments; as in Zach. xiii. 8, 9. "And it shall come to pass that in all the land, saith the Lord, two parts therein shall be cut off and die; but the third part shall be left therein. And I will bring the third part through the fire, and will refine them as silver is refined." Should any of our religious communities, even those esteemed most rigid, expunge one-third of her mem-

bers, as corrupt, their course of discipline would incur universal censure, as being too censorious, and a milder policy would be recommended, fearing lest they might lose some of their remaining members; but that policy sanctioned by Jehovah, is to carry on a purifying, reforming process, until two-thirds are excinded, and then continue the remaining third in the refining ordeal.

Zion is required by Jehovah to maintain her character as "the pillar and ground of truth." And when by her firmness and integrity, when the watchman on her walls sound an alarm at every invasion of error, and use the key of discipline for the appointed purpose of casting out the stranger, and the leprous, when she thus gives evidence of her purity and devotedness to the honor of her Head, he will establish her "on the top of the mountains, as the joy of the whole earth, the crown of his glory." And when her enemies, strong and mighty, "go to with axes and hammers, to break down the *carved work* of his sanctuary," if then she be faithful in unfurling her banner, because of truth, and remain firm in its support, the glory of the divine presence shall beautify her, heaven's approving countenance shall light up her path like the smiles of the morning, and she shall at last be presented faultless before the throne of God, "adorned as a bride to meet her husband."

HONESTAS.

---

ART. V. *Misrepresentations Corrected.*

It is sometimes difficult to determine whether to reply to a slander or to let it pass unnoticed. A portion of the community may understand the case and count the correction a mere waste of time and labor; yet another portion may wish to understand it more fully, and may have a just claim to be gratified. Experience teaches that in a defence against personal attacks, we should draw but sparingly on the patience and sympathy of the public; but in defending a public body, and especially an important cause struck at through that body, we may use more liberty. I have lately had access to the 4th and 5th numbers of the Associate Presbyterian Magazine, in which I find so many misrepresentations of the proceedings of the Associate Presbytery of Cambridge, that I might well despair of obtaining the patient attention of the reader in even *noticing* them particularly; and such a particular notice I trust is unnecessary. There are, however, a few misrepresentations which many readers may have no opportunity of understanding, and which may need some explanation, in justice both to the Presbytery slandered, and to the public imposed upon; and these may be taken as specimens of the whole.

A committee appointed by the Presbytery of Cambridge, prepared and published a Narrative of the proceedings of the Presbytery in the cases of Dr. A. Bullions and Mr. Stalker. In the Associate Presbyterian Magazine, the grossest misrepresentations of these proceedings are given, and yet to gain credit to these misrepresentations, they assert before their readers, who may not have access to that Narrative, that it verifies materially all their statements. (p. 108.) Now if this were so,

the Presbytery must have been shamefully wicked, and their committee infatuated.

In the Magazine, page 110, the editor represents the Presbytery of Cambridge as *requiring* Dr. Bullions to retract as unfounded and slanderous what they at the same time knew to be true. He adds, "There can be no doubt about this, for they themselves attest the fact. They say they required Dr. Bullions to commit the sin of denying the truth—we content ourselves with placing their own account of this iniquitous transaction before our readers, and we add no comments, for it needs none." Now instead of this being the *Presbytery's own account* of the matter, and without *comment*, the Presbytery gave no such account, and it is wholly comment and perversion. For the Presbytery to have required Dr. Bullions to deny the truth would have been hard; to have done so knowing the truth in question, would have been sinful indeed; and still more sinful to have required this as a condition of restoration. But what is the state of the case? The Presbytery's requisition as stated in their minutes and in the Narrative which the editor pretends to quote without comment, is "That Dr. Bullions either retract his declaration as unfounded and slanderous, that four members of this Presbytery are unfit to sit as members of this court, on supposition that certain reports in possession of Messrs. Peter Gordon and George Mairs, are true; or on the other hand, that he pledge himself to Presbytery to produce those reports for Presbytery's judgment—and in the latter case, that he remain under suspension till he produce them to Presbytery." Now, was this requiring Dr. Bullions to retract his former assertion? It was a proposal of alternatives, giving him his choice. Dr. Bullions had made an injurious assertion but pertinaciously refused to furnish the means of investigation. Order required him either to retract or furnish those means; and this was proposed by Presbytery. The one alternative was fair, just and easy: Was this requiring him to choose the other? And what is more common than this procedure? A civil tribunal proposes to the accused, however innocent he may be, to plead guilty, or stand his trial. Is this requiring him to plead guilty? A church member found guilty on trial, has his choice to submit or be cast out. Is this requiring him to choose the latter? Who but this writer could say that it is? Can any one, even in charity, believe that he thought he was treating the Presbytery fairly, or that he was not of purpose perverting the truth in order to slander? From this specimen let the public see the spirit of our opponents; and let them judge whether such a writer is likely to lead their views correctly in matters in debate; or give them a fair view of the controversy. Is he conscious that his cause is just, or does he depend on divine guidance or protection, when he uses such means of offence or defence? We do wish our opponents to defend themselves if they be injured, but we have a right to demand of them whether as christians or as men, that they do it honestly and honorably.

In the Magazine, pages 108-9, the Presbytery of Cambridge and their committee are ridiculed for pleading that *a Presbytery may reject an appeal, proceed with the trial, and still allow the appellant to carry up his cause to a superior court, but that he ought in the mean time to submit*. Yet the first part of this plea is founded on our own Book of Discipline, part iii. art. 12: "When a protest and appeal are offered, the judicatory is to consider whether they will admit or reject them: If they admit, the cause is to be left to the judgment of the superior court; but if they reject, they may proceed in the trial of it. The

party may protest against the rejection of his protest; and if this is sustained, he may still bring the cause ultimately before the superior court." The latter part of the plea is justified by our Overture, which this writer quotes with approbation; Book II. chap. 9. § 9: "When the appeal is taken from a sentence of suspension, deposition, or excommunication, which sentence shall be considered as in force till the appeal is issued." The Book of Discipline of the Presbyterian Church Chap. vii. § 3. item 15, is substantially the same. Thus the whole argument of the Presbytery's committee on this point is fully justified; for if a sentence of suspension, &c. shall be considered as in force till the appeal is issued, it does require submission in the mean time. But to render the committee's argument ridiculous, the editor of the Magazine construes it thus: (p. 109.) "The Presbytery means, that if one of their members appeal to Synod from a sentence of *rebuke* (?) and they should reject the appeal, he may still carry it up by an additional appeal, only in the mean time he must submit to the *rebuke*, and sometime after, the Synod will decide whether the Presbytery ought to have inflicted the sentence to which he has already been compelled to submit." Now all this construction is made by slipping in the little word *rebuke*, which the committee did not use in the passage criticised. Did the Presbytery mean that Dr. Bullions should submit to the rebuke and yet appeal from it to Synod? They did not ask such a submission, and they would not have accepted it, had it been offered by the Dr., as they showed when he did so offer it at Salem. (See Narrative, pp. 14, 15.)

The committee was speaking of all the Dr.'s appeals together, p. 43. Their meaning was, that Dr. Bullions should have submitted to a rebuke without appealing, but when he did not submit to this sentence, and was suspended, even with an appeal from the latter sentence, he should have submitted till the case would be issued in the higher court. That is, he had his choice of submission to a rebuke *without* an appeal, or to a suspension, with an appeal, if he chose to make it. This was the submission spoken of. Why then did the editor of the Magazine slip in the word "rebuke" in his construction of the committee's argument? Not because the committee used it so, but because it required this word to make it ridiculous. But why did he not introduce the word *suspension* instead of *robuke*? (For this was the very sentence to which the Presbytery did require Dr. Bullions to submit under his appeal.) No doubt, because it would have appeared reasonable and just, and founded on acknowledged rules. Thus the true state of the case must be concealed and perverted by the editor of the Magazine, lest the public might see it and justify the Presbytery. Still, perhaps, to some, it may not be clear what the difference is between submission to a rebuke and submission to suspension, with an appeal in either case.

The difference is this. Submission to a rebuke is usually in order to restoration, and involves an acknowledgement of the justice of the sentence and a confession of sin. An appeal in such a case, is therefore absurd; and a reversal of the sentence by a superior court, is not only a condemnation of the judgment of the inferior court, but also of the man's confession of sin. Submission to a sentence of suspension with an appeal does not involve such acknowledgment, and a reversal condemns only the judgment of the inferior court.

In page 109 of the Magazine, the editor says, "The Presbytery (of Cambridge) suspended Dr. Bullions for *no other offence*, than using this undoubted constitutional privilege (of protest and appeal.) This is utterly false. Dr. Bullions had uttered an injurious slander against mem-

bers of Presbytery, and refused to furnish the means of investigation, according to the acknowledged order of the church, and in contempt of the Presbytery's demand of these means; he refused submission to a rebuke for this conduct, and thus adhered to his slanders and his contempt of acknowledged order. For adherence to his slander and contempt of order, proved by the non-submission to the rebuke, he was suspended. According to this writer's logic, if a man were condemned to die for murder, on his own confession, then, not the murder, but *his confession*, is the sole offence for which he is punished.

In page 108, the editor says, "All that has been proved about the letter sent to Mr. D. Gordon is simply, that Dr. Bullions' name, which was written on the back of the letter, was in his own hand-writing, and also the few following words at the bottom of the last page of the letter, viz: 'N. B. Let Mr. D. Gordon have the reading of the above,' every thing else that has been written, or published, or said on this subject, is either fiction or mere conjecture, unsupported by any proof whatever. This is all that Presbytery have been able to establish, as will be seen from their own pamphlet." Even this proof was much, and sufficient to convince many friends of Dr. B. who attended the trial in Presbytery. But why does this writer make such a sweeping declaration that this was all that was proved, when he knows that Mr. Stalker's testimony and Mr. Whyte's statements, which he engaged to confirm by oath if it be thought necessary, prove much more? And why does he assert that the Presbytery's pamphlet confirms his assertion, when it contains these additional testimonies of Messrs. Stalker and Whyte? Such sweeping assertions in the very face of *truth and proof*, are no doubt made in the hope that a certain portion of his readers will never have access to correct information.

In page 106, the editor condemns the Presbytery for charging Mr. Stalker with "disagreeing with the Synod and Presbytery in maintaining our profession in respect of the United Secession." To maintain this censure of the Presbytery on this point, he quotes an act of the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania, passed April 28, 1791, defining the terms of admission of church members; and concludes that the act of Synod in 1827, to which the Presbytery of Cambridge refer in their charge against Mr. Stalker, is not binding, because it was not expressed against the United Secession in the act of 1791, even though its basis and substance is included in that act.

In page 140, the editor undertakes to make his readers *fully acquainted* with all the circumstances of the case between Mr. Stalker and Messrs. Miller and Anderson, and commences by stating that "some-time in 1832, Mr. D. Gordon had invited Dr. A Bullions to assist him"—that "the Dr. declined,"—that "the Presbytery called upon him to answer for the offence of refusing to assist Mr. D. Gordon at the time he had been invited." On the contrary, the Presbytery never made the Dr.'s refusal to assist at the time he had been invited, an offence, nor called upon him to answer for it. His offence for which he was called to account, was for refusing *christian and ministerial communion* with Mr. Gordon, although members of the same church.

The editor adds, "The Doctor assigned as his reason for refusing assistance, the fact that Mr. D. Gordon, in a paper used by him before the Presbytery, had represented him as a person destitute of godly sincerity," &c. That is, Dr. Bullions, in 1832, refused to assist Mr. D. Gordon, and gave as his reason for that refusal, certain expressions said to be used by Mr. Gordon in June, 1833. The latter date was the time

that it was said he used those expressions. It is most probable this misstatement was not intended by the editor, but it shows how fit he is to give his readers an accurate account of the case, and to correct the history given by the Presbytery. It is also most probable that he would have escaped this error, had he not endeavored to fix on the Presbytery the charge of "calling Dr. Bullions to answer for the offence of refusing assistance *at the time he had been invited.*"

On the same page, in reference to Mr. Stalker's charge against Messrs. Miller and Anderson, for testimony given by them to the effect that Mr. Stalker had been called by Presbytery, in a certain trial, to give testimony; this writer says, "The Presbytery did not at that time, nor at any other time, call upon Mr. Stalker to give testimony in the case." And again on page 141, "It was not proved that the Presbytery had ever called upon him to swear to the truth of his statement"—and "It was indeed fully admitted that the Presbytery had at no time called upon Mr. Stalker to swear to the truth of said statement." Now, to say the least, these are impudent falsehoods. In the Presbytery's Narrative, pages 6 and 7, express testimony to the contrary is given by several witnesses; and Mr. Stalker substantially yields the point in his paper to Presbytery, published in the Narrative, page 10, close of the paper.

But the editor adds, in order to confirm these unblushing falsehoods, "and it could not be otherwise in the nature of things, for there never had been any trial of the case," &c. This is no less bold. The committee of Presbytery, in their Narrative, state that there was a trial entered and prosecuted. Moreover, Dr. A. Bullions took an appeal on this case, and it was accordingly reviewed by Synod in 1834, and the Presbytery sustained in their procedure, in their minutes of the proceedings, even in opposition to Dr. Bullions' and Mr. Stalker's contrary statements, and their final decision. And yet this editor boldly says, "*there never had been any trial of the case.*" I would remind the editor that when truth is a defence, it is the most efficient weapon; and he that is conscious that his cause is good will employ it alone.

I had marked several other misrepresentations for correction, but I intended only to give specimens, and I am afraid I have already exhausted the reader's patience. Such exhibitions should be brief, although they be necessary. Just defence of personal character, and of the proceedings of church courts, may not immediately promote edification, but it is necessary in order to remove impediments to edification. It has been the usual method of adversaries of the cause of God, to attack it through its advocates; witness the treatment of the Apostle Paul often referred to by him, as in 2 Cor. x. xi. xii. chapters. The present unhappy dissensions in our church are falsely viewed by many as personal quarrels. They did not originate in personal antipathies, but in radical differences of religious sentiment and principle. This produced opposition in aims and measures, naturally producing disaffection and distrust. To effect objects indirectly, which could not be attained directly, the cause professedly maintained by our church, began to be undermined, by insinuations against its truth or its importance in some of its parts, or by practical neglect or contempt. No national differences, or personal temperaments originated the present contests, although this may, in some cases, have fanned the flame when kindled. Where there was unity of principles, all such distinctions were obliterated and forgotten, and confidence and harmony in counsel and action

prevailed. Look at the state of parties in our church. Has not unity of principle completely buried all temporal differences, where they have existed? How absurd and vain the exhortation to lay aside dissensions and walk in love when a radical difference of religious sentiment and principle is cherished! It is an admonition to walk in love without the grounds, the means, or the spirit of love. The only successful method of walking in love is to seek unity of principle and to be "of one mind" and so to "live in peace." (2 Cor. xiii. 11.) Divine Providence has left a party in our church to betray their spirit under circumstances calculated to bring the matter to an issue, in order that the secretly corrupting principle might be detected and removed; and this result appears to be now effected which had not been contemplated in the beginning of these contests. The party now speak out holdly their views of the defection of the United Secession, which before they insinuated by words betrayed by action. (See Magazine, pages 107-147.)

PEACE WITH TRUTH.

---

ART. VI. *Letter to the Editor of the Religious Monitor.*

DEAR SIR—The advertisement which I send you to-day may require some explanation. As the *three forgeries* which it contains are the cases on which rests that huge superstructure of defamation, vulgarity and abuse, that has been so lavishly heaped upon the Associate Synod, both collectively and individually, for three years past; their exposure seemed necessary.

*Personal* abuse I disregard, and have long disregarded. But when an attempt is made to stigmatize a whole community through me, silence would be criminal. I have been urged by friends who are acquainted with all the facts in the case, to call the Rev. gentlemen referred to in the advertisement into a court of justice; but no *personal* considerations can ever induce me to take such a step. Because such a course of conduct is in most cases unscriptural, and savors more of the feudal barbarism of the dark ages than of the gospel of peace; because *pious* people of all denominations look upon it with abhorrence, and because whenever a minister of the gospel resorts to a civil court of justice to defend his character, especially against the members of his own communion, he almost invariably finds, that a general belief prevails in the christian community that he never had any. But as these men, by the laws of Christ's house, are no longer ministers or members of the christian church, and as they persevere in uttering slander through me against the whole community; if the Associate Synod should fail to elicit the truth at its next meeting, it is possible I may find an obligation resting on me to take a step which I have for four years perseveringly resisted. Nor have I, as yet, had cause to repent of this course. Through the mercy of God, I have unalloyed satisfaction with the people among whom God has called me to labor. A good degree of attention to gospel ordinances prevails; and many are looking for their portion beyond the transitory enjoyments of this mortal life. Seventy-four have been added to our communion within a period of eighteen

months.\* So that while the storm howls without, we have peace and prosperity within. Can my calumniators say as much? For it is according to their manner to trumpet their own fame at the expense of others.

Your account of the *pretended retraction* is correct, as far as it goes; the whole transaction is as follows: I drew up a paper withdrawing some of the statements; which Mr. Stark refused to accept. In this stage of the transaction the committee of Presbytery was appointed; the paper laid before them: Alterations were suggested and interlineations made with a pencil, partly by Mr. Stark, and partly by the committee, among which the word ALL was substituted for SOME. In this amended shape, I promptly rejected it. Mr. Stark then requested the paper over night (it being about nine o'clock in the evening) for consideration as I supposed, to make up his mind whether or not he would accept it as I had written it; not regarding the pencil marks made by others, to which I had never acceded as of any account. After a solemn pledge from him to make no use of it to my injury, and to return it in the morning; and after the urgent solicitation of Mr. Campbell, who appeared surprised that I should suspect the good faith of Mr. S., I reluctantly consented to let him take the paper for consideration till the morning, when I expected he would either accept of it *as I had written it*, or return it. This plain statement the reader will perceive, is corroborated by the testimony of Messrs Campbell and Smart, the only persons present except the parties concerned, which is already before the public. And, if necessary, it can be substantiated by the Rev. Samuel McArthur, that Mr. Stark virtually admitted that the paper was only in negotiation, when I came into the Presbytery on the following morning. This is entirely consistent with your account, and even with Dr. B.'s, only that the Dr. leaves out an essential part which he says he did not *understand*. I *did* say that I had *permitted* the interlineations with the pencil, because, when I made a proposition which he would not accept, the next step was to hear *him*; but I *did not accede* to the alterations. I *did* say, that I had given or offered to give the paper to Mr. Stark the night before *as I had written it*. But, it appears, the Dr. could not "understand" the words in italics. And it is not a little remarkable that in his defective statement he actually represents me as saying—"that the retraction as first written was not so full"—as the interlined paper which Mr. S. had. Thus we see how easy it sometimes is to commit the highest act of injustice by a little prevarication, especially where, in addition to this, a man is so reckless of moral principle as to violate a solemn pledge given in the presence of witnesses.

But further, a little attention to the chronological order will throw great light on this disputed transaction. Designed anachronism is a favorite *trick* of the writers in the Associate Presbyterian Magazine, by means of which they give to falsehood an air of truth. An instance of this occurs in the number for December, page 138, foot note.

In May, 1835, Mr. Stark writes thus through his legal adviser:

"If Mr. Webster feels disposed to retract, the retraction may be either general or specific, as he pleases; but in either case it is essential that it should embrace *every thing* contained in the pamphlet which goes to affect the character and standing of Mr. Stark.

---

\* I rely upon 2 Cor. xii. 11. to justify this reference to myself.

"Such a retraction will be received by Mr. S. in full satisfaction of the grievance of which he complains.

"Yours,

"WM. PARMELEE."

On the 9th of September, 1835, the disputed paper was in negotiation before the committee of Presbytery; that paper which Mr. Stark declares was a full retraction of every thing against him as unwarranted and unfounded. But on the 10th of September, Mr. S. alleges that I destroyed said paper and fell from my retraction; accordingly Mr. S. and Dr. P. Bullions contended that I should be libelled and the latter was appointed to draft the libel, a copy of which is still in the possession of Presbytery in Dr. B's hand writing. And it was not till the 28th of October that Mr. Stark introduced his famous resolution that it is unlawful to permit a person to prove what he has already retracted *as unwarranted and unfounded*. If the retraction had been really made, why did not Mr. Stark object to framing the libel? why did Dr. B. draft the libel? The only consistent answer that can be given, is, because they knew that no full retraction had been made. It was a scheme got up afterwards to condemn me, if possible, without a trial; to prevent me from bringing exculpatory testimony, which they knew would prove fatal to their cause, and go very far towards my justification.

But in September, 1836, Mr. Stark puts the civil suit to trial. One year after the pretended retraction. Now compare this with his note by Mr. Parmelee. If I had really retracted, then that suit was a violation of the pledge given in Mr. Parmelee's note. But if I had fallen from the retraction, so as to justify the civil suit, then it fully justified the Presbytery in taking me on trial. For in October, 1835, Mr. Stark contends before the Presbytery that I *had* retracted, though at the very time I also stood before the Presbytery denying the pretended retraction; and in September, 1836, he stands before the civil court contending that I *had not* retracted! Now let the Rev. gentleman take which horn of the dilemma he pleases. According to his own showing, all his abuse of the Presbytery for granting me a trial is unfounded calumny, of the vilest character; or he sued me after I had given him that satisfaction which he pledged himself should be received as a "*full satisfaction*." Truly "*the legs of the lame are not equal*."

The whole matter then stands thus:—I had received some erroneous statements respecting Mr. Stark, and published them, supposing that they were true. I had published many others which both he and I knew to be true. He seizes on these erroneous statements, though I always stood ready to retract them in the fullest manner as soon as the error was discovered, and says I will sue you on *them* unless you retract the *whole*, hoping to conceal the truth, palm a lie upon the church of God, and cover up his own delinquency. The truth of the things which I refused to retract, and some of which are embodied in the libel put into his hands by the Presbytery of Albany, thus receive the strongest possible confirmation. Had I given them up, I could have avoided the civil suit, saved myself some vexation and \$700 or \$800 in money. Now I appeal to the common sense of mankind, whether it is probable that any man, with an income but little beyond a bare subsistence, would be likely to throw away such a sum merely to establish a lie against his neighbor! It appears to me that the man who would act thus, must

either be insane, exceedingly malignant, or exceedingly wealthy, or rather the whole combined.\*

It is hoped that this unvarnished narrative, confirmed by the solemn oaths of the only disinterested persons who witnessed the transaction, and whose character is and ever has been unimpeached, will have a tendency to roll away from our church courts, in the estimation of all reflecting men, that mountain of odium which has been heaped upon them merely on account of their efforts to clear their skirts of those *unfruitful works of darkness* which, to say nothing of the christian religion, are degrading to any civilized community. *Personally*, I repeat, I care for none of these things. Once, I acknowledge, it was different with me, when the delusive dream of youthful ambition exerted a more powerful influence than at present. But now through the greatness of God's mercy I have learned to follow the advice of the Psalmist, (Psal. xxxvii. 1.) But to be used as a kind of scourge over the backs of venerable fathers and respected brethren, was, in my opinion, carrying the matter a little too far: And when I reflected that the men who are laboring in this work, appear like those who would revolutionize their country in order to escape the penalty of its violated laws; it appeared incumbent on me to speak.

An attempt has been made to fix the authorship of my pamphlet upon the *Presbytery*, because the mistakes in it originated with *Mr. Irvine* † But I seek not, and never did, the least concealment in this business. Strange reasoning, truly; if a *body* of men are charged with an offence and that offence is fixed upon an *individual*, does not this clear the body in the most satisfactory manner possible? It was to do away the wholesale slander against our church courts, that operated as one motive in making that letter public. But men can maintain falsehood against evidence, when no other expedient can be found to screen themselves from the consequences of their moral delinquencies. How often does the fear of the rod lead truant boys to the commission of this sin! and who is *wholly* delivered from it in riper years! If there be any such, he is not very far from perfection.

In relation to the sweeping denunciation of *all* the Scotch people in the world with which I am charged, its ineffable baseness might well excuse me the trouble of giving it even a passing notice. Aside from its unscriptural character, what is its design? Plainly to enlist national feeling in the cause of iniquity. Were I to offer such an insult to any people as is implied in this appeal of Dr. P. Bullions, I should not consider myself very safe among them, unless they had lost the spirit of men. But since much stress appears to be laid on this pitiful slander, I will state a few *facts*, and leave the editor to answer the call I have made upon him for the manuscript. And 1. It is a fact that some of the warmest and longest tried friends I have on earth are Scotsmen. 2. It is a fact that some of the most estimable men with whom I am acquainted are Scotsmen. 3. It is a fact that many who abhor the course pursued by the editor of the Associate Presbyterian Magazine

\* It is not my design to *rest* the proof on the above reasoning. It is only used as a collateral confirmation. I hold that the testimony taken on my trial is good and sufficient proof. It appears to me if the writers in the Associate Presbyterian Magazine continue their present employment, it will impose upon the Presbytery of Albany an obligation to publish the whole of that testimony.

† Mr. I's. name would never have been made public had he not been apprised, before his statements were communicated, that they were designed for publication, and were requested with this view alone. The letter containing his statements bears this on the face.

as much as I do, are Scotsmen. 4. It is a fact that the majority of the court which tried the issue between Mr. Stark and myself, were Scotsmen. 5. It is a fact that before the call from the first Associate congregation of Philadelphia was presented to me by the Presbytery of Albany, the Rev. P. Bullions accused me with this charge and failed in the proof; and was required by the Presbytery to retract his calumny. What are we to think of the man who makes a charge before a court which is *judicially* investigated, and falls without a shadow of evidence; and then afterwards publishes the same charge to the world? He knows that such conduct would lead to his suspension were he in the church. For "persons who are active in reviving scandals that have been *legally removed* shall be considered as scandalous." (Book of Dis. p. 59.) But as he has been already *SUSPENDED*, he appears to cast off all restraint; yet he should bear in mind that there is a superintending power higher than any earthly tribunal. This is the substance of all I know certainly respecting this charge. But as I have called upon the Dr. to produce my hand writing for a charge to which he has affixed my name; and as he is in duty bound to furnish it, or stand before the public in no enviable light; *when it is furnished*, I will make the necessary apology.

Respectfully yours,

C. WEBSTER.

*Philadelphia, Jan. 31, 1839.***ART. VII. *Precious Remedies against Satan's Devices.***

(Concluded from page 372.)

**CHAPTER III. *The third Device that Satan hath to keep poor sinners from believing in, and closing with the Saviour, is,*** By suggesting to them the want of such and such preparations and qualifications. Saith Satan, Thou art not prepared to entertain Christ; thou art not humbled and justified; thou art not heart sick of sin; thou hast not been under horrors and terrors as such and such persons have; thou must stay till thou art prepared and qualified to receive the Lord Jesus, &c. Now the remedies against this device are these:

*Remedy 1.* Against this device of Satan, consider, that such as have not been so prepared and qualified, as Satan suggests, have received Christ, believed in Christ, and have been saved by Christ. Matthew was called, sitting at the receipt of custom, and such was the power that went with Christ's call, that he was made to follow him. (Mat. ix. 9.) We read not of either horrors or terrors, &c. that he was under before he was called by Christ. Pray what preparations and qualifications were found in Zaccheus, Paul, the Jailor and Lydia, before their conversion? (Luke xix. 9. Acts xvi.) God brings in some by the sweet and still voice of the gospel; and usually such who are thus brought into Christ, are the most humble, choice and fruitful christians. God is a free agent to work by law or gospel; by smiles or frowns; by presenting hell or heaven to sinner's souls. God thunders from Mount Sinai upon some souls, and conquers them by thundering. God speaks to others in a still voice, and by that conquers them. You that are brought to Christ by the law, do not judge and condemn them that are brought to Christ by the gospel; and you that are brought to Christ

by the gospel, do not you despise those that are brought to Christ by the law. Some are brought to Christ by fire, storms, and tempests; others by more easy and gentle gales of the Spirit. Thrice happy are those souls who are brought to Christ, whether it be in a winter's night, or a summer's day.

*Rem. 2.* Dwell upon the following scriptures, which do clearly evidence, that poor sinners who have no qualifications to meet with Christ, to receive and embrace the Lord Jesus Christ, may, notwithstanding that, believe, rest, and lean upon him for happiness and blessedness, according to the gospel. Read Prov. i. 20. ult. and chap. viii. 1-11. and chap. ix. 1-6. Ezek. xvi. 1-14. John iii. 14-18, 36. Rev. iii. 15-20. Here the Lord Jesus Christ stands knocking at the Laodiceans' door; he would fain have them sup with him, that he might sup with them; that is, that they might have intimate communion and fellowship one with another.<sup>1</sup>

Now pray tell me, what preparations and qualifications had these Laodiceans to entertain Christ? Surely none; for they were lukewarm, they were 'neither hot nor cold,' they were 'wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked,' and yet Christ to show his free grace, and his condescending love, invites the very worst of sinners to open, though they were no ways prepared or qualified to entertain him.

*Rem. 3.* Seriously consider, that the Lord does not in all the scripture, require such preparations and qualifications before men come to Christ, believe in Christ, or entertain, or embrace the Lord Jesus.\* Believing in Christ is the great thing that God presses upon sinners throughout the scripture: as all know, who know any thing of scripture.

*Object.* But does not Christ say, 'Come to me all you that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest?' (Mat. xi. 28)

To this I shall give these three answers:

1. That though the invitation be to such that "Labor and are heavy laden," yet the promise of giving rest, is made to *coming*, to *believing* souls.

2. That all that this scripture proves and shows is, that such who labor under sin, as under a heavy burden, and that are laden with the guilt of sin, and sense of God's displeasure, ought to come to Christ for rest; but it doth not prove that only such must come to Christ, nor that all men must be thus burdened, and laden with the sense of their sins, and the wrath of God, before they come to Christ.

Poor sinners, when they are under the sense of sin, and wrath of God, they are prone to run from creature to creature, and from duty to duty, and from ordinance to ordinance, to find rest; and if they could find it in any thing, or creature, Christ should never hear from them; but here the Lord sweetly invites them; and to encourage them, he engages himself to give them rest. 'Come, (saith Christ) and I will give you rest.' I will not show you. nor barely tell you of rest, but 'I will give you rest.' I am faithfulness itself, and cannot lie. 'I will give you rest.' I that have the greatest *power*, the greatest *will*, the greatest *right* to give it. 'Come laden sinners, and I will give you rest.' Rest

\* Rom. iv. 5. God justifies the ungodly. It is a comfort that he does justify such, or there could be no hope, since all are sinners or ungodly by nature. D.

is the most desirable, the most suitable good, and to you the greatest good. 'Come,' saith Christ, that is, 'Believe in me, and I will give you rest.' I will give you peace with God, and peace with conscience: I will turn your storm into an everlasting calm. I will give you such rest, that the world can neither give to you, nor take from you.

3. I answer:—No one scripture expresses the whole mind of God, therefore do but compare this one scripture with those several scriptures that are laid down in the second remedy last mentioned, and it will clearly appear, that though men are not thus burdened and laden with their sins, and filled with horror and terror, they may come to Christ, they may receive and embrace the Lord Jesus Christ.

*Rem. 4.* Consider, that all the trouble, sorrow, shame, and mourning for sin, which is acceptable to God, flows from faith in Christ, as the stream from the fountain, as the branch from the root, and as the effect from the cause. (Zech. xii. 10.) 'They shall look on him whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him.' All gospel mourning flows from believing; they shall first look, and then mourn.

CHAPTER IV. *The fourth Device that Satan hath to keep poor sinners from believing in, and closing with a Saviour, is, By suggesting to them Christ's unwillingness to save.* It is true, saith Satan, Christ is able to save thee, but is he willing? Surely, though he is able, yet he is not willing to save such a wretch as thou art; thou hast trampled his blood under thy feet, and hast lived in open rebellion against him all thy days, &c.—The remedy against this device of Satan, is briefly to consider these few things:

1. The great journey that he hath taken from heaven to earth, on purpose to save sinners, doth strongly demonstrate his willingness to save them. (Mat. ix. 13.) 'I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance,' and 1 Tim. i. 15.

2. His divesting himself of his glory in order to the salvation of sinners, manifesteth his willingness to save them. He leaves his Father's bosom, he puts off his glorious robes, and lays aside his glorious crown and bids adieu to his glittering courtiers, the angels, for a season; and all that he may accomplish the salvation of sinners.

3. That sea of sin, of wrath, of trouble, and of blood that Jesus Christ waded through, that sinners might be pardoned, justified, reconciled, and saved, strongly evidences his willingness to save them. (2 Cor. v. 19, 20.)

4. His sending his ambassadors early and late to woo and entreat sinners to be reconciled to him, doth loudly proclaim his readiness and willingness to save them.

5. His complaints against such as refuse him, and who will not be saved by him, loudly proclaim his willingness to save sinners. (John i. 11.) 'He came to his own, and his own received him not.' So in John v. 40. 'But ye will not come to me, that ye may have life.'

6. The joy and delight that he takes in the conversion of sinners, demonstrates his willingness that they should be saved. (Luke xv. 7.) 'I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons which need no repentance.' God the Father rejoiceth at the return of his prodigal son; Christ rejoices to see the travail of his soul; the Spirit rejoices that he hath another temple to dwell in; and the angels rejoice that they have another brother to delight in, &c.

CHAPTER V. *Here follows seven Characters of False-teachers, which let me add for a close, viz:—*That Satan labors hard by false teachers, who are his messengers and ambassadors to deceive, delude, and destroy for ever the precious souls of men. (Acts xx. 28–30. 2 Cor. xi. 13–15. Eph. iv. 14. 2 Tim. iii. 4–6. Tit. i. 11, 12. 2 Pet. ii. 18, 19. Jer. xxiii. 13. Mic. iii. 5.) They seduce them, and carry them out of the right way into bye-paths, and lead them into error. 'Beware of false prophets.' (Mat. vii. 14, 15.) These draw out the very blood of souls. (Phil. iii. 2.) These kiss and kill; they cry peace, peace, till precious souls fall into everlasting flames, &c.—You may know them by the following characters:

1. They are men-pleasers: they preach more to please the ear, than to mend the heart.\* (Is. xxx. 10. Jer. v. 30, 31.) They handle holy things rather wittily, than with fear and reverence. False teachers are soul destroyers, they are like an unskilful surgeon, who skins over the wound, but never heals it. Flattery undid Ahab and Herod, Nero and Alexander. False teachers are hell's greatest contributors. 'Not bitter, but flattering words do all the mischief,' said Valerian, the Roman emperor.

2. False teachers are notable in casting dirt, scorn, and reproach upon the persons, names, and credit of Christ's most faithful ambassadors. Thus Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, charged Moses and Aaron that they took too much upon them, seeing all the congregation was holy. (Num. xvi. 3–9.) And so Ahab's false prophets fell foul on good Micaiah, paying him with blows for want of better reasons. (1 Kings xxii. 26.) Yea Paul the great apostle of the Gentiles, had his ministry undermined, and his reputation blasted by false teachers. (2 Cor. v. 10.) They rather contemn him, than admire him; they look upon him as a dunce rather than a doctor. And the same hard measure had our Lord Jesus from the Scribes and Pharisees, who labored as for life, to build their own credit upon the ruin of his reputation. I suppose false teachers mind not that saying of Austin, 'He that willingly takes from my good name, unwillingly adds to my reward.'

3. They are the inventors of the devices and visions of their own heads and hearts. (Mat. xxiv. 4, 5, 11, 14. Tit. i. 10. Jer. xiv. 14. chap. xxiii. 16.) They are Satan's great benefactors, and such as Divine justice will reward with punishment in hell as the greatest malefactors, if the Physician of souls do not prevent it, &c.

4. They easily pass over the great and weighty things both of law and gospel, and stand most upon those things that are of least moment and concern to the souls of men. (1 Tim. i. 5–7. Mat. xxiii. 23.) False teachers are particular in the less things of the law, and as negligent in the greater. (1 Tim. vi. 3–5.) If such teachers are not the veriest hypocrites, I know nothing. (Rom. ii. 23.) The earth groans to bear them, and hell is prepared for them. (Mat. xxiv. ult.)

5. False teachers cover and color their dangerous principles and foul impostures, with very fair speeches and plausible pretences; with high notions and golden expressions. They know sugared poison goes down sweetly: they wrap up their most pernicious (soul-killing) pills in gold.

In the days of Adrian the emperor, there was one Bencosby gather-

---

\* But so are not true teachers. (Ga. i. 10. 1 Thess. ii. 1–4.)

ed a multitude of Jews together, and called himself Be-cocuba, the son of a star, applying that promise to himself. (Num. xxiii. 17.) But he proved Barchosaba, the son of a lie. And so will all false teachers; for all their flourishes will prove at last but flowery lies.

6. False teachers strive more to win over men to their opinions, than to better them in their conversations.\* (Mat. xxiii. 15.) They busy themselves most about men's heads; their work is not to better their hearts, and mend their lives: and in this they are very much like their father the devil.

7. False teachers make merchandize of their followers. (2 Pet. ii. 1-3.) They eye your goods more than your edification; and mind more the serving of themselves, than the saving of your souls: so they may have your substance, they care not if Satan have your souls. (Rev. xviii. 11-13.) False teachers are the great worshippers of the golden calf. (Jer. vi. 13.)

Now by these characters you may know them, and so shun them, and deliver your souls out of their dangerous snares: which that you may, my prayers shall meet yours at the throne of grace.

---

**ART. VIII.** *A Reply to an Article in the Associate Presbyterian Magazine, entitled "The Examination examined."*

The above named periodical has seen proper to examine at some length, an article published in a late No. of the Religious Monitor, over the signature of "A Transylvanian." This examination has evidently been written in great haste and under highly excited feelings; and considering these circumstances, it will be no more than fair to make great allowance for the severity of its language, and the rashness of some of its statements. An answer to it would not have been regarded as necessary, had not some of the facts asserted by the Transylvanian been denied, or rather the whole of them; for it is said without limitation that the materials of the article published in the Monitor, "are nothing but falsehood, misrepresentation and unsound reasoning." The paper, it is said, might be correctly defined, "an uninterrupted tissue of falsehood, slander, jesuitical sophistry, and pitiful quibbling." And after an enumeration of statements said to be "falsehoods," some of them "entirely false," some "wholly false," and some of them "undisguised and wilful falsehoods," it is added, "These statements have been put forth by an anonymous writer, unsupported by proof, and we pronounce them to be false, utterly false, in every circumstance and in every particular." As to writing anonymously, the author of these remarks could hardly have failed to perceive that his own article is, in this respect, entirely on a level with that of the Transylvanian. Both have written, as is common in such cases, without appending their own names, yet under the signature of a responsible editor. As to the facts so strongly denied, they are mostly things of such notoriety, that no denial of them was anticipated. They are mostly things said and done on the floor of Sy-

---

\* "For shame, (says Epictetus to his Stoics) either live as Stoics, or leave off the name of Stoics." The application is easy.

nod, or things extensively known where they are said to have occurred, and if occasion require, abundant proof of them can be obtained. Some of the most important of the statements denied, have been confirmed by the Review contained in the ninth number of the Monitor; a brief notice of some other things is all that is intended in the present communication. And as the writer in the Magazine has given us no signature, he will be referred to, agreeably to the title of his piece, as the Examiner.

The Examiner says, (p. 171,) the Transylvanian "insinuates that by looking at the account of this decision [respecting the Presbytery of Albany,] as published by the Synod itself, mistaken apprehensions have prevailed to some extent." Here he has not properly apprehended the meaning of the Transylvanian, who had not said that such mistakes had prevailed in consequence of any thing published by the Synod, but only in consequence of what the Synod had not published.

The Examiner denies that a Missionary was sent forth, and that money was raised to bring on to Synod such as it was thought would befriend Mr. Stark. (p. 172.) This he pronounces "a mere fiction, an invention of the author, and an entire falsehood." It was generally thought in the west that a certain young minister traveled through a number of the western Presbyteries, calling on many of the brethren and urging them to attend the next meeting of Synod for the purpose of befriending Mr. Stark, and those who had taken part with him in the Presbytery of Albany. Whether it were indeed the said young man or "a mere fiction, an entire falsehood," can be ascertained by the testimony of something like a dozen or more ministers, members of the Presbyteries of Chartiers, Allegheny, and Shenango. Some of these can also testify whether there were offers made of pecuniary assistance. The Rev. A. T. M'Gill and Joseph M'Kee, can also testify that they received information in New-York of money having been raised for this purpose, and that this information was given them by at least one member of Mr. Stark's congregation. If, then, what was mentioned in the examination be entirely false, the reader will at least see how the writer was led into such mis-statements: It was by crediting a number of men who have hitherto sustained a good character for honesty and truth.

Another of the falsehoods charged against the Transylvanian, is the allegation of a plot to secure a majority of Mr. Stark's friends by a full and timely meeting, in one or more Presbyteries. Of this, the Examiner professes, that he and his brethren never "heard the remotest hint till this statement appeared in the Religious Monitor." Supposing this to be true in the full extent of the assertion, yet their not hearing of such a charge, does not prove that such a charge was not made upon the floor of Synod; that it was not freely and fully spoken of by many members, and was not generally considered as well established. Truth, however, requires it to be added, that not only some of the conductors of the Magazine, but the editor himself, spoke on the floor of Synod on the subject of this charge; so that it would seem they had something like a remote hint of it then, though it may have escaped their memory since.

Passing a verbal criticism next introduced by the Examiner, by merely referring him to the 11th page of his own Magazine, where he will in a like case find more just ground for exercising his critical acumen,

we proceed to the next charge of falsehood, which is in respect to the acknowledgment of the aforementioned plot implied in the words of Mr. H. H. Blair. In a speech delivered by him on the floor of Synod, in answer to the charge of a plot, he stated that *they had been long praying for such an opportunity, and that Providence had answered their prayers beyond their expectations.* The words in Italics were the words used by him, either verbatim or nearly so. The confession which he had thus innocently, or inadvertently made, was the subject of much remark at the time, both in and out of Synod; and if necessary, this fact, which is now said to be "wholly false" and "utterly false in every circumstance and particular," could be substantiated, by probably not less than a hundred witnesses.

It is also said to be wholly false that the friends of Mr. Stark were so convinced of this plot that they did not deny it, and it is added, "It was impossible for them to deny a charge of which they never heard." It may be that the Examiner never heard of it, but he tasks our faith too much, when he requires us to believe that a thing cannot be true because he did not hear it. Is he perfectly sure that none of his friends heard of this charge? Have they all told him so? If not, is not his own assertion a little hasty? We are confident that some of these friends both heard of this charge and believed it, because they expressed their disapprobation of the proceedings of these brethren, on the very ground of what was charged against them. That a censure of these proceedings, as manifesting intrigue, was embodied in one of the resolutions proposed as a pacific measure by Mr. Stark's friends, is distinctly remembered by more than the Transylvanian. The assertion formerly made on this subject is now called in question, and classed among the things "utterly false in every circumstance and in every particular." If, besides many who voted against Mr. Stark, many who voted in his favor, will not be ready to testify that such a resolution was read in connection with other resolutions, proposing a pacific settlement of the difficulties agitating the Synod, the Transylvanian is ready to come out in his own proper name, and though he cannot in conscience own a "wilful falsehood," he will own himself as deep in mistakes as the Examiner charges him with being deep in lies. It is impossible, at this distance of time, to recollect every circumstance particularly, nor is it material in this instance. The main fact is the reading, proposing, or moving of the resolution in question. The impression of the writer is, that the resolution was not moved, but only read, being introduced out of order, after the previous question had been carried on Saturday, for which reason neither it, nor the others read with it, appear in the minutes. In this, it is possible, he may labor under some mistake.

Of this much, however, he is confident, that a resolution in substance charging these brethren with intrigue was introduced by their friends; and it proves satisfactorily what it was adduced to prove, that these friends believed in the charge embodied in their resolution. The Rev. Mr. Rodgers can testify whether he proposed such a resolution as a condition of his assenting to the rest, and the others concerned in framing this measure can testify whether they agreed to its being inserted. These men will not back the Magazine in asserting that what was advanced on this subject was "false in every circumstance and in every particular."

The Transylvanian had said that Mr. H. H. Blair called on Mr. Martin to ascertain whether a distant member had arrived, whose

presence might have materially deranged their plans. The fact of his calling on Mr. Martin is admitted, and if the fact of his inquiring whether the distant member had arrived had also been admitted, then all that was asserted would have been granted. It seems now that Mr. Blair says he did not call "with the design falsely imputed to him, but for an entirely different purpose." Nothing was said about his *designs* farther than to attribute to him the intention to do the thing which he did, which seems to be a fair way of reasoning about intelligent agents. In what light this disavowal of Mr. Blair's should be regarded when compared with the following statement of his conduct by the Rev. Mr. Martin, is left to every reader's judgment. Mr. Martin in a letter to the writer, gives the following account of the occurrences referred to:

"On the morning of the meeting of our Presbytery, 18th April, 1838, I met Mr. Blair in the street, who asked me very particularly whether Mr. Graham had come; I told him that he had not, but that perhaps the steam-boat had not arrived. He then started off for the steam-boat landing; but in about an hour called at my house, and again asked me if Mr. Graham had come; I told him that he had not; but he seemed to doubt my word, for passing me in the hall he walked up stairs to my study, without any invitation, apparently with the design of *seeing* whether Mr. Graham was there or not. That he made other inquiries I will not deny. But that this was the *principal* object of his calling at that time I have not the least doubt. This you know was stated in Synod."

It may be added to Mr. Martin's statement, that every body attending Synod, and observing the proceedings, knows that these things were related by Mr. Martin as proofs of that plot, of which those most interested, now declare that they had not the remotest hint until it was mentioned in the Religious Monitor!

Another falsehood charged against the Transylvanian, is his saying that the Presbytery of Albany met at the precise time, whereas the clock struck the hour before they entered the place of meeting, and of course it might have been some minutes, or perhaps some part of a minute, after the hour. It becomes one to be very accurate and precise indeed, when grave charges of falsehood are founded on such trifles. The Examiner may see that the term *precise* was not used by the Transylvanian so very precisely, but that he supposed the Presbytery might have met even six or seven minutes later than the hour. After all, if the Examiner must be so precise—he thinks "Mr. Martin's watch might not have been correct"—is he perfectly sure that the clock was correct? May it not have been as much before the time as they were behind the clock in their meeting? Other points of like importance with this shall be passed over in silence for the sake of brevity.

The Transylvanian had said of these brethren, "They claim in connexion with their friends to be the Scotch party, and have often told us of their being the learned, respectable, and pious portion of the church." This saying appears to have excited no small degree of wrath. Among other declarations of a like character, the Examiner says, "We are fully warranted to call it, not only an undisguised but a wilful falsehood." Now for the proof. Is it false that these men have put forth claims to be the Scotch party in the Associate Church? In the Associate Presbyterian Magazine, No. 1, pp 7, 8, 9, they characterize the proceedings of the Associate Synod for a number of years,

as unceasing prosecutions carried on against one or other of the Scotch ministers; they regard the saying imputed to Mr. Webster as the true explanation of the proceedings of some of the Presbyteries and also of the Synod, in other words, that the majority of Synod which has opposed them, has opposed them because they are Scotch. "They," says the Magazine, "*want the Scotch under their feet and to keep them there.*" And they recognize themselves as the Scotch suffering persecution because of their being Scotch, for it is immediately added, "Is it any wonder that the Scotch should not be greatly in love with such expressions of brotherly affection?" and so on to the end of the paragraph.

If there were any mistake in supposing that they considered themselves, however reluctantly driven to it, as a Scotch party laboring under persecution, the above declarations appear sufficient to show that the mistake hardly deserved to be called "an undisguised or wilful falsehood." But as to their claims of learning, respectability and piety has the Transylvanian been guilty of falsehood in this particular? Let the reader examine the following quotations and judge:—"It is, however, but justice to remark, that these proceedings are the work of a party, and they have been uniformly opposed and protested against by those members of Synod who are the most distinguished for their *piety and learning.*" (Ass. Pres. Mag. p. 28.) "A full meeting [that is plenty of Mr. Stark's friends] would secure, that things would be done in a *wise, just and orderly manner.*" (Mag. p. 3.) "It is true the most *honored* names in that church stand on record against this unscriptural decision;" that is the vote convicting Mr. Stark of insubordination. (Mag. No. 3. p. 73.) In the first page of the Magazine, those opposed to these brethren are described as under the influence of "unchristian feelings and motives," acting "a strange and sinful part," deposing brethren "without any just cause and even without any plausible pretext," as persecuting them, treating them with "much indignity and cruelty." Such is a specimen of the character which they give of the majority of Synod; and what is the character which they give of themselves? On the same page, they speak of themselves as acting under "a high sense of duty," more concerned on account of the discredit brought upon religion by these sinful proceedings than for any personal inconvenience;" and were it not for their "high sense of duty," ready "to suffer in silence the ill usage and persecution of their brethren." Mr. Stark begins his letter to his congregation by telling them he had been assailed by the shafts of malice, "in common with more *eminent men.*" Putting the most modest construction on his words, he may be considered as speaking comparatively, merely asserting his own eminence, and conceding a greater degree of it to others. In the same letter, he tells his people that an attack had been made upon himself and several of the *most respectable* ministers in the community, that is, on several of the Scotsmen who have acted with him, and whom he represents as not only more respectable than their brethren, but "the most respectable ministers in the community." Some of them are elsewhere spoken of as "the most *respectable, diligent and useful* ministers that ever belonged to the Associate Church." (Mag. p. 104.) Mr. Stark in his letter to his congregation, says, "It can hardly be thought that the *pious* ministers of the Associate Church will approve of such a deed." (Letter, p. 13.) In his remarks on a Pamphlet by the Associate Presbytery of Albany, (p. 3,) he says, "I still entertain the hope that the

pious ministers in that church will not permit this most unjust decision to remain unreversed." If these quotations be not enough to screen from the charge of wilful falsehood the aforesaid declaration, that these men have claimed to be the learned, respectable, and pious portion of the church, there are a few more of the same kind in reserve. Probably, however, the reader will be ready to say, *satis superque satis*.

Having thus disposed of the falsehoods of the Transylvanian, the Examiner proceeds to misrepresentations. It seems the case of Mr. Stark was misrepresented by its being stated that he "had been charged with a number of flagrant offences, of which he had been convicted by the Synod." If so, Mr. Stark is equally guilty against himself, for he uses the very same language in stating his own case, only he asserts that the conviction was not just, a matter which, as it was not what the Transylvanian proposed to consider, he neither affirmed nor denied. (Magazine, No. 1, p. 13th, 7th line from the bottom.)

The next misrepresentation alleged, is in respect to the Declinature of the Presbytery of Albany, which the Examiner persists in denying to be a declinature. The argument of the Transylvanian was founded on the character of the paper itself, and this the Examiner has not touched. The Presbytery of Albany, he says, did not consider it in the light of a declinature, and deal with him accordingly. And what then? Does the Examiner regard their judgment as so infallible, that if they did not so consider it, the paper could not be a declinature; or does he think impunity full proof that there has been no crime? The Presbytery of Albany may have erred in their judgment and procedure, but this does not at all affect the true character of the paper. But it is said the Synod did not regard it as a declinature: They allowed Mr. S. to take his seat as a member, and therefore the Examiner thinks the paper was not a declinature. Mr. Stark also did not regard it in this light; so we have a triple argument, as good as a triple escape from prison, to prove that there was no guilt. But there is no need of dwelling on this point after the satisfactory evidence furnished in the Review, to prove that even the facts on which this reasoning is built are totally groundless.

The Examiner says, that the Synod of 1837, "perceiving the injustice and irregularity of a former decision, [relating to Mr. Stark,] agreed to review it." If the Synod had so much light as this, there was no great occasion for a review. They would surely have at once reversed a decision which they had discovered to be unjust and irregular.

He says, the Presbytery of Albany did not exclude Mr. Stark from his seat because he had given in his declinature. This has been shown to be directly at variance with facts. (See Review, Rel. Mon. pp. 400, 401.) The argument which the Examiner here advances to establish his point, is in substance this: Members of the Presbytery complained of the proceedings of the Synod in the case of Mr. Stark, therefore it must have been in opposition to the deed of Synod that they excluded him from his seat in Presbytery! Now, their dealing with Mr. Stark respecting his declinature, was agreeable to an order of Synod: how then could this be in disobedience to other deeds of which they complained? Is it fair to regard all the obedience to the laws, yielded by such as oppose the administration, as acts of rebellion against the government? yet such is the spirit of this argument. The Examiner is evidently much puzzled about this declinature, which is a main

point in his defence; and if he cannot get strong facts, he at least gives us plenty of strong language. He tells us not only that he has proved, but that he has proved "in the clearest manner," that this paper was not a declinature. Having paid this compliment to his own argument, "both as to matter and manner," he proceeds to show by the aforementioned reasoning, that the Presbytery did not exclude him on account of the declinature, but "in direct opposition to the decision of Synod." Thus, as he thinks, having made the thing "very plain," he gives the decision in his own favor in the most triumphant manner. "We thus," says he, "inevitably arrive at the conclusion;" we have "thus established Mr. Stark's right to a seat beyond all controversy." People are very ready to conclude that such strong assertions are most commonly employed where there is a lamentable deficiency of strong reasons.

The next alleged misrepresentation is in regard to the illegal admission of the elder from New-York. The Examiner professes to believe that there was no act of the Presbytery of Albany declaring Mr. Stark's congregation in a state of insubordination, &c. The assertion now denied was founded upon the declarations of the Presbytery of Albany, in a Narrative judicially enacted, in which they speak of Mr. Stark's congregation as "having followed him out of the communion of the Associate Church," as having no longer "a standing as Associate Presbyterians," but being "in a state of independency;" and they accordingly "exhort them to return to their former standing *under the care of this Presbytery.*" (Narrative, pp. 4, 30, 31.) The suspended brethren appear to have considered Mr. Stark's congregation as in this excluded state at the time of their meeting, April 18th, 1838; for the motion, as recorded in their minutes for the exclusion of Messrs. Campbell and Martin, accuses them of having deprived "Mr. Stark and the elder from his congregation, of their seats in Presbytery." If, then, they knew of no deed of the kind previous to the meeting of Synod in 1837, they surely could not be ignorant of this deed which they proposed to censure; and how then can they say, "Now this is the first time we ever heard of this congregation having been censured in any way. We do not believe that the Presbytery ever made such a declaration as this, nor do we believe that any such deed ever existed; otherwise we think we must have heard it." But, it is pleaded, if such a deed existed, it must have been set aside by the Synod of 1837, which "*restored*" the elder from Mr. Stark's congregation to his seat. Here it is acknowledged that the elder had been excluded, else how could he be *restored*. But how does the Synod's admitting him annul the deed of the Presbytery respecting the congregation? It would be a very convenient rule for some, if the violations of laws and acts set them aside. The admission of the elder from New-York was inconsistent with the act of the Presbytery, but it no more set aside that act, than the admission of a layman as an elder would set aside the law of Presbyterianism. Things inconsistent with the law are quite different from the abrogation of the law.

The next misrepresentation alleged, is in regard to the way, in which Mr. Stark was admitted to a seat in the Presbytery, on the 18th of April, 1838. It is now denied that the protests of Dr. P. Bullions, Messrs. Blair and Stark, were withdrawn in order to allow of his admission, and it is said that these protests were withdrawn subsequently to his admission, at the making up of the roll. This change of position does not at all affect the argument proving his admission ille-

gal; for it still appears that he was allowed to take his seat without any review, or attempt to review, the deed of Presbytery excluding him. This view of the case has, however, much appearance of being an *after-thought*. It was not the representation given by these brethren at the meeting of Synod; nor does it agree with their minutes, either as published by themselves, or as published from the original paper in the Review of their Magazine. When Dr. P. Bullions withdrew his protest, he is not made to say in the minutes that this was done, because the deed had been set aside, and Mr. Stark was allowed a seat, but he is made to speak as one pronouncing sentence against the deed, and giving his reason for it: "That decision," says he, "being in itself null and void, because in opposition to a decision of Synod." Messrs. Blair and Stark assign the same reason for withdrawing their protests, only in different words. The original minute, as published in the Review, sustains the representation formerly given of this proceeding still more clearly, for, according to it, Mr. Stark's name was not put upon the roll until after the protests were withdrawn. It seems that the Examiner, feeling the absurdity of annulling a deed by withdrawing protests against it, wishes now to shift his position, but the new ground is no better than the old. According to the present representation, Mr. Stark took his seat without any thing done, either formally or informally, against the deed of exclusion, and this also, while he and two of his brethren were continuing to protest against the said deed.

The Examiner charges it as misrepresentation, that he and his brethren are said to have attempted "to exclude Messrs. Campbell and Martin from their seats in Presbytery." This, says he, is "wholly unfounded. Nothing of the kind was ever contemplated by us, and nothing of the kind was ever done by us." And yet, in a few lines afterwards, he mentions that "a motion was made that they should be excluded from their seats, unless they would submit to the decision of Synod." Here also there is a great change of position, and one in direct opposition to their own minutes. It is now said that this motion for the exclusion of Messrs. Martin and Campbell, was made in consequence of their "refusing all obedience to the Moderator, and continuing to disturb the Presbytery and to interrupt its business." And in a foot note it is added, "This dealing with them was occasioned solely by their own irregular and turbulent conduct."

Compare with this their own minute, even as given by themselves. This motion to deal with them, occasioned solely by their irregular and turbulent conduct after coming into Presbytery, is in the following words: "Whereas, the Rev. Messrs. Martin and Campbell have acted in opposition to a decision of Synod, in depriving Mr. Stark and the elder from his congregation, of their seats in Presbytery, Therefore, Resolved, that they be excluded from their seats in Presbytery till they submit to the authority of Synod." This resolution Dr. Bullions admitted he had prepared before the meeting of the Presbytery. Did he foresee the irregular and turbulent conduct which was to be the *sole* reason of his offering it? or was it solely for present disorder that it was proposed to punish past disobedience? Did the Presbytery mean their own authority, when they spoke of the authority of Synod? or is it "wholly unfounded" to say that an attempt was made to exclude Messrs. Campbell and Martin from seats in

Presbytery? But enough has been said of such alleged misrepresentations. It seems hardly necessary to answer charges where the accuser is making and answering them in the same breath.

Little need be said respecting the remainder of this paper, in which the Examiner professes to treat "of the unsound reasoning contained in the paper subscribed 'A Transylvanian.'" As it is admitted that the weight of the reasons depends upon the facts, the chief or only controversy is in relation to them. If the Examiner will not think his intellect undervalued for the sake of not impeaching his sincerity, we would say of his remarks on the first reason, that he has not understood it. This reason in vindication of the deed of Synod was "the great precipitance with which those who met at the precise time constituted, and proceeded to business." The Examiner treats this as if the argument had been founded on their meeting at the *precise time*, and not on the *precipitance* of their meeting and of their transactions. The circumstances also, which rendered this precipitance so exceptionable, and without which no particular exception would have been taken against it, are not at all noticed. The other reasons are treated in much the same way. It may be presumed, that if the Examiner's cause had been more defensible, his reasoning would have been more fair, and his language more decorous.

On the concluding remarks of the Transylvanian he says, "It is here admitted that this decision of the Synod may have been wrong." This supposed admission is founded on the following sentence: "After all, supposing that the decision of the Synod was wrong, it was a mere measure of administration, &c." Surely it requires no answer to satisfy any thinking person that *a supposition* is not *an admission*.

The reasoning of the Examiner, in a long note at the conclusion of his piece, is sufficiently answered by distinguishing between the *vitiating* of a church court and the *annihilation* of it. He supposes, that if the Presbytery of Albany were vitiated by the admission of Mr. Stark, then the Synod must have been vitiated by the same unworthy member, and so "There would have been no Associate Synod." He supposes also, in the case of the Associate Presbytery of Cambridge, that the Synod's setting aside what they had done at a particular meeting, when a member had been illegally admitted, would also have "annihilated" that court. Now the question is not at all about annihilating church courts. The Synod did not decide that the Associate Presbytery of Albany was annihilated even for a moment, but only that their proceedings were vitiated, and that those who resisted their corrupt proceedings and withdrew, were entitled to be considered the Presbytery, in preference to those who remained. There is also a wide difference between a person's being legally admitted to a seat, even though not worthy of it, and his being admitted in violation of the law. Mr. Stark was legally admitted to a seat in Synod when a vote was taken to relieve him from suspension, and his occupying a seat under such circumstances, did not vitiate the proceedings of the court. In the Presbytery of Albany, he took a seat without any such vote of the court, and in opposition to an act excluding him. If the Synod had refused to relieve Mr. Stark from suspension, or had voted that he was not entitled to a seat, and he had notwithstanding taken his seat as a member, the case would have been parallel.

In the former article it was stated, that the decision of the Synod, even if wrong, being a mere act of administration, involving no re-

linquishment of profession, or even censure of these brethren, they might have submitted without any injury to truth or a good conscience. They might have exonerated themselves from all approbation of the act by a protest. This the Examiner denies. "It is not true," says he, "as this author affirms, that the way was opened for us to exonerate ourselves by a protest. On the contrary, it is well known that we offered a protest, and it was disallowed, which was made the foundation of our declinature." How much truth there is in this denial the reader may ascertain from the minutes of the Synod. (Rel. Monitor, vol. XV. p. 19.) After the decision of the Synod respecting the parties claiming to be the Presbytery, these brethren handed in a paper, in which they protested against the decision, and also declared to Synod their purpose to resist it. A committee was appointed to report on this paper, whose report was adopted by Synod. They distinguish in the paper what was allowable and what could not be allowed. They admit, that so far as it was a protest, it was allowable, but so far as it proposed a contempt of the authority of the Synod, it was a declinature, and could not be allowed. The first sentence of this report is as follows: "That the brethren who have subscribed the above paper have a right to enter a protest against the deed of Synod with which they are dissatisfied. for their own exoneration, if they choose to do so, is not denied." How then can it be said that the way was not opened for them to exonerate themselves by a protest? or that the Synod required them to "*acquiesce* in this decision," with which they were allowed to be "*dissatisfied*," and to express their dissatisfaction?

The most of these things which the Examiner has noticed, are only of secondary importance; and though he is forward enough to decide for himself that he has made his positions perfectly plain, has proved them in the clearest manner, &c. &c. it is left to the judgment of the reader how far he has succeeded, even in what he has attempted, to convict the Transylvanian of "falsehood, misrepresentation, and unsound reasoning." The main points of the case are handled very sparingly, or not touched at all. He has not attempted to show that the paper sent by Mr. Stark to the Presbytery of Albany, was not in its letter and spirit a declinature, and a paper of such a character, that it was utterly inconsistent in him to ask, and in them to grant him a seat, while it was lying on their table. He has not attempted to show that this paper was not referred to that Presbytery by the Synod, with instructions to deal with him respecting it. He has not attempted to show that the Presbytery transgressed any order of the Synod, or did not act in the way of duty in dealing with him according to the aforesaid instructions. He has done nothing worthy of the name of an attempt to show that his exclusion from a seat in the Presbytery was disorderly, or his subsequent admission regular. He writes as if he expected his readers to take his assertions for arguments, and his contradiction of others as a sufficient answer to their reasonings.

It is rumored that these brethren intend to apply to the next meeting of the Synod for the redress of their supposed wrongs. If so, it is the more proper that all interested, and especially those who may be called to act judicially in their case, should examine its true merits. And it is evident that their case has been placed on very different grounds by their proceedings since their excision. The question is not now, whether the discipline of the church exercised towards these men for their past offences,

shall be set aside, but whether the Synod will concur in the contempt with which that discipline has been treated; and whether they will overlook all the misrepresentations, slanders and revilings, in which these men have indulged against individuals, Presbyteries, and the Synod itself? If there be any doubt respecting the concern of some of these men in slanders published anonymously, there can be none about those which they have published under their own names. It is evident that these persons cannot be admitted into the church under present circumstances without rending it to pieces. Even if those who have opposed them were willing to sit with them again, without their retracting the reproaches and slanders so unsparingly heaped upon them, it is obvious from the past, what use would be made of power, if it were in the hands of these men. They would no doubt be ready to use it as they attempted to use it in the Presbytery of Albany. But we cannot think that most of those, who have in time past favored these men, will follow them farther. Their spirit has made itself so manifest in the pages of their Magazine, that there is no need of any other exposure to enable all to understand their true character. If this periodical were designed to facilitate their readmission to the church, then they must at least be exempted from the charge of having managed it with much art; for they have not only abused beyond measure those whom they account their enemies, but they have been equally unsparing of some, who, to a certain extent, have acted as their friends.

It is evident that, in the hands of the Examiner, nothing can be unanswerable; and if he be so inclined, it will be perfectly easy to reply to the preceding remarks, and set aside and disprove things in his usual *clear manner*. It is not, however, probable that the controversy will be pursued farther by

A TRANSYLVANIAN.

ART. IX. *A Letter from the Rev. Joseph McCarrell, D. D. S. T. P. to the Editor of the Religious Monitor—with accompanying Remarks.*

NEWBURGH, Jan. 7, 1839.

REV. JAMES MARTIN,

You have thought proper to state in your Magazine for November, 1838, that "there is no truth in my reference to the Testimony of the Associate Church," and that I "meant to practice a deception on my brethren and the christian public," and the reason you give for these grave charges, is that "your testimony does not contain the sentiment imputed to it." I am accountable for what I have written, not far your *blunder*. I referred to the Testimony of the "Associate Church," and stated its meaning fairly. When I quote the testimony of John, and you do not find that testimony in Johnson, you have not sustained against me your charge of untruth and deception. The book from which I derived my statement, is entitled, "Narrative and Testimony agreed upon and enacted by The General Associate Synod, &c. published by appointment of Synod, Edinburgh, 1804." Your Book is entitled "A Display of the Religious Principles of the Associate Synod of North America. Albany, printed by Webster & Wood, 1828." If the Synods then represent their respective churches, and the testimonies of the Synods are the testimonies of their respective churches, the difference between the testimony to which I referred, and your testimony, is the difference between, "The testimony of the Associate Church and The Testimony of the Associate Church of North America." I therefore announced my authority by its proper name. That I have given its meaning fairly, will appear by comparing what I stated with the language of the document itself. My statement is, "The Testimony of the Associate Church allows of other inspired songs taken both from the Old Testament and the New." (p. 170.) Compare this with the testimony, p. 170, sec. 5, Of the Psalmody. "We assert and declare:

1. That the Psalms contained in the book which bears this name, and other Scripture Songs, were given by Divine inspiration, to be used in the ordinances of praise under the Old Testament.

2. That these Psalms and Songs are of the same divine authority under the New Testament, and these, as well as others contained in the New Testament itself, may be sung in the ordinance of praise.

I have stated the truth, and nothing but the truth. But these charges are, if possible, still more surprising and unaccountable, inasmuch as Mr. Martin's own Synod, as late as 1827, recognized the church which adhered to that testimony which I referred to as *the same church with themselves* and as *maintaining the same testimony*.

"Against the act of the General Associate Synod ratifying the above union, (that with the Burger Synod in 1821) a small minority of ministers protested, and continued to claim the name of the Associate Synod, and to adhere to its principles as exhibited in the testimony emitted in 1804, and other subordinate standards. It was pleasing to find these protesters thus preserved as the Lord's remnant and still occupying the same ground which they and we had been accustomed to occupy in fellowship of the truth. They were, by an act of this Synod passed at the same meeting of 1827 at Pittsburgh, judicially recognized as continuing to be one church with us and engaged in maintaining the same testimony in behalf of a covenanted Reformation." A Display of the Religious Principles of the Associate Synod of North America, p. 41.

And yet for quoting this same testimony of this one church with your own, you have not been ashamed to publish me to the world, as guilty of an untruth and an intention to deceive! I might now retort upon you the charges which you have had the candor to make against me. But as I am required by the highest authority to bless them that curse me, I merely remind you that when you have calumniated a minister of Christ, it is your duty to correct the mischief as extensively as possible, and with the least possible delay. As an act of justice, I claim for this letter an insertion in the Monitor.

JOSEPH MCCARRELL.

#### Remarks on the above Letter.

The foregoing letter was received at too late an hour to find a place in our last number. We are indeed sorry, on the writer's account, to be under the necessity of publishing it at all. He must surely have found himself placed in an ugly predicament, or he never would have written in such a style. The most careless reader will not fail to perceive, that this letter is sadly deficient as to *common courtesy*; and moreover, that there is a remarkable *littleness* about it, as for example, "When I quote the testimony of John and you do not find that testimony in Johnson," &c. And again, "Your Book——*Albany, printed by Webster & Wood, 1828.*" Other specimens of a similar kind the reader himself will easily detect.

But what have we done to occasion such a *display* from the pen of this *courteous and dignified* writer? Why, it seems we denied the correctness of his reference to the Testimony of the Associate Church, in a certain Report of his; and further, he says, that we thought proper to state, that he "meant to practice a deception on his brethren and the christian public." The difference between this part of his charge against us and the *truth*, is just as great as the difference between a *positive statement* and the *expression of a doubt*. We did not directly charge him with *meaning to practice a deception*.

In the number of the Monitor referred to, we published a Report written by Dr. McCarrell, on the subject of Psalmody, which was adopted by the Associate Reformed Synod of New-York, at their last meeting; in which the Doctor says, "The Testimony of the Associate Church allows of other inspired songs, taken both from the Old Testament and from the New." In introducing this Report to the notice of our readers, we remarked:—"Our readers will at once perceive that there is no truth in the reference of Dr. McCarrell to the 'Testimony of the Associate Church.' Our Testimony does not contain the sentiment imputed to it. We can not understand what the Dr. means, unless it be to practice a deception on his brethren and the christian public."

Now, we think it will be manifest to most people who read this *controversy*, that the Doctor's attempt to justify the *propriety* of his statement and to convict us of *calumny*, is exceedingly lame, puerile and unsuccessful.

In a place, in the neighborhood of which several congregations belonging to the Associate Church reside, the Doctor's Report was read, stating that the Testimony of the Associate Church declared so and so. Now, who that heard that Report read, (and it is probable that members of the Associate Church were present,) could have thought otherwise than that the reference was to the Testimony of the Associate Church in this country? Or who that has

seen that Report in print, where the Testimony of our church is known, could have dreamed that the reference was to any other document? We venture to say that *ninety-nine* out of a *hundred* of all who heard or have seen the Report in question, formed the same judgment on the subject that we did, viz: that the language employed by the Dr. according to any fair principle of interpretation, pointed directly to the Testimony of the Associate Church in this country.

But, says the learned and courteous Doctor, "I am accountable for what I have *written*, not for your *blunder*"—I did not mean the Testimony of the Associate Church in the neighborhood, but the Testimony of an Associate Church three or four thousand miles off, in Europe!—For the sake of illustrating the Doctor's *tact*, let us suppose a case or two:—A certain Dr. somewhere in the State of New-York, surrounded by Presbyterian, declares, that the Presbyterian Church has almost wholly degenerated into Socinianism—Why, what does the Dr. mean? exclaims some Presbyterians greatly surprised—I hope he is not trying to impose on the credulity of the people! You blockhead, says the Dr. in a great rage, I am accountable for what I have *said*, not for your *blunder*. I meant the Presbyterian Church in *Switzerland*! Again, the same Doctor on another occasion writes—"The Lutheran ministers almost to a man have turned Neologists." What does he mean, says some simple hearted Lutheran? Surely this is not true of our ministers. Is he not attempting to impose on the ignorance and credulity of his readers? The Doctor, much excited at this contradiction, exclaims, you calumniating fellow, I am accountable for what I have *written*, not for your *blunder*—I did not mean you Lutherans here in the United States, but the Lutherans away off in Germany, near the Baltic sea! Ah, Doctor, this is a poor get off!

Our Testimony was adopted in 1784, and has ever since been familiarly called, in this country, "The Testimony of the Associate Church:" But Dr. McCarrell insists that he is correct in calling the Testimony of the Anti-burgher Seceders in Scotland, which was adopted in 1804, "The Testimony of the Associate Church," and that there is nothing ambiguous in his language, or calculated to leave a false impression! Thus the Dr. settles the question, that the Anti-burghers in Scotland, though there be no such a church, *are* the Associate Church, and that their Testimony, though now obsolete, *is* "The Testimony of the Associate Church," and that we poor Seceders in the United States have no more right to be called the Associate Church, than *Johnson* has a right to be called John!

But the Doctor's defence of his language is strangely defective, when it is recollected, that the document from which he quotes is no longer a Testimony in any branch of the Associate Church: It was abandoned in 1821, by all its former adherents but a few Protesters, and after the union of the Protesters with the Constitutional Presbytery in 1827, it was entirely laid aside, and what is called the Testimony of the Original Seceders substituted in its place; in which Testimony the sentiment in question is not to be found. With what propriety then can the Dr. persist in calling that instrument, which has been *dead* for a number of years, "The Testimony of the Associate Church?" But says the Dr., "When I quote the testimony of John, and you do not find that testimony in Johnson, you have not sustained against me your charge of untruth and deception." To this *little witticism* we reply by saying—Aye, Doctor, but when you quote the testimony of John *as* the testimony of Johnson, when you know or ought to know, that John and his testimony are both *defunct*, you ought not to complain, even *if* such a charge were preferred against you.

If the Dr. would not take it ill, we might safely say that "we cannot understand what he means," unless it be for the purpose of *obscurat*ion, when, in describing our book, he adds—"Albany, printed by Webster & Wood, 1828." Though apparently giving the title-page of *our book*, even down to the *imprint*, he carefully omits these words, FIFTH EDITION. (The *first* edition was

printed in Philadelphia, 1784.) What does he mean by this? Is it to create the impression that our book is not so old as the European Testimony from which he quotes, that it is only the *son* of that Testimony, even as Johnson is the *son* of John, and that, therefore, he "announced his authority by its proper name?" We only ask for information.

We deny that we have "calumniated a minister of Christ" in any thing we said respecting the Dr.'s Report. But whether he be altogether clear of this charge we will not undertake to say. For even a text of scripture may be quoted with a calumnious intent. Though there may be a *show* of piety in making the quotation, perhaps, after all, there is *really* more of calumny than piety in it. The Dr.'s quotation *seems* to be of this kind—"As I am required," says he, "by the highest authority to bless them that *curse me*, I merely remind *you*," &c.

Now had the Dr. been so minded, how easily might he have escaped with honor from any charge we brought against him, by simply admitting the impropriety of his language, acknowledging that it was calculated to leave a wrong impression, and that he ought to have named his authority, "The Testimony of the *late* General Associate Synod in Scotland." But he has chosen rather to defend what is utterly indefensible; and has thus, we think, placed himself in somewhat of an awkward predicament before the public. "Honesty is the best Policy."

We will only add, that his sending copies of the above letter to other periodicals for publication, before it could appear in ours, and before he knew whether we would publish it or not, to say the least, was very *unhandsome* treatment; particularly as those periodicals had never published the *statement* complained of. The Dr.'s letter has already appeared in the *Christian Magazine* and in the *Associate Presbyterian Magazine*. That any other editors will be found so wanting in *courtesy* and *justice* towards a brother editor, we do not believe. Had the Magazines named waited, and published the letter with our accompanying remarks, no fault could have been found with them; or had we refused to publish the letter, they would have been justifiable in publishing it on the solicitation of the writer. But as the matter now presents itself, the editor of the *A. P. Mag.* will be regarded, on account of existing *relations*, as having committed a real *Samaritan trick*: and the editor of the *Ch. Mag.*, as being more ready to correct the *alleged* misstatements of another's periodical, than to correct the *genuine* falsehoods of his own. And as both of these editors have inflicted on us an injury, by publishing this letter in the way they have done, we claim at their hands, as an act of justice, the publication of these Remarks.

---

#### ART. X. Notices.

The Letters respecting the Pittsburgh Convention, are necessarily excluded from the present No., for want of room. They will be attended to in our next.

Some *strange* statements contained in the last No. of the *A. P. Magazine*, will be noticed in due time.

☞ As our volume is drawing to a close we hope our subscribers will not be forgetful of *their dues*, nor of *our necessities*.

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,  
AND  
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

APRIL, 1839.

---

ART. I. *Extracts from a Clergyman's Diary.*

*All is for the best*, is a maxim and motto with many, who, in using and adopting it as applicable to themselves, are guilty of the grossest self-deception. All is for the best to the believer in Christ, but to no other. Does conscience accuse, and its threatenings terrify the soul? These woundings of the spirit only tend to embitter sin, and drive to the blood of the Lamb for peace and mercy. Does Satan tempt, and by his fiery darts threaten the believer? He does but chase the soul to her impregnable fortress, where his arrows cannot enter, where his assaults are vain. Do afflictions distress? They are sent to humble the soul and ripen it for glory. The dark cloud and the rain are as necessary in the natural world to the seed sown, as the clear shining of the sun after rain. Afflictions are the pruning knife, applied even to the fruitful branch, "that it may bring forth more fruit." They sever the chains which bind the heart to the world; they strip from the soul the "thick clay" with which Satan seeks to hinder our progress Zionward; yea, they work for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory. The pit into which Joseph's brethren cast him—the dungeon of Potiphar, was but a step to the highest dignity under Pharaoh; and thus, the heaviest trial of the christian, is but a step advancing him nearer to his throne in heaven. Death itself, whether it come sudden as the whirlwind, or steal upon him in a lingering, wasting consumption; whetlier it comes when old age has silvered the hair, or when the cheek is in its bloom;—comes at the best time, and in the best way; comes as one of the christian's treasures, opening the door which admits him to his home. The word chance, as used by the world, has no place in the language of Canaan. The christian knows that every event, every trial, every tear, every sorrow, every bereavement, every circumstance, great or small, from the cradle to the grave, was appointed in infinite

wisdom by his best friend ; and that all is for the best to him. All things work together for good to them that love God: health, sickness, life, death, reproach, persecution, the darkest and apparently most discordant providences should never make him doubt what the God of faithfulness hath spoken.

But to sinners, nothing is for the best. It is not for the best when riches and worldly honors flow in upon them. These only pamper their pride and ripen for destruction. It is not for the best to the sinner when afflictions meet him. They come against him as ministers of vengeance, causing him to rage and blaspheme, and proclaiming the terrors of the doom which awaits him, if he persist in scorning offered mercy. It is not for the best for the sinner, that his death may be what his friends and acquaintance call peaceful and happy ;—no bands, no bodily pangs in the last struggle : for let death come upon him how and when it may, like the arrow of Jehu on Jehoram, it finds the soul unprepared and unprotected. Yes, to such we may well say, *nothing is for the best to you, while you are out of Christ*:—nothing can be for the best to you, while you fear not, serve not, and love not God. Every angel in heaven, every devil in hell, the stars in their courses, the beasts of the earth, the stones of the field—every element—all—all are against you as the enemy of God : and when commissioned by God, in a moment could crush you.

Throughout the universe of God, nothing can be for the best to you, if you are not of Christ. Gifts are not. Saul's advancement to the throne—Balaam's vision of the Almighty—Judas's preaching and casting out devils—all in the end but added to their guilt, and aggravated the horrors of their doom. Riches are not for the best to the sinner, not only because (as we have said) they prove a snare, but because they are also utterly unable to satisfy the desires of the immortal soul. In the fables of the heathen, Tantalus, (the son of Jupiter and king of Sipylus, in Phrygia,) for the punishment of his crimes, is represented as standing up to his throat in water, with the most delicious fruits hanging over his head ; and yet, when he attempts to appease his raging hunger, or quench his burning thirst, both the water and the fruit elude his grasp. Would you count a being thus tortured and *tantalized*, happy ? So the groundling, who seeks his happiness in this world, though you should fill his house with gold and silver, and pour the wealth of the Indies at his feet, the soul would be unsatisfied:—hungry and thirsty, happiness would still elude his grasp. In another heathen fable, Tityus is represented as chained to a rock, while two vultures incessantly gnawed his liver. Would you count him happy ? The love of riches—the desire of the pleasures and honors of the world, thus gnaw and torture the heart of the man who loves not God supremely, and can he be happy ?—happy, with such vultures growing with what they feed on, thus tearing his heart, drinking his spirits, and feeding on his life ?

He only is happy who lives on angel's food:—all is for the best to him alone who loves the Saviour—seeks his happiness in heaven—drinks by faith of the water of life—and who rejoices in, rises to, and rests in God as his all.

---

*In the place where the tree falleth, there it shall be.* The sinner may be compared to a tree hanging over a precipice, with all its branches growing downward to the gulf—the axe lying at the root of the tree

ready to cut it down. As the sinner is when he falls before the axe of death, such will he be throughout eternity. As the tree falls it will lie; and it will fall to the side where *the branches grow the thickest*. When God commands justice to hew down the tree, to cut down the sinner thus hanging over the abyss, he must sink into hell. O! remember, then, the time is short. Death is at the door. Remember, as a diligent minister once expressed it, that "the blood of the soul runs out with wasted time." Time wasted—mercies abused—talents misimproved, like a mill-stone hanged about the neck, will sink the soul in the sea of wrath.

Dec. 31st, 1837.—When Antiochus had invaded Egypt, the Roman Senate sent him orders to withdraw his army, or be denounced and treated as an enemy of Rome. Antiochus, desiring time for deliberation, the Roman ambassador, Popilius, drew a circle with his staff around the king, and said:—*In hoc stans delibera*—before you move give an answer.

The last sun of 1837 is rolling through the heavens—in a few hours, and like the years that have gone before it, it will enter eternity: a few hours more, and it will return to God, with its account of the way in which we have regarded his offer of peace. God is now setting before you life and death, the blessing and the curse:—before the year closes forever, let it bear to the God who gave it, an earnest cry for mercy. If God is your enemy, can you sleep this night in peace? Sleep on the top of a mast, when the ship is tossed on the raging billows?—sleep—sleep on when your habitation is in flames around you—sleep, when the knife of the assassin is at your throat?—but O sleep not another night in sin unrepented of:—give not sleep to your eyes, nor slumber to your eyelids, till you have sought pardon of sin through the Saviour's blood; till you have cried earnestly to God for the life of thy soul. God is now giving you a sign in the departing year; his providence and word are, as it were, drawing a circle around you, and demanding what answer you will give to the offer of mercy.

Wilt thou be made whole? Wilt thou accept or refuse reconciliation with God—a free and full salvation? Purchased by the death of Christ, it is now freely and sincerely offered to thee. Wilt thou receive it? What answer will the departing year bear to the tribunal of judgment? You would think it dreadful—your knees would smite in terror, and your flesh tremble for fear, if a voice from heaven should name you, and announce that this hour the hand of death should strike you where you sit; that this night you should die. The Bible warns you of something more terrible still. You may not die for years;—but before 1837 enters eternity, the sentence—the irrevocable sentence, may issue from the throne: "Let him that is filthy be filthy still:—He is joined to his idols, let him alone:"—and your condemnation for eternity sealed. The seal will never be broken—the sentence will never be reversed. You may see on earth many Sabbaths, but if this is neglected with the few hours of 1837, your day of grace may pass forever, and no place for repentance, though sought with tears, though your eyes weep blood, be ever found. The day of salvation to you will be ended, the accepted time passed away, never, never to return.

Every day, every year, should be improved as our last. While we speak, while we read, life is passing away. When death receives his commission, he will not stop to ask if we are ready.

You know enough of the human body, to understand that all the blood passes through the heart. By the circulation, it is carried from the veins of the body to the heart, and then, before its return to the thousand vessels of the system to nourish and support it, it is forced by the contraction of the heart, into the vessels of the lungs; where, through the influence of the air, it loses its black unhealthy character; and now, become red blood, possessing healthful and nourishing properties, returns through the pulmonary veins again to the heart; and thus prepared for sustaining life, passes again into the aorta, and thence is distributed to all parts of the body. What causes the contraction and dilatation of the heart, none can tell. It is evidently involuntary, depending not on our power or will. All that we can say is, that by the power and preserving care of God our Maker, the heart beats; or, if that care is withdrawn, still in a moment and forever its pulsations. What should, however, be particularly noticed is, how in a moment, suddenly, the body may become lifeless—the heart cease to beat.

Even when free from disease, the heart contracts and dilates, or in other words, beats between sixty and seventy times every minute, above four thousand times every hour, an hundred thousand strokes every day, every twenty-four hours. For some thousands of times, perhaps, since you opened these pages, God has caused your heart to beat; has permitted it to perform its functions;—has caused the breath to heave the lungs, and the blood to circulate through the veins, instead of arresting it in a moment, and summoning the soul to the judgment.

If the heart should cease to beat and the blood to circulate, that instant you would die—your body fall lifeless dust—your soul pass into eternity. Above a hundred thousand times before to-morrow at this time, should God spare you so long, your heart will beat, and with every stroke the solemn “*question*” is, as it were, asked, whether you will live or die? Whether the next moment you will be a malignant tortured fiend, or rise a glorious and blessed angel? It is owing to the goodness of the God you disregard, that your heart continues to beat, and perform its wonderful office even while you sleep:—and, O remember, if this warning is spurned, before to-morrow dawns, the blood may cease to flow, and the heart stand still forever.

MAXTON.

---

## ART. II. *Further Reflections on the Treatment of our Colored Population.*

(Concluded from page 442.)

If the evidence be palpable and plain, that, as a nation, we are implicated in the original contraction of guilt, it is, if possible, more indubitably manifest that, as a nation, we must stand arraigned at the bar of a just God, for sustaining and supporting the odious and revolting system of slavery in our country. To this a brief allusion has already

been made, but it is necessary that it should be more fully insisted on here. On this point the testimony is so full, so conclusive, so overwhelming, that the mind finds difficulty in selecting particular points, where the mass is so immense and solidly combined. In our legislation, both as a nation and as separate States, there is little else to be seen but one continued and systematic effort to depress the colored race. Whatever may be, or may have been, the philanthropic wishes or endeavors of individuals, it must be acknowledged that our acts, as a sovereign people, both in a Federal and State capacity, have almost uniformly tended to rivet the chains upon the bond man. We have adopted a national or federal constitution, which, in many of its features, obviously tends to this result. One of its express provisions is, that for near twenty years, the national legislature *should not* interdict the importation or traffic in slaves. Some of its important provisions are plainly based upon, and but too obviously sanction the holding of the colored people in bondage.

Our State legislation, too, loudly proclaims the same truth. Confinement within certain prescribed limits, has ever been held as a punishment of high grade, and unless merited by the commission of crime, looked upon as a most unwarrantable and tyrannical exercise of power. It is true, we do not say to the black man, you shall abide within the limits of a certain territory, on pain of losing your liberty or suffering severe pains and penalties, but the action of the different States prohibiting the entrance of such persons within their borders has precisely the same effect. If there be one right which nature proclaims in language universally understood as belonging to the members of the human family, and of which they ought not to be deprived, unless as a punishment due to crime, it is that of free locomotion. Not only has nature provided man with physical power to traverse the surface of this fair world, but she has planted in his bosom many incentives to do so. Interest, curiosity and pleasure, with all their associations and blandishments, propel with instinctive and irresistible power, and that creature must be held in chains who does not obey their mandate. This treatment of the colored people as a nuisance, sustains the system of slavery in two ways. In the first place, it pronounces a sentence of degradation which puts them on a level with the vilest criminals, and prepares the mind for the commission of those crimes for which, though innocent, they must necessarily endure the punishment. In the second place, we say to the slave-holder, though we regard you as a great sinner for holding your brethren in bondage, though we fear the just judgments of Heaven on our country for such a violation of the divine law, yet we will not move one of our fingers in helping you to remove the burden. We tell him in language not capable of being misunderstood, that we regard the negroes as a malignant poison, with which we are determined not to come in contact, and that with them he may do as do he may. Can such inconsistent conduct escape the notice of the most listless and unobserving? If the slave-holders kill the prophets, do we not build their sepulchres? If the few thousands that might locate themselves in the free States would poison the elements of society, what would be the consequence to the Southern States, where millions would remain? While we conduct ourselves thus, how dare we ask our brethren to release their slaves? How dare we, with these facts before our eyes, stand up in the face of high Heaven, and tell the southern people, that for all the insult and contumely which the colored peo-

ple suffer in our country, even where slavery is not known, they are accountable? "O my soul, come not thou into their secret; unto their assembly; mine honor, be not thou united."

If a person of candor and intelligence were asked, what is the greatest obstacle to granting freedom to our slaves, would he not answer, without hesitation, the moral and intellectual degradation of the people of color, both bond and nominally free. If he were asked again to point out the most prominent cause of this moral and intellectual degradation, would he not as unhesitatingly tell you it is want of culture, want of instruction. There is no part of the system of slavery as practiced amongst us, which strikes us with more horror than those laws which constitute it a criminal act to instruct the slave in the use of letters. To fetter the body is bad enough, but to brutify the mind, to smother every ray of intelligence, to destroy, as it were, the very soul itself, is such a daring outrage of all that is sacred, that we almost wonder how the wrath of the Almighty is restrained, and not poured out on the head of such guilty wretches. But, even in this point of view, is the slave-holding part of the community alone guilty? It is true, we cannot find these fiend-like statutes, that would disgrace the bloody edicts of a Nero or a Caligula, in our codes of law, except where slaves are held; but have we no evidence that the same spirit is manifested elsewhere? If a pious female possess philanthropy and virtue enough to place her above the contempt of the pharasaical world in which she lives, and essays to collect around her and instruct the sable sons and daughters of an abused race, the very fountains of justice are poisoned, that she may be driven from her holy purpose. If a few generous souls purpose in their hearts to build a house to the Lord, to teach these sons of Ham the ways of truth and righteousness, that they may be fit instruments in heralding the glad news of salvation to their long benighted brethren, they can find no Salem, no city of peace for its location. If humanity prompt a legislator to extend to them the benefits of those donations made by a paternal government for the instruction of youth, he is frowned upon with contempt and disdain. Nor are these the transient, the fleeting impulses of a momentary excitement, but the settled indications of public sentiment, confined to no particular locality, but spread wide as our country, and enduring as its history.

It is painful, exceedingly painful, to trace a chain of evidence so humiliating to human nature, and so ominous of woe to our country, and gladly would I leave the reader to make his own reflections and draw his own conclusions, but justice requires that I should select one other point out of the innumerable array which present themselves, and that point is, the disability almost universally imposed upon the blacks in giving testimony. I plead not that they should be immediately restored to all the rights of citizenship. Some of these are conventional regulations, in reference to which, disability implies neither inferiority nor absence of respectability, much less the want of moral rectitude. Quite different is the case, when we impose upon them a disability which is never imposed upon others but for crimes of the deepest dye. That man justly forfeits the confidence of his fellow-creatures, who, with uplifted hand, calls upon God, the searcher of hearts, to witness that which he knows to be a falsehood; but to treat an innocent, unoffending person, who is a lover of truth, in the same way that we treat a perjured villain, is a refinement of cruelty which has few parallels. Black men

will lie, and so will white ones, but to declare by statutory authority, that either the one or the other are universally unworthy of credence, is the most effectual means that could be adopted to make them so. If we indeed be in earnest, if we be sincere in our professions of a desire to restore the people of color to freedom in this or any other land, why treat them thus. Does not common sense dictate, that to prepare them for the enjoyment of rational liberty, we ought to take them by the hand and encourage them; apply every proper stimulus, that the latent germs of virtue may shoot forth; hold forth to them the highest premiums which prudence will sanction, that those already treading in the paths of honor may be sustained?

Let me close this point of argument by a single reflection. It is much to be feared that thousands are clamorous for freedom for the slaves, who know not what they say, nor whereof they affirm. Well regulated and substantial freedom is doubtless a precious boon, but nominal liberty and substantial servitude is one of the heaviest of curses. The slave, if he is fortunate enough to have a humane master, finds in him a guardian and protector; one who will see that he suffers no wrong; one who will provide, in some measure at least, for his immediate and pressing wants. Not such is the condition of the only nominally free. He labors under a thousand disabilities; doomed in most cases to poverty, ignorance, imbecility, with all their hateful accompaniments of folly and vice. Hard as the condition of the slave generally is, it might be, and doubtless often is, better than that of many who are nominally free.

I will now advert to the third head of argument, and prove the nationality of our guilt, from the nature of those judgments which we have abundant reason to fear are suspended over our heads. I trust it is not necessary that I should disdain all pretension to prophetic vision, or even to that second sight which seems to have been in some measure peculiar to the land of my forefathers. It is indeed true, that God's ways are not as our ways, nor his thoughts as our thoughts—that in his quiver are many arrows, and that with perfect ease and certainty he can chastise us nationally, locally or individually. War, pestilence and famine, are but the ministers of his will; and such commission as he gives them, they will execute with a precision dictated by infinite wisdom. We, however, would be culpably negligent in our duty, if, after having laid before us the numerous examples of nations chastised or ruined for their sins, we did not solemnly ponder the point now under consideration.

In speaking of these probable visitations, I shall confine myself to the contemplation of two modes of pouring out judgment, which are perhaps more frequently resorted to than any other in the divine procedure with guilty nations. The one is the bringing upon us the sword of a foreign power, the other that of raising against each other our own swords.

If a foreign enemy were to assail us, at what point would the attack be made? Would not such enemy naturally direct his efforts to such points as are regarded weak and defenceless, where the great body of the population are thought to be disaffected to their own government and ready for revolution? Such would doubtless be his policy; and from the prevailing sentiment of the times, from the general abhorrence in which slavery is held in the civilized world, we cannot question but our servile population would not only be invited to his stand-

ard, but that means would be adopted to arm and arouse them throughout the country. The time has been, when such a course of conduct would be marked with the detestation of mankind, but we have only to contemplate what we have heard and what we have seen in our own day, to see that such would not probably be the case now. That those held in bondage would avail themselves of such a favorable opportunity to obtain their freedom and avenge themselves upon their oppressors, we have abundant evidence in the disaffection, in so many ways manifested by them in their frequent partial, but ill-concerted efforts to shake off their chains.

It is not my purpose to harrow the reader's feelings by presenting to his view a Southampton tragedy, co-extensive with the slave-holding portion of our country, but to turn his attention to what might be the result of such events to our country at large. There are pages in the history of the human family marked by such relentless atrocity, the contemplation of which stupify and blunt our sensibilities, instead of refining them. From such scenes we turn our eyes with horror and disgust, lest the contagion seize our souls, and we too, cease to be men. But what would be the consequence of such a state of things to the free States? We stand pledged by the most solemn engagements to defend our country, our whole country, and every part of our country. The mandates of justice, the promptings of friendship, the impulses of patriotism, yes, the sanctions of religion, too, would all impel us resolutely, to thrust the invader from our shore. Would the solicitations of these heavenly virtues be obeyed? Few would stand back were it a question simply defending our country's outraged rights or insulted honor, but such a case, many would not be disposed to regard it. We find thousands in our land who regard the slave-holder as a man-stealer, a thief, a robber. Now, *would* or *could* such conscientiously strike at an enemy, when the sword must pass through the vitals of those who have been robbed, those who have been stolen, and who are fighting in the holiest of all causes, that of obtaining freedom of body, freedom of action—fighting for the emancipation of their very souls? To persons entertaining these sentiments, the question would present itself embarrassed with many difficulties. The condition of the slave is now in most cases, such as fills us with loathing, but what would it be if they should be subdued, after having risen in rebellion at the instigation of a foreign enemy? Not only would their blood flow in torrents, not only would they be hunted, and tortured, and subjected to every species of cruelty while the vindictive fury of their oppressors lasted, but throughout all coming time, the survivors would be subjected to a state of bondage ten-fold more inveterate and unrelenting than that which they have hitherto endured. We now find our passions wrought into fury, denying each other not only the common charities of life, but pouring incessantly upon each other's heads the bitterest and hottest vials of wrath. Does it require any thing but the application of a match to spring a mine, which, in its fury, would burst our social fabric into atoms, scattering the fragments far and wide, leaving nothing but stately ruins, pointing to the beholder what we once were, but which could never again be reunited in order, beauty and solidity? Could one part of the community stand aloof from such a contest, while the other would burn with zeal to avenge their country's wrongs, without kindling a fire that would envelope the land in a flame of conflagration, strife and bloodshed, that would burn to the lowest hell?

But is this the only source from which we are to apprehend danger. Is it not apparent to the most careless observer that the North and the South are daily growing more suspicious and jealous of each other? The author of these remarks has seen, or thought he saw, the disposition of these sections of our country to fraternize growing weaker and weaker. In our political relations, a line of demarkation has already been drawn, and that line divides the Union with special reference to the subject of slavery. We have usually, in ordinary cases of political excitement, little reason to despair of the commonwealth, because the combatants are commingled together throughout the whole extent of the country, and however ardent they may be, they are not sustained by mutual encouragement and support; but, on the contrary, are checked and counter-balanced by opposing weights in every section of the Republic. Ordinary excitements, too, are but the beings of a day, and serve for food for those ephemeral creatures called politicians, which are made use of for the present occasion, but cast aside when no longer available. Very different is the character of the division spoken of. On either side will be arrayed parties of great strength, separated by radical principles and sentiments, on a question which, in its very nature, admits of no compromise. Here we have all the elements which usually divide and drive to extremities large masses congregated masses of mankind—supposed union of interest, stimulus of passion, confidence inspired by undivided strength, and above all, hatred engendered by real or supposed injustice and injury. Should our brotherly feelings and sentiments continue to become more and more estranged from each other, it requires no Seer to foretell the consequences—the land will be drenched with blood.

Should alienation of brotherly affection, in reference to religious communion, be superadded to those enumerated above, fearful indeed will be the result. This has already commenced. Several denominations have, at this present time, assumed ground on which it is impossible for christians living in the North and those living in the South to fraternize, and the signs of the times but too clearly indicate that others are likely to follow in their wake. Religious alienations are generally of the most bitter and rabid character, but when they take place with special reference to such practical duties, as are regarded deeply affecting the salvation of the soul, they put on an aspect of asperity that is peculiar to themselves. It will not be an estrangement occasioned by wide-spread deserts or impassable mountains, nor will it be such as springs from the intervention of lakes or the broad expanse of the ocean; nor yet such as results from dissimilarity of language, laws, manners, customs, or ancestral descent. These estrangements result principally from our not being able readily to bring the points of social sympathy into immediate contact with each other, and bespeak rather the absence of sympathizing affection, than a heart filled with bitterness and gall. Very different is the case, when we violently rend asunder those ligaments which have long bound us together as friends, which have sustained us in our conflicts, comforted us in our sorrows, and which have greatly enlarged and purified the cup of our enjoyments. This violence not only breaks the social ties, but it tinctures with a deadly poison, which reaches the inmost vitals. The onward course of these powerfully operating causes, not only threaten the dismemberment of our country, but threaten, should that deplorable event take place, to leave behind them irreconcilable enmity and deadly strife. Can our country

become dismembered without internal commotion and civil war? Most assuredly it cannot, and fatal will that day be to our proudest hopes and holiest aspirations, when the fire is kindled.

Here my brethren of the free States, I *have* brought an indictment against ourselves. Out of the vast mass that lay before me, I have selected and summed up with the utmost brevity, the evidence on a few points only, but is the case not made out in a clear and satisfactory manner? Is there a sane and well informed person amongst us, who, when he contemplates the subject of slavery with candor and impartiality, will say, 'I am innocent, I will stone the slave-holder?' Here is ground for much repentance, humiliation and prayer. Much reason for the inquiry, 'Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?' How many are saying to themselves, peace, peace? how many are flattering themselves that, in reference to this subject, their garments are clean and white, who, to the eye of the Infinite One, appear deeply stained with filth and pollution? Let us lay no such 'flattering unction to the soul.' A work lies before us that must be performed, or, rest assured, the slumbering wrath of the Almighty God will burst upon the head of this guilty people, and sink us in that fearful abyss which has entombed so many nations who hardened their necks against his righteous authority.

A. B.

---

ART. III. *The Case of the Rev. A. T. McGill.*

This is the title of a paper published in the Presbyterian of December 15, 1838. This article contains a notice of this brother's leaving the Associate Church and joining the Presbyterians, with a statement of his reasons for making a change in his profession. The writer has no disposition to bring Mr. McGill before the public, nor to scrutinize his conduct. "To his own Master he stands or falls." Let God be his judge, and not man. It is hoped, for the credit of religion, and for his own happiness, that, instead of "conferring with flesh and blood," he acted from the dictates of conscience. If so, and the searcher of hearts only knows, he has but used a right granted to all. It was indeed esteemed a gratification, that neither the Associate Presbytery of Philadelphia which he left, nor any of his former brethren, made any public notice of his defection, or of his peculiar conduct preceding the event, though it is more than probable that justice to themselves demanded it; for had they thus made even a bare statement of facts in relation to this, their motives would have been impugned, as having acted from envy, or some such improper spirit. But when the Presbyterians have seen proper to publish their own statements of this affair, and thus made his letter containing his reasons the property of the public, it can not be esteemed any violation of the law of love to make this the subject of a few observations. And in doing this, it is the sincere desire of the writer, that a sincere love to the truths of Christ, and a high regard to Mr. McGill, whose personal friendship he was ever happy to enjoy, and hopes still to cherish, may characterize each expression of sentiment. And though the correctness of his reasons are questioned, and the principles involved in them opposed with all the candor and force possible,

yet this is done with a fervent wish that neither this nor any thing else may prevent his usefulness or high esteem in his present association, but that he may be highly instrumental in promoting gospel purity and the grand interests of religion.

The sequel is the letter referred to, and is addressed to the Associate Presbytery of Philadelphia :

"Perhaps I have erred in not searching more thoroughly, when I made a profession of the peculiarities of the Associate Church. But it is now my painful situation to doubt the propriety and truth of such a profession.

"1st. I can not sustain the discipline of our church, which makes it censurable for any member to attend the preaching of the word in any other church, that we acknowledge to be a church of Christ.

"2nd. I can not see a warrant for excluding from the table of the Lord all who are not in full standing in our own particular communion ; I can not see that, communion in the ordinance of the Supper, should not be as free to believers, as the ordinance of preaching the word is to sinners. As all men have the privilege of hearing the word from us, wherever we labor, so all believers should have the privilege of receiving at our hands the symbols of Christ's dying love. To define believers, we need only inquire 'are they unblemished members of the church to which they belong, and is that church, according to our own admission, a church of Christ.'

"3d. Although the Psalms of David should always be used in the worship of God—though they are doubtless intended for worship in New Testament, as well as Old Testament times, I can not see that they were ever exclusively used even in Old Testament times, nor that they were exclusively used in the days of Christ and his Apostles on earth. I believe that the warrant for singing praises to God, comprehends human composition, or the doctrines of the gospel, and the exercise of faith couched in human language, as well as in a literal human version of the scriptures, &c.

"ALEX. T. MCGILL."

This expose contains at least the merit of consistency ; for if the stand which the Secession has made in favor of restricted communion in the teaching ordinances, be incorrect, it must also be improper in respect to the sealing ordinances ; and if it be not an incumbent duty to enforce a punctilious observance of the law of God's house relative to the character of those admitted to its privileges, neither is it to demand a compliance with the divine injunction to "praise God" with the songs of inspiration. The objections here urged against the principles and practice of our church, deserve a respectable notice, which, however, shall be very brief, with no elaborate argumentation, nor even statement of all the reasons which might be urged. It would not be deemed necessary to notice this paper at all, were it not that the sentiment it contains, though nothing new or ingenious is presented, obtains so general approbation, and is eminently calculated to please the taste, and win the applause of a people in our times, disposed to have the way broad, strewed with the flowers of ease, popularity and carnal indulgence. And when people "love to have it so," when this is so much more congenial to their corrupt tender nature, when they wish to believe a scheme of doctrine so easy and popular, it must be considered an arduous task to oppose it, an effort promising but little success, and an only reward of public contempt. But weeping Christ, and suffering despised truth, are paramount to all other considerations, in their imperative

call on the faithful to bear a pointed public witness in behalf of the correctness and safety of the old "strait gate and narrow way."

1st. The first objection here urged against the Secession Church, is respecting the stand which she has taken on the subject of "occasional hearing." Though there be a destitution of candor, yet there is arch cunning in attacking an association on some point on which the prejudices of the public can be enlisted with ease, and much success. Our enemies are ever grasping with eagerness at this idea, and are not wanting of skill in their art of painting it with false colors, as if we professed to be the only church, and our ministers the only commissioned heralds of Christ. Such disingenuous, dishonest representations would not be esteemed by any person of candor worthy of notice, were it not that they have often been made by such as claim a title to the highest respectability.

An honest statement of our views on this subject is simply this: We have made a religious profession of faith in the doctrines of Christ, by which we are distinguished as a witnessing body; we also claim the favor of being considered *sincere* in our profession, believing it to be in accordance with the expressed mind of God, and that any deviation from this is dishonoring, injurious to the sacred truth of Jehovah; and we feel convinced that duty requires us to maintain this profession by church discipline, by corresponding words and actions. This position, we think, should receive the approbation of all, as a dictate of common sense. Its propriety is admitted by all societies. When a person is known to be a member of a Masonic, or Colonization Society, we naturally expect that he will maintain the principles and rules of the society in all his speeches and writings, and public acts; and should he fail of acting with this consistency, all would consider the society justifiable in exerting its power to exact it, and punish the default. And when a person professes to be a Unitarian, an Episcopalian or Presbyterian, would not every candid person expect that, if he were sincere and convinced of the truth and correctness of his profession, he would speak and act accordingly? that he would receive and maintain the ministry of his own denomination, that he would use prudent efforts to bring others to espouse what he believed the truth, that he would lift a warning voice against all deviations from it as dangerous? And should not each of these religious bodies exert their ecclesiastical power in requiring of their members a walk and conversation corresponding to their professions, and punishing their defections? This is what our church has aimed at by her judicial acts, and all ever she has pretended to. And although this may not be thought proper in Seceders, yet it was the course pursued by the Presbyterians on a memorable occasion, when at Pittsburgh the Old School issued their "*Testimony*," and faithfully warned their members against receiving the poisonous doctrines promulgated by the New School. This proceeding has been sanctioned by the Presbyterian Church, as reasonable and highly proper. But a *reasonable* Presbyterian, expressing no doubt the sentiment of thousands, can gravely make this same proceeding in the Secession Church an objection of the greatest moment. Some have eyes which look *outward* only, and seem as if placed on positions moveable at the pleasure of the *will*, which detains them fixed on that side of the picture most pleasing to sense, and will not suffer a glance at the scene often presented by the cause of Christ, where reproach, and suffering, and self-denial are the most prominent features. It is a noble exercise of charity to

reproach and calumniate the Associate body for endeavoring to induce all her members to receive the ministrations of the ordinances of grace as they believe to be strictly and purely scriptural, and for discountenancing and warning them against attending on the ministry of such as are believed to be in a course of defection!

It is indeed readily admitted, that if our rule of duty were to be marked by what is agreeable and desirable, and even very *reasonable* in the estimation of many, the practice of our church on this subject must be deemed reprehensible. But the rule of moral action is much higher, marked by the will, the command of God alone. He does not consult the pleasure nor weak reason of sinful man, in drawing the lines of moral rectitude. Divine revelation is very explicit on this point. The whole economy of the Jewish Church, and its wise administration by Jehovah himself, give one uniform declaration of his abhorrence of the practice of mingling among the corrupt, and receiving instruction from erroneous seducing teachers. His discipline, which is truly thought bigotted and too censorious by the liberal fashionables of this age, was to punish with death both the false teachers which led them astray, and those who were enticed by their instruction. (Deut. xiii. 5-18; see also Ps. lxxviii. 59. cvi. 40.)

It is worthy of note how plainly this is taught in the ceremonial law of leprousy. A priest who was found leprousy, was not permitted to officiate, till cleansed; neither were the people permitted to come near him, lest they might become infected. Its meaning is obvious. A minister, one truly a priest of God, if he prove leprousy, must cease officiating; and whether this moral disease "be in his head," his understanding, erroneous opinions, or in his body, his actions of life, the people of God must not "come near him," lest they become infected with his leprousy sins. Is it not now equally dangerous to attend the official ministrations of such priests as we believe sadly infected with the leprousy of false corrupt doctrines? And should our church be censured for endeavoring to keep her members from the contagious influence of such? The mind of God is very clearly expressed on reference to this: "The leaders of this people cause them to err; and they that are led of them are destroyed." (Isa. ix. 16.) It is the characteristic of Christ's sheep, that "they follow him, and know his voice; but a stranger will they not follow, but will flee from him; for they know not the voice of strangers." (John x. 4, 5.) But many professed followers of Christ, "having itching ears," run after strangers, erroneous teachers, and love the "voice" of any speaker who may have the gift of oratory, the sweet tones of eloquent delivery, or some novelty in his address. Such are the most dangerous, as they are apt to seduce by their fascinating appeals. Therefore, a divine prohibition is expressly given, "Cease to hear the instruction that causeth to err from the words of knowledge." (Prov. xix. 27.) And the solemn injunction, "take heed how ye hear." Let the practice of the Secession be correct, or not, she has the example of good precedents, the whole practice of the Jewish Church, the uniform practice of Christ and his Apostles,—of the Reformers, and of the Presbyterian Church in the days of her greatest purity. It is well known that the Puritan fathers protested against going to hear the curates preach; assigning this very natural reason, that while they did thus wait on them, they could not consistently testify against the evils of prelacy, nor effect a reformation from them. With this conviction, many of them "took joyfully the spoiling of their goods," and suffered

death rather than "hear the voice of strangers." And it should make a modern Presbyterian blush to read of the faithfulness and unyielding integrity of the good old pillars of Presbyterianism in Scotland, England, Germany, Geneva, &c., whose firmness and undeviating practice on this point, give the best reproof to the advocates of modern liberalism.

Did we believe that some pretending to preach Christ, had adulterated the "golden oil" of pure gospel truths, and distributed this with some dangerous ingredients, whether should we encourage or forbid our members to receive their ministration? Knowing that a steward, who had received commission to draw bread and wines from his Master's house for distribution among the famishing, had either unwittingly or designedly intermixed a quantity of poison, but spiced the whole with so much art that detection is quite difficult, should we be reproached for warning and dissuading all within our influence from receiving this at his hand? We have professed that many other religious denominations, though possessing a great amount of precious truths, have mingled these with poisonous errors, and we do sincerely believe these corrupting doctrines calculated to injure the spiritual health of christians, and spread moral diseases in the church of God. Should we, then, countenance them, or suffer our members to be exposed to their infection, by attending on their ministry?

The church is the great family of Jehovah; and he holds communion with its members through the instituted ordinances of grace, the principal of which are the ministry of the word and the sacraments. Through these we have communion with one another. The same sanctity pertains to each ordinance; and if it be right to hold fellowship in one of these, it is in all. Those circumstances which render it incumbent to "withdraw from" a portion of our brethren, as "walking disorderly" in a way of communing in the sacrament, also forbid our communing in the teaching ordinances. The converse of this proposition is likewise true, that these circumstances which make it proper for us to *be one with* our brethren, and to have full communion in the teaching ordinances, also justify fellowship in the sealing ordinances. Now, consistency would require a Presbyterian who receives and countenances the ministry of the Methodist, or New School, or Unitarian, to be *one with them*, to have full communion, and to abolish all separating distinctions. It seems indeed evident, that the writer of the article under review, felt the force of this reasoning in no small measure; for we find him stating with candor, "I can not see that communion in the ordinance of the supper should not be as free to believers, as the ordinance of preaching the word is to sinners." We might then expect him in favor of preaching to all, and admitting all sects indiscriminately to the supper. Accordingly, with less orthodoxy, but with more consistency than some of his brethren, he declares in his

2nd reason for leaving the Seceders and joining the Presbyterians, that "I can not see a warrant for excluding from the table of the Lord all who are not in full standing in our own communion"—"as all men have the privilege of hearing the word from us, so should all believers have the privilege of receiving at our hands the symbols of Christ's dying love." The sentiment, in other words, is the popular scheme of "Free Communion," without restrictions. It cannot fail to excite surprise in the minds of men of *common capacity*, to behold the wonderful effects which a sudden influx of light to the understanding of a *liberal genius*

has exerted in *enlarging* his views, and *extending* the sphere of his fraternal love. Indocinated in the strict principles of Presbyterianism, as maintained by the Secession, he seems to have considered their sentiment of close communion, as *narrow*, too *confining*, and as a *fettering yoke*, which, he bursting suddenly, throws down with exulting contempt, as if now for the first time *free* and untrammelled, and as if this distinguishing doctrine of Presbyterianism was fit only for the *dark ages*.

(To be continued )

---

ART. IV. *The Man born Blind*—Reflections on John IX.

God in his wisdom ordered the innumerable cases of human misery, of which we read in the days of our Lord's personal ministry, for most holy ends.

1. That opportunity might thereby be afforded for the miracles of our Lord, which were the visible seal of his commission from the Father. He intimates this much in the third verse: "Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents, but that the works of God might be made manifest in him."

2. That opportunity might be given for the manifestation of his own divine nature and perfections. John declares it to be the main object of this gospel to show this; (chap. xx. 31;) and one argument advanced is, that he performed such works as none but God could perform.

3. That by the number and variety of men's distresses, when considered in one view, we might have a lively picture of the ruin which sin has brought upon mankind. Blind, deaf, dumb, palsied, lame, maimed, withered, leprous, demoniac, dead, each of these presents some distinct aspect of our case, and altogether, shows the whole man under the most fearful ruin and wretchedness.

4. By the manner in which our Lord performed cures on the body, was admirably set forth his suitableness and all-sufficiency to save miserable and perishing souls. Now when the power of sin and Satan appeared at a height, he had but to touch with his hand, or speak the word, or by the silent act of his will, and a perfect cure was effected in a moment.

5. By the process of means which he sometimes employed in cures, is represented to us the order of that work, by which a sinner is brought from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God. This we consider strikingly clear in the case of this man, described in this chapter.

He was blind from his birth. His blindness was not the result of disease or accident, as might have been the case in many other afflictions that were brought to Christ for healing. Such is human depravity, not acquired after a person comes to the period of moral agency, that we are spiritually blind from our birth. It is very remarkable, that of all the advocates for the purity of human nature in new born infants, none have undertaken to show that they possess true spiritual knowledge, or to explain their spiritual blindness as no depravity of nature. The

image of God, impressed on man at his creation, consisted in knowledge, righteousness and holiness; many have contended that men still come into the world possessed of this holiness, but their want of knowledge is undeniable; and is not this a fearful depravity? It is nothing less than to be without God; and how, in that case, can they possibly be conformed to the spirit of his law, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart," &c.? Where, then, can be their righteousness? They must, by the holy law, that perfect and eternal rule of righteousness, be pronounced positively unrighteous and unholy. He who was born blind, was altogether in darkness, and walked in darkness. The disciples asked Jesus, saying, "Master, who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?" It is obvious, upon the least reflection, that sin is the root whence spring all the evils under which mankind groan; where there is no sin, there will be no sorrow nor sighing; and it is often very easy to trace the connection between men's sins and the afflictions that befall them in the course of their life; but here was a case where it was not so plain—this man suffered the consequences of sin before he had actually done any good or evil in this world, still it could not be for a moment supposed that God would subject a person to suffering who had no sin, either inherent or imputed, therefore to account for such cases as this, we are informed that the Jews (or at least many among them) had adopted the idea that men existed in a certain state of being, previous to their appearance in this world, and in that state were often guilty of such flagrant actual sins, as provoked God to punish them in their persons during their life in the flesh. The question of the disciples seems to arise from some such idea; they thought it might indeed be, that this affliction was sent for some great sin of the parents, some actual sin in which they were beyond others. Our Lord expressly declares this was not the case: "Neither hath this man sinned nor his parents;" they are not sinners above others, as ye suppose from their being afflicted above others; there is a very different reason for this particular dispensation, viz: that the works of God might be manifested in him.

We are surprised at the absurdity of Jews in adopting so heathenish a notion as that of a pre-existent state of men, when they had the light of God's word among them. But let us examine it a little; if we reject the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's first sin to his posterity, and still believe that God is just in all his ways, it will be very difficult to account for those evils that men suffer, even from their birth, on any ordinary principle of reasoning; and the pre-existent scheme might be considered no unphilosophical conjecture on a dark point. Certainly, the Jews and heathens were less absurd in this, than those men of wisdom, under the clearest light of the gospel, who adopt one half of the scheme and leave the rest a blank; who reject the imputation of Adam's first sin, and profess to believe that God is just in all his works, yet afford no explanation of the effects of sin reigning over those who have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression.

Verse 6—"When Jesus had thus spoken, he spat on the ground and made clay of the spittle, and anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay, and said unto him, Go, wash in the pool of Siloam." Our Lord sometimes required a profession of faith, before he performed a miracle of healing, as in the case of the blind man. (Math. ix. 28,)—"Believe ye that I am able to do this? They said unto him yea Lord." Generally he waited for an expression of the desire of the sufferer, hence the

question, "What will thou that I should do to thee? Lord, that my eyes may be opened," &c. But in the case before us, there does not appear to have been so much as an application made to him.

1. This diversity displays his sovereignty, who distributes to every one severally as he willeth, both as to time, manner, measure and kind.

2. Those cases where Christ would have the sufferers petition, illustrate the connection of faith with the saving benefits of his purchase; they are received by faith alone; but

3. That the miserable sinner may have no ground of boasting, as if this faith at least, were produced by his own power; the case before us presents another point of the great work to our view, viz: the very beginning of it, which was solely and sovereignly by Christ, neither the aid nor even the consent of the sinner was required. If Christ had not gone to find this blind man, how could he ever have sought and found him; unless He, by his spirit, enlighten the mind, the sinner never can see him in his true character, so as to embrace and rest on him; unless the will be renewed also, and the sinner not only persuaded but also enabled by the same power, that is, unless Christ himself work the whole work, it will remain undone.

Christ put clay of spittle on his eyes; a very humble and coarse application we should think, and very unlikely to effect so great a cure; but it was the means chosen by divine wisdom, and that was enough. It was very fit to teach us that the efficacy is not in the means themselves, but by the blessing of Christ, in those who, by faith, attend upon them. The means employed here, were also very fit to call forth the exercise of faith and obedience; for reason never could discover any use in such an application, nor easily be brought to submit to it; but like Naaman of old, would naturally spurn it as inferior to other means of his own choosing: but faith resigns the understanding and will to God, in unreserved obedience.

This clay may well represent the ordinary means of grace. These are of a very humble and feeble nature in themselves considered, and even foolish in the estimation of carnal reason. The preachers and preaching of the word as means of opening men's eyes spiritually, turning them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God, have no more virtue or power of their own to that end, than clay of spittle to open the bodily eyes; and both are alike absurd to carnal reason—Christ crucified, and the preaching of him, was to the wise of this world, foolishness. But this means, like the clay in the case before us, derives great importance from the divine appointment, "It pleased God, by the foolishness of preaching, to save them that believe."

Christ said to the man, "Go wash in the pool of Siloam;" as this pool had a significant name, it is used to represent that which is spiritual. It was a fountain rising at the foot of Mount Zion, and very well typified the fountain opened for sin and uncleanness, viz: the blood and Spirit of Christ. Here, one or two things are particularly to be observed:

1. This washing must be added to the anointing with clay, before the man receive his sight, and if either be omitted, the effect will not follow, because both had the same appointment. So, if we ply some means, and neglect others, we have no reason to expect the blessing; and all outward means together, will be no more than clay put on

the eyes, unless the Holy Spirit work his work in applying to us Christ and his benefits.

2. The man had not yet seen Christ, nor properly known him, though no doubt he had some information concerning him; Christ had proceeded, as we may say, some steps with his work upon him, before his eyes were opened. So is it in the spiritual work. Christ proceeds by anointing the eyes through the ordinary means of grace, before the sinner see him, or know that it is he who is the operator. There may be some general knowledge of him, by information, as it was with the blind man; but the sinner is not first to discover the excellence and suitableness of Christ, and make the first move to embrace him.

3. The man was directed to go to the pool, and to wash, and could do so, even before his eyes were opened; so sinners, in an unrenewed state, are to be directed to use the outward and ordinary means; it is their duty, and they have ability to do so, though as to spiritual things, they may do it very blindly; they may also do it in a certain spirit of obedience, as this man did. Considering the pool as an emblem of the Holy Spirit's work, still the representation is correct; the sinner is commanded to ask by prayer the gift; and in doing so, in such manner as he can, will be like this blind man, groping along in the right way, in which the blessing was never sought in vain. "He went away, therefore, and washed, and came seeing."

"They said unto him, how were thine eyes opened?—a man that is called Jesus, made clay and anointed mine eyes, &c. Where is he? He said, I know not." There may be a saving change of heart, a person may have passed from darkness unto light, who still has but a small measure of knowledge, obscure and imperfect views of Christ, and little spiritual acquaintance with him. It was so even with the disciples. We find them, even to the end of Christ's personal presence with them, very dark as to the spiritual nature of his kingdom, his death, resurrection, &c. This man also speaks of him as one to whom he was a stranger: "A man that is called Jesus"—but when the eyes are spiritually opened at all, the light will break in on the mind more and more. When the Pharisees asked him, "what sayest thou of him, that he hath opened thine eyes? He said, he is a prophet." A moment's reflection on what he had experienced, of his power and goodness convinced him that Jesus was indeed sent of God.

"Then again called they the man that was blind, and said unto him, give God the glory, we know that this man is a sinner." The work performed spoke for itself, that it was of God, this was undeniable even by the obstinate Pharisees, but the doer of it had contravened their ideas of duty, and therefore they were sure he was a sinner. "He answered and said, whether he be a sinner or no, I know not; one thing I know, whereas I was blind, now I see." Where Christ savingly opens the eyes, he also sheds abroad his love in the heart; this man had a small measure of knowledge, as we have seen, and he had also a spark of love to Christ, therefore he could not join them in speaking against him; nor hear it without saying a word for him. Whether he be a sinner or no, I know not, that is, I do not know that he is a sinner; his opening my eyes is to me a strong proof to the contrary.

Christ proves himself to be a divine Saviour, in the experience of his people, far more clearly than all the arguments of the learned, and beyond the skill of all enemies to confute. One thing is indis-

putable, and spoke for itself, whereas he had been blind, now he saw. Where the power of Christ has been experienced in saving illumination, there will be in some measure zeal for him, and readiness to confess him before men. "Will ye also be his disciples," said he, intimating his own purpose and desire of cleaving unto him. They reviled him, but he was neither afraid nor ashamed, he even increased in boldness and went on to plead for Christ, as in verse 30: "Why, herein is a marvellous thing, that ye know not from whence he is, and yet he hath opened mine eyes.—Since the world began, was it not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that was born blind. If this man was not of God, he could do nothing." What a contrast between this spirit and conduct, and that manifested by his parents; they were afraid to speak on the subject at all, lest they should incur the displeasure of the rulers; they could not even say who had opened the eyes of their son. The reason of this sinful subjection to men, was, they had not experienced the power of Christ in delivering them from the darkness and misery of their natural state, as he had. The Jews had agreed that if any man did confess that Jesus was the Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue. This was in some respects very proper; for those who declare their acceptance of Christ, therein renounce all righteousness of their own, and cannot belong also to the synagogue of the self-righteous. The words of the man in behalf of Jesus, so plainly amounted to a confession that he was Christ, that they "cast him out," saying, 'Thou wast altogether born in sin.' This was very true, and now that he was enlightened by the power of Christ, he would no doubt understand this better than they did. His original guilt, pollution and helplessness, showed the suitableness and excellency of Christ Jesus to him. It was not exactly true, however, as they meant it, viz: that this constituted an essential difference between him and them. They had no idea that they also were born in sin, that they were blind and helpless as much as he was; they were strong believers in the purity, ability and goodness of human nature, at least as it was in themselves; and as it must be with all who hold such doctrines, it was impossible they could have any right views of Christ, as to his suitableness and infinite fullness, their own need of him, or the exceeding riches of divine grace in the plan of salvation by him. The whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick.

One thing, however, is observable, that no person on this occasion thought of ascribing the work that had been performed, to any but to Jesus; it was evidently far beyond any virtue in the clay or the water that had been used; no one considered it as the man's own work by washing; even the Pharisees, with all their notions of human ability, never lay it to him, and in this they were not quite so absurd as their followers in the present day: and the man himself, of all others, was farthest from claiming the praise of it. He had indeed used the appointed means, yet most heartily acknowledges the work to be wholly of Christ; and so will every one who is spiritually and savingly enlightened by him.

In conclusion, if men will be so unreasonable as to maintain that they have opened their own eyes and changed their own hearts: it is needless to reason with them; but one thing is certain, that their case, by their own account, is contrary to every example in the word. Their spot is not the spot of God's children. If they will have it, that they can by their own natural power believe, we must let them say so; but they

cannot also claim that their believing is the faith of the operation of God. They say they can repent; perhaps so, but it cannot be repentance unto life, for that is God's grant and gift. (Acts xi. 18.) They say they can of themselves also love God, but if so, they cannot call their love the fruit of the Spirit. When they boast that they can of themselves keep all God's commandments, they certainly need not, and can not at the same time, receive and rest upon Christ Jesus alone for righteousness and strength. And when they have said all this, they may with perfect consistency claim all the glory.

But, alas, "cursed is man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, whose heart departeth from the Lord; blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord, and whose hope God is."

BARTIMEUS.

*ART. V. More of Dr. P. Bullions' Misrepresentations Corrected.*

MR. EDITOR—It may not agree with the taste of every reader of the Monitor, that its pages should be so much occupied with the affairs of the Associate Presbyteries of Albany and Cambridge, as to exclude much, perhaps, important matter on other subjects. But "to every thing there is a season, and a time to every purpose under heaven." A defence of church courts, and of their decisions, when they are just, is unquestionably a duty, and especially when they are assailed not only by false reasonings, but by denial of truths and misrepresentation of facts, which must pervert the minds of many, unless met and refuted. By such means, those Presbyteries are assailed in the Associate Presbyterian Magazine; and the Associate Synod sustaining them, is involved in the same slander.

It is certainly unpleasant to hear the charges of falsehood and misrepresentation made and reiterated by both parties in this contest; and many readers may be perplexed by the contradictory assertions. The charges, too, we see, are as easily retorted without foundation as with it: the thief can as easily cry *thief*, as the honest man. But there are usually means furnished by Divine Providence for discriminating between them; and it requires time, patience, and the proper use of those means to attain this end.

In the pages of the Magazine, I see many statements respecting the proceedings of the Associate Presbytery of Cambridge, which I must pronounce false; and representations of their words and deeds, which I must say are misrepresentations. Simply to say they are false, may seem tame to those who are intimately acquainted with the matters in controversy; but while proof is my chief object, I can not say less, and I need not say more, at least here.

As those passages in the Magazine of which I complain, are too numerous to be exhibited in the pages of the Monitor, I shall chiefly confine myself to some remarks in the 4th No., page 128, connecting with them some other expressions on the same points. On that page, in relation to Dr. A. Bullions' slanderous charges against his brethren of the Presbytery, and to the anonymous letters for which he was proved to be responsible, the editor says:—

"1st. That the charges referred to are neither unfounded nor slanderous :

"2d. Whatever be their character, they are not charges of D. B.'s raising :

"3d. That Dr. B. never intended to make, and never did make, any such acknowledgment as is here attributed to him : and

"4th. That that part of the documentary history (page 13th) which represents him as so doing, is an unfair and deceptive representation of the facts in the case.

On the 1st, I observe, that the charges referred to were as follows, according to the minutes of Presbytery, and as published in Presbytery's History, p. 11. Dr. Bullions said, "that if reports were true, for which he would refer Presbytery to the Rev. George Mairs and the Rev. Peter Gordon, there were four members of this Presbytery not fit to sit in this court—stating moreover—that what was charged against them, was error in doctrine and immorality in practice." Now, it is true, that this would not have been of itself a charge by Dr. B., but he steadily refused to furnish the items or specifications of the reports, and consequently the means of investigation, and therefore, by the laws of church and state, rendered himself responsible for the reports of immorality and error. He moreover stated the above as the substance of what he had offered as a reason for his proposal that Presbytery should postpone the business on which they had entered, thus insinuating that the reports were true. Thus he made charges against four members of Presbytery. Further; in bringing forward these charges of immorality and error, Dr. B. referred to the reports in the hands of Messrs. G. Mairs and P. Gordon, which, on inquiry, and according to the testimony published in the Presbytery's History, pp. 23, 24, 27, were found to be copies of the same anonymous letters received by Messrs. Miller and D. Gordon. Now, how does the editor of the Magazine say that "these charges were neither unfounded nor slanderous?" He does not deny Dr. B.'s expressions to be charges, he acknowledges that they are, and pleads that they possess a certain character. The idea conveyed can be nothing less than that the contents of those anonymous letters are true. And how does he so confidently declare this, as though they were true to his knowledge? The Presbytery deny these charges, and there is not a particle of proof in their favor adduced by the Editor, nor by any of the party, to our knowledge. Must the Presbytery and its members lie under these charges without proof? or is it insisted that it lies on them to prove themselves innocent on a mere unsupported and wanton charge? Common courtesy, as well as law, both ecclesiastical and civil, require the Editor to adopt a different course. Yet, in the mean time, for sake of satisfying the reader, while the Editor and his party insist on the truth of those charges, and refuse all proof of them, I will step beyond the requisitions of technical order, and give a brief sketch of the contents of those anonymous letters, and some evidences against their truth, agreeably to what is published in the Presbytery's documentary history, but which, most probably, most of the readers of the Monitor have never seen. I shall only take the more prominent charges contained in the letters.

1. The anonymous letters charge one of the members of Presbytery with "beastly intoxication," and that "he stands so charged on our minutes" of Presbytery. Now no such minute is known to me, nor have I ever heard of any member of this Presbytery so charged.

2. Those letters charge the whole Presbytery with unfaithfulness and partiality in neglecting to censure that member for intoxication though confessing his crime; and that they neglected this because his services were wanted against Dr. Bullions. This of course falls to the ground, when no such case occurred.

3. A member is charged with slandering Dr. B. in a paper read by him in Presbytery. This charge was made by Dr. B. in Presbytery, fully tried in his presence, that member was acquitted, and Dr. B. himself submitted to the decision; and yet, after all this, these anonymous letters were written and published.

4. Another member is charged with lying. This same charge was before the Commission in Salem, in 1832, and the case satisfactorily explained. Yet after this, the charge is repeated in those letters.

5. The same member is charged with error. This charge was never laid into Presbytery; they know his sentiments to the contrary on the point on which he is charged in the letter.

6. The general charge in these letters, in proof of which the above charges with some others of less importance were adduced, is, that some members of Presbytery had tampered with members of Cambridge Session in order to form a party against Dr. Bullions. This charge was made by Dr. Bullions in Presbytery; it was tried; after progress, a time of some weeks was given in order that any person knowing of any proof on the point should bring it in; all the testimony offered was taken, unless we except Mr. John Robertson, who, replying to Dr. B.'s proposal of him as a witness, said that the Doctor must be mistaken as to what he expected him to testify. Dr. B. did not insist. It was decided unanimously that the charge was not proved. And Dr. B. expressed "his conviction that the charge was without any foundation, and was slanderous."—he acknowledged "his sin" and expressed "his sorrow for the offence given to the church by the declaration referred to." Yet after all, it is renewed in the anonymous letters. And in the face of all this evidence published, the Editor of the Magazine says deliberately, that the "charges are neither unfounded nor slanderous." How can any person or court be safe with such an antagonist, if he be believed? Any further consequences of this assertion in the Magazine, may be prevented by a manly and full retraction by the Editor, as publicly as the slander was assumed by him.

The 2d assertion by the Editor, quoted above, is, "Whatever be their character, (the charges made by Dr. B. against his brethren of the Presbytery) they are not charges of Dr. B.'s raising." That I may treat the Editor fairly on this assertion, I shall take it in connection with some expressions found on page 96, which are as follows: "The story about the anonymous letter is—sound without substance—We put it to every one who shall read the Presbytery's documentary history, if they have furnished a *particle of evidence* that Dr. B. either wrote, or caused the letters to be written—We say there is none—not a particle. And if witnesses spoke the truth, as we believe they did, they could not testify to any such thing." Here is a confident assertion, implying a profession of intimate and perfect knowledge of the whole matter. Here is a bold assertion, that the Presbytery's documentary history has not furnished a particle of evidence of Dr. B.'s responsibility for those letters. This will be very imposing with those who have not seen the Presbytery's History; and the Editor knows that many of his readers have not seen it. He is aware that such readers

will certainly, or probably at least, reason thus: "The Editor, a gentleman of respectable standing, has seen the Presbytery's history; he surely would not risk, or wound his character by a false assertion, which could be easily detected; we may, therefore, confidently believe him, while we can not see the *history*; how unjust and oppressive, then, must the decision of the Presbytery of Cambridge be! and how openly perverse the Synod in sustaining it!"

Now the consequences of deception under such circumstances are serious, and the responsibility to God and man, for such an abuse of trust, is weighty. The Editor can not justly even palliate his fault in these assertions, by referring to his own expression limiting the Presbytery's charge to *writing*, or *causing the letters to be written*; for the Presbytery's charge was, that Dr. B. "had made himself responsible for certain slanderous letters against members of this Presbytery, by *writing, causing to be written, publishing, or commending them.*" (See History, p. 26.) Now, he says, "that the story about the anonymous letters is sound without substance:" that is, the Presbytery's charge, as they made and tried it. He moreover adds, on page 108, that "All that has been proved about the letter sent to Mr. D. Gordon, is simply, that Dr. B.'s name, which was written on the back of the letter, was in his own hand-writing, and also the few following words at the bottom of the last page, viz: 'N. B. Let Mr. D. Gordon have the reading of the above.' Notwithstanding the many oaths—this is all that has been elicited; and every thing else that has been written, or published, or said on this subject, is either fiction or mere conjecture, unsupported by any proof whatever. This is all that the Presbytery have been able to establish, as will be seen from their own pamphlet."

Now, not to be tedious, by transferring the testimony taken on the case to these pages, I will simply state, with brevity, the principal things contained in that testimony as published in the *Presbytery's pamphlet*.

The following things will be found in that testimony by those who may examine it; viz:

1. That on one copy of the anonymous letters, Dr. A. Bullions' name was on the back, *as the address* of the letter, in his own hand-writing.

2. The letter, so addressed, was post-marked Franklinville, N. Y., and the Post-Master of that place, by letter, denied that it had passed from that office.

3. The words at the bottom of one of the anonymous letters, viz: "N. B. Let Mr. D. Gordon have the reading of the above," were in Dr. B.'s hand-writing.

4. The Rev. J. P. Miller, George Mairs, and Peter Gordon, had each a copy of this letter.

5. The Rev. George Mairs refused to let his copy be seen on account of the hand-writing.

6. Some months before the copies of this letter were sent to Messrs. Miller and Gordon, Dr. Bullions read a copy of the same to the Rev. Messrs. Whyte and Stalker.

7. Messrs. Whyte and Stalker entreated Dr. B. to do nothing with the paper but to burn it.

It will be fair to give the views taken of this testimony by Presbytery, in coming to a decision on the case—and

1. It appeared that there was an attempt by Dr. B. *at deception*, in

addressing the letter to *himself* with his *own hand*, and in having it falsely post-marked, "Franklinville."

2. That the person who addresses the letter should be held as the author, unless he can show for whom he did it, even though the hand of an amanuensis alone may be seen in the body of the letter.

3. That a *Nota Bene*, at the close of a letter, not professing to be by a different author, identifies *its* author with *that* of the letter itself, till he show that he is not the same. In this case there was no hint given that it was written by any other than the author.

4. The writer of the *Nota Bene*, assuming to dispose of the letter, as in this case he does, assumes the authorship of the letter, and all the responsibility;—which was the thing charged by the Presbytery.

5. That Dr. B., by reading the letter to Messrs. Whyte and Stalker, without expressing his disapprobation of it, was publishing it, and so rendering himself responsible, according to the charge by Presbytery.

6. That Dr. B., having the anonymous letter in his possession, and using it as he did, was responsible for it, till he show how he obtained it.

7. That Messrs. Whyte and Stalker, by entreating Dr. B. to do nothing with the letter, but to burn it, showed that they understood him to be concerned in the authorship or publication of it, and that he had used no means to change these apprehensions.

8. The facts appearing in testimony and published, that the anonymous letter to Mr. Miller contained a note, "that a copy would be handed to the Rev. G. Mairs"—that Mr. Mairs obtained a copy accordingly—that the earliest copy known was in Dr. B.'s possession, according to the testimonies of Messrs. Whyte and Stalker—that Dr. B. called on Mr. Mairs to see the letter in his possession, without any communication between him and Mr. Mairs, from the time of its reception till the time of his call to see it, plainly importing that he knew by his own deed that it was there—and that Mr. Mairs refused to let his copy be seen by others on account of the hand-writing, all make an irresistible impression, that Dr. B. was responsible for the letters.

9. When the charge was first made before the Presbytery, and in Dr. B.'s presence, he made no denial, nor challenge of proof; and he did not again appear before Presbytery to defend, though informed of the case on hand, and several times cited, nor in any of his communications to Presbytery afterwards did he ever send in a denial of the charge.

10. With all this evidence against Dr. B., there was none offered to acquit him of the charge. There was not even a probability in his favor, which could render the evidence against him in the least doubtful: nor even a probability arising from internal evidence, as the Editor of the Magazine now pleads, p. 96. This was against him, for the letter contained many of his familiar forms of expression, and the very expressions which he had in Presbytery used on such of the topics in the letter as had been in trial.

But the Editor says, p. 96, in reference to those letters, "that Dr. B. offered to his congregation, on the 11th of June last, satisfactory evidence that he neither wrote them, nor caused them to be written." But if he did, neither Presbytery nor Synod were in fault for neglecting such evidence, as it was withheld from both. And if he did, it has been

kept close with themselves. We have not yet seen the evidence; the public do not know it. Why is it not published by those who take so much interest in the matter as to deny the charge? The Editor says, p. 96, that by these anonymous letters, "Dr. B. has suffered more than from any thing else." Surely, then, good acquitting evidence would be worth publishing. Till the evidence appears, the public will appreciate this "satisfactory evidence," and the assertion of it, justly. They will no doubt allow it as much weight as the Synod did the Doctor's plea, I think, his only one on this point, viz: *That before he left home, a certain person had offered to father or mother the anonymous letters*; although, with all the importance of the matter to him, he neither brought that person forward, nor his or her affidavit, nor even the name.

The 3d and 4th assertions by the Editor of the Magazine, quoted above, I take together, as the latter fixes and defines the meaning of the former. In relation to Dr. Bullions' retraction of his charges against his brethren, the Editor here says, "that Dr. B. never did make any such acknowledgment as is here attributed to him," and adds, "that the documentary history (p. 13) which represents him as so doing, is an unfair and deceptive representation of the facts of the case." If the Editor should say that I misrepresent him in his 3d assertion, as he was only denying the Doctor's acknowledgment in the particular form of statement which he was criticising, the 4th shows that he intended that very form of statement which is made by Presbytery. The Presbytery, then, has asserted and published, and did not expect a contradiction of it, that Dr. B. retracted "as *unfounded and slanderous*, the declaration, That four members of this Presbytery are unfit to sit as members of this court, on supposition that certain reports in possession of Messrs. Peter Gordon and George Mairs are true." The Editor denies that Dr. B. ever made this acknowledgment or retraction; and this he does in the face of full legal evidence, and that evidence as known to him, and all this too, without adding any thing in support of his denial. I shall now adduce sufficient evidence against this denial:

1. The statement just given above as the Presbytery's, is a true extract from the minutes, which is always acknowledged legal evidence in court.

2. At Salem, some weeks after this retraction was made by Dr. B., the following minute of Presbytery was made, which is also published in the Presbytery's pamphlet, and therefore known to the Editor, viz: "Does Dr. B. acknowledge his sin, and profess his unfeigned sorrow for it, in the falsehood and slander which he has acknowledged he did utter against his brethren of the Presbytery? He expressly refused to use the words *unfeigned sorrow*, but answered (in writing) 'I thought I was really sorry for it, and I have made it a matter of confession before God.'" Now, here was an unequivocal recognition by Dr. B. of the retraction referred to by the Presbytery, in their question to him.—For what did he express sorrow? For the falsehood and slander which he had acknowledged?

3. The Editor knows that Dr. B. did make the retraction which Presbytery say he did, and records it in his Magazine, pages 45, 47, 48. In page 45, he correctly records the Presbytery's 5th requisition of Dr. B., the first part of which is sufficient at present, viz: "5. That Dr. B. either retract his declaration as *unfounded and slanderous*, That four members of this Presbytery are unfit to sit as members of this court, on supposition that certain reports in possession of P. Gordon and D. Mairs

are true," &c. On page 47, he proposes to give a copy of Dr. B.'s answers to Presbytery's requisitions, in which copy, on p. 48, the following is found, viz: "Fifth, My answer to the fifth was, and I still adhere to it, that I had no sooner uttered the language charged, than I was convinced that it was wrong, and I am sorry for it and *retract it.*" Was it then too much to say as above, that the Editor denied Dr. B.'s retraction in the face of evidence known to him? The reader may be reminded that the retraction just quoted, is not the same with that recorded by Presbytery. The state of the case was this: Dr. B. produced and read a set of answers; the fifth, as just now quoted from the Magazine, was one of them. Presbytery objected to it, and Dr. B. produced another, which was recorded by Presbytery. Thus Dr. B. and the Magazine have preserved an additional testimony on this point.

4. The fact of Dr. B.'s retraction is susceptible of proof, by, no doubt, fifty witnesses, and some of these his warmest friends.

Before yielding the page, as the occasion is suitable, I would ask the liberty of answering a call in the Magazine for February, p. 211, by Mr. Stark. He has taken much interest in the Appendix to the Presbytery's History, and in its supposed errors and authors. A writer in the Monitor, over the signature of FAIR PLAY, has kindly and appropriately corrected his misapprehensions. But he is not yet satisfied on the subject of the authorship, and says: "It is surely reasonable to believe the Appendix to be the work of the same authors as the Narrative, at least, till it be disclaimed by them." I would have supposed the statements of Fair Play to be sufficient; but since they are not, I do now say, that the *Appendix was not the work of the Committee who published the Documentary History, nor did it ever come under their inspection.* But it may perhaps be said, Why so long in making this disclaimer? I reply, I thought there was no urgent necessity; and this was only one of many misrepresentations, which flowed so fast in the pages of the Magazine, that I soon despaired of noticing any more than a few prominent ones. Besides, on a careful attention to the writer's object, I did account the Appendix on the excommunication of the Burghers substantially correct, as Mr. Stark himself acknowledges it is, by his excusing Mr. Stalker for inaccuracy on the ground of "common usage." I did, however, believe that the remarks on this point in the Appendix, were liable to misapprehension, and did regret, when I first saw it, that a cautionary clause had not been employed. The writer himself, too, observed it before Mr. Stark's remarks appeared; so that the latter might, had he known this, have saved himself from the unpleasant exposure of his egotism, in alleging the committee to be dependent on his intelligence and information.

While I have my pen in hand, I would very briefly notice one thing, which runs through, perhaps, all the Nos. of the Magazine, as far as yet published, viz: the charge of Popery against the Associate Synod, and at least some, if not all, of the Presbyteries under her inspection.

In addition to what is said by the Editor of the Monitor on this point in the Feb. No., I would add, that this cry appears to be used as talismanic—for operating on the feelings of the weak, rather than for enlightening their minds. The disaffected members of a church discover a resemblance between some things found in Popery and in Protestant Churches, and they raise the cry of Popery. Now will the

writers in the Magazine say that every thing must be condemned that is found in Popery, however much abused by their superstitions? Must infant baptism be discarded because the Papists hold it and practice it, although they add errors and superstitious rites with it? Must the sacrament of the supper be discarded because Popery holds it and perverts it? And must church government, and that submission which Christ requires in his church be rejected, because Papists pervert it? It is either a weak or perverted mind that will discard from their profession or practice what is good and necessary, because some have perverted or abused it.

The charge which the Magazine makes of Popery in the Associate Church, is chiefly of a claim to infallibility: and this claim is imputed to their courts, because they claim submission to their decisions by those who ask membership and communion with them, either in office or in sealing ordinances. There are two opposite extremes to which opinions and practice are apt to go on this question, viz:

1. That absolute obedience is due to church courts and their decisions, whether right or wrong. And

2. That no obedience whatever is due further than a person's pleasure, and that church courts have merely an advisory power.

The first is Popery; the second is Independency and Free-Thinking. The first is charged by the Magazine on the Associate Church, at least in America; to the latter, I think the Magazine is tending. So that our controversy is likely to be a difference of principle too wide for coalescence. A discussion of this subject of church government and discipline, in the pages of the Monitor, when they are a little more at leisure for it than at present, might be highly useful. But for the present, I would ask whether the Magazine does not intend the following doctrines, and if not, what is its definite intention?—

1. That no church member is bound to submit to any decision of a church court which *he thinks* is wrong?

2. That no church court ought to require submission of any member who thinks their decision wrong? And therefore—

3. That no church court should require any member to submit, if he is pleased through pride and stubbornness to say steadfastly that he thinks their decision erroneous?

4. And that the church court should allow the disobedient, who *says* their decision is wrong, to still continue in their communion, and in the station he may occupy, whatever be the charge against him, whether of error or immorality, and even if his plea be justification of his sin or error?

As I do take this to be the meaning of the Magazine on this point, I am willing to hear it define and explain; but for the present, under this view, I ask,

1. Whether, on these principles, there *should* be any government in the church,—any thing but advisory conventions?

2. If there *should* be a government, of what use would it be under these principles?

3. When our Lord says, (Matt. xviii. 17,) “but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican,” would such an one be held as a “heathen” and a “publican,” if he should be allowed still to continue in their communion? or does not the rule necessarily require the court to insist on their sentence and

its execution, as long as they consider it just, although the individual should think it unjust?

4. I further ask, whether Deut. xvii. 8-13, does not require a sentence by a court, and that the court insist on their sentence, instead of yielding to the prejudices and pride of the culprit?

5. Whether Christ required the angel of the Church of Pergamos, (Rev. ii. 14, 15,) to make a sentence against the Balaamites and Nicolaitans, and insist on it to their reformation or exclusion; or whether he required them to make none, or to recede from it, because of the ignorance, error, or stubbornness of those heretics, as they were virtually doing at that time. Let the same remarks apply to Thyatira. (Rev. ii. 20-25.)

6. Whether the false apostles tried by the angel of the Church of Ephesus (Rev. ii. 2) acknowledged the sentence just, and if they did not, whether the angel did recede from the sentence, or whether he ought to have done it? But

Finally, are we asked in turn, Must we submit to every sentence, just or unjust? I reply, No; not to any thing that would require us to commit a sin—but if we cannot submit, nor effect a reformation, we would neither ask communion with them under such sins, nor intrude ourselves on them. And when our church will neither reverse an unrighteous sentence, nor suffer us to leave their communion, but will suppress our testimony by the hand of power, we also will join in the cry of Popery.

Yours sincerely,

A. ANDERSON.

---

ART. VI. *Inceptum occultare proditores.*—No. 2.

MR. EDITOR,

In the preceding number some surprise was expressed at the "*Unavailing efforts*" of the editor of the Associate Presbyterian Magazine "*for peace.*" It is not becoming in one man to impeach the motives of another, or to treat his profession as false, without good evidence. Neither is it becoming in a rational creature to receive as true the professions of men which are contradicted either by their own conduct, or by well established facts. This would be to extinguish the light of reason in the soul, and abuse the faculties God has given us. If a man profess himself deaf while he answers a question put to him in a whisper, his *profession* will most likely be disregarded, and his conduct treated with contempt. So if a man profess himself laboring with *unavailing efforts for peace* and church fellowship, with a class of men whom he holds up to the world as destitute of every moral virtue, his *profession* ought to be disregarded, and his conduct not only treated with contempt, but his person excluded from every well regulated community, as a disturber of the public peace. And such appears to me to be the condition of the editor of this Magazine.

With this remark, we proceed to notice some of the heavy *charges* which he brings against the Associate Synod. "It is admitted," says this editor, "on all hands, that the difficulties under which we are suf-

fering arise, not from error in doctrine or immorality in conduct, in any of those who have been so many years the object of almost unceasing persecution, but from a spirit of contention in some of our church courts, under the influence of which, there has arisen at least as much that is worthy of blame on the one side as on the other." Knowing, as the writer of this article does, all the facts in controversy, he is compelled to acknowledge that he had not supposed it possible for the ingenuity of man to embody in a plausible form, within the compass of a single sentence, so much falsehood, or so effectually to put darkness in the place of light! Yet we do not ask the reader to take an assertion for this statement; for if he possess not sufficient judgment and discrimination not to take the mere naked assertion of any man on a subject of this kind, much less the *ex parte* statements of accused persons, he is not capable of forming a correct opinion. But we ask every candid reader to weigh the following considerations:

1. The editor declares that "there has arisen at least as much that is worthy of blame on the one side as on the other." And what are the evils that have arisen according to this editor? They form a black catalogue. Nothing less than "falsehood"—"party spirit"—"oppression"—"convicting the accused in the absence of all testimony"—"ineffible baseness"—"scheme of infamy"—"persecution"—"war in the heart even to extermination." These, and other lamb-like expressions of a similar character, are every where dispersed up and down the pages of this Magazine; and yet "there is at least as much that is worthy of blame on the one side as on the other;" and of course the editor of the Magazine, if he is to be believed, is personally guilty of all the horrid crimes above enumerated! Crimes, the very thought of which can not but make a pious man shudder! We will not insult the reader's understanding by any further comment on this point.

2. The editor also asserts that "it is ADMITTED on all hands" that there "is as much worthy of blame on the one side as on the other." I am perfectly willing that the Rev. Dr. P. Bullions should confess to the world that he has been guilty of all the above enumerated crimes. But as a member of the Associate Synod, I, for one, utterly deny that I have been actuated by any such spirit as Dr. B. tells us has actuated *him*, or that I have been guilty of any of the crimes which he says *he* has committed. It is NOT, therefore, ADMITTED on all hands. And I would sooner lose my right hand than make any such admission; because it would be a violation of my own conscience, and a calumny upon brethren. But I deny the right of Dr. Bullions, or any other man, to make confession of sin for me, either before God or men; but since he has had the temerity to do so, I know not how to answer him, better than in the language of the learned and pious *Charnock*:—"Actions are to be tried by God's knowledge, not our surmises. Principles and ends lie deep and hid from us, and it is intolerable pride to pretend to have a joint key with God to open that cabinet which he hath reserved to himself. Besides the violation of the rule of charity in misconstruing actions, which may be great and generous in their root and principle, we invade God's right, and become usurping judges of evil thoughts. (James ii. 4.) It is therefore a boldness worthy to be punished by the judge, to assume to ourselves the capacity and authority of him who is the only judge. In censuring men, we may doubly imitate the devil, in false accusation of the brethren, as well as in an ambitious usurpation of the rights of God."

But while the right of the Dr. to confess the sins of others in this manner is denied, it is freely admitted that if he see cause to make such a public confession as the above, others have no right to complain. And had the confession of the Rev. gentlemen been *less general*, and had it been made without the apparent design of involving the innocent in the same condemnation into which it is admitted on all hands that he has fallen, it would be more commendable. It would afford a faint ray of hope that the fearful schism might yet be healed—that a spirit of *contention and persecution* might yet yield to the mild and heavenly spirit of the gospel—and that the devouring sword might now at length be returned to its peaceful scabbard. For I maintain and intend to prove, before I close these papers, that a refusal on the part of our schismatical brethren to make a *particular* confession of sin against God and his church, is the cause of the breach that has occurred. But a general confession amounts to nothing. It is in the mouth of the most profligate, and is made by way of palliation. Others are no less guilty; and sin is such a prevalent evil, that I at least am as good as others. If others accuse me of sin, it is only “SATAN REPROVING SIN.\*” There is at least as much that is worthy of blame on the one side as on the other! Such was not the confession of David and Paul, nor of any of the saints. *They* constantly use the personal relative in the *first* person and *singular* number—“I acknowledge *my* transgressions and *my* sin is ever before *me*.” “Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners, of whom *I am chief*.” Had the editor of the *Magazine* and his coadjutors made this *particular* confession, when convicted of *particular* offences, the Secession Church in these United States had not now been broken and trodden down by the common enemies of our common christianity; or were they willing even now to make such a confession, the hurt might yet be healed.

3. The Dr. declares further, “that the difficulties under which we are suffering, arise not from IMMORALITY in conduct in any.” “It is admitted on all hands” that “party spirit”—“convicting the accused in the absence of all testimony”—“contention”—“persecution”—“war in the heart, even to extermination,” &c. are the causes of our difficulties, and that there is as much worthy of blame on the one side as on the other. And yet it is admitted on all hands that our difficulties arise not from “IMMORALITY IN ANY?” What! these horrid crimes not immoral! Persecution, condemnation, and even extermination of the innocent, not immoral! Was ever sentence like this submitted to public inspection? In the language of another—“How are the mighty fallen, not in fighting the battles of the Lord; but in fighting against him!” The best account I am able to give of this strange sentence, is to suppose that men are sometimes more ready to run into any absurdity than make a *particular* confession of sin; or that *anger* steals away the judgment and perverts the reasoning faculties of men reputed wise.

“*Not immorality in any!*” Not immoral to write and publish in a secret manner, and for a series of years, anonymous pamphlets of a “mendacious and ribaldish character, and of an infidel tendency,” against those whom he publicly professes to honor as christian brethren! Not immoral to write a paper, cause it to be transcribed, and then deny the authorship! Not immoral to obtain a paper from another, un-

\* This elegant and dignified language is the Dr.'s answer to the charge of betraying an *unchristian spirit*. True enough. But it is Satan reprovng sin: *Ergo*, sin is no sin!

der a solemn pledge not to make any use of it whatever to the injury of the individual from whom it was obtained, and then incorporate into it interlineations of others, changing its entire character, and publish the whole, as thus altered, to the world, under the signature of the person from whom it was thus fraudulently obtained! No immorality in writing letters to weaken and even do away our testimony given under oath! No immorality in giving currency to an anonymous letter of a highly slanderous character with forged post-mark, and addressed to the individual who thus gave it currency in his *own hand-writing*? And then months afterwards, refer to such letter as the proof of a *fama clamosa* against brethren in the church! And yet all these charges, and others of a similar, but less aggravating nature, were charged upon some of the suspended brethren—some against one individual and some against others. And not only charged, but proved in the church courts; yea, proved by indubitable testimony, which is not in the power of sophistry itself to evade or set aside. It is sickening to make these details; but the cause of truth, the cause of the innocent suffering under a load of calumny, demands a full disclosure.

Here, then, we have all distinction between right and wrong, all discrimination between the innocent and the guilty swept away, rather than make a *particular* confession of sin. Sooner than do this, they have for years embroiled our church courts—offered to submit to *censure* on condition that they were acknowledged *innocent*! And having failed to palm upon the church their new code of morals, they have raised a party, made a breach, and are publishing monthly to the world falsehood and abuse of the church of God. Confessing themselves, as we have seen, and truly believe, guilty of heinous offences, in the vain hope of fixing a like stigma upon men who never participated in their *unfruitful works of darkness*, and who regard all such doings with the utmost abhorrence. And all this, rather than make confession to their offended God and injured brethren. Is this to be ambassadors of the Prince of peace—to preach the gospel of peace—to teach men to live in peace—to be co-workers with God in the salvation of his church? Does infidelity need such a weapon as they place monthly in its hands? Does the native ignorance and depravity of the human heart require such aliment? Does vice need such stimulus?

But if the Head of the church has not withdrawn from us, as a public body—If he has not left the Synod to a blind fatuity, it appears to me she will require a *particular* confession of sin from these separating brethren, and a return to the path of duty, or erect a wall of separation between them and her communion, as high as that which separates her from Romanism or the wildest anarchy of Independency. For laxity of discipline is undoubtedly the root of “our difficulties.” Had these *immoralities* which the Dr. now confesses been nipped in the bud by a prompt application of our adopted rules of discipline, they had never grown to their present magnitude. Had the Presbytery of Cambridge applied these rules when Dr. P. Bullions left his charge in a disorderly manner—had the commission of Synod which sat in Salem in 1832, applied these rules, instead of *admonishing*, for the repetition of offences for which a *rebuke* had been previously administered—had the Presbytery of Albany applied these rules when Mr. Stark declined their authority, there is every reason to believe that the Secession

Church would long ago have been a quiet habitation. It is not intended to cast the least degree of censure on the courts here referred to. They erred on the side of charity and humanity, hoping for the return of a better spirit in their delinquent brethren. It was, nevertheless, a false lenity, and the church now reaps the bitter fruit of her misplaced confidence. Although Mr. Stark declined the authority of the Presbytery of Albany, in a most contemptuous and abusive manner, and declared in writing, that he would treat *whatever* decisions they might make as *null* and *void*, and protested against their interfering with him *in any way*; yet he and the editor of the Magazine now try to make the public believe that he did not decline their authority, because he was not suspended *instanter*! It is probable that the cry of *persecution* raised against the church courts, while *they were suffering* the basest kind of persecution from the unceasing *secret stabs*, and open misrepresentations of their delinquent brethren may have had its influence. Men will yield much to an opponent, rather than incur the suspicion of cruelty. But it should be forever borne in mind that church courts must rest contented under the cry of persecution, or forego the exercise of discipline altogether. There is no alternative between these two ways, as all history and experience fully demonstrate. If they will be found faithful, they must lay their account at once to suffer reproach. Ahab denounces Elijah as a "troubler of Israel:" Tertullus, Paul as "a pestilent fellow:" Rome, Wickliffe "a diabolus:" Luther a "satelite of Satan and trumpet of rebellion." The great, the intrepid Calvin, is to this day falsely denounced as a murderer. It is to be feared that many in this evil time, are choosing sin rather than affliction. But let the timid souls of the fearful hear the word of the Lord—"Lift up your eyes to the heavens, and look upon the earth beneath; for the heavens shall vanish away like smoke, and the earth shall wax old like a garment, and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner: but my salvation shall be forever, and my righteousness shall not be abolished. Harken unto me, ye that know righteousness, the people in whose heart is my law; *fear ye not the reproach of men, neither be ye afraid of their revilings.* For the moth shall eat them up like a garment, and the worm shall eat them like wool: but my righteousness shall be forever, and my salvation from generation to generation. *Who art thou that thou shouldest be afraid of man that shall die, and of the son of man, which shall be made as grass, and forgettest the Lord thy Maker?*" (Is. li.)

But the Doctor regards the rejection of a Resolution offered in Synod on Saturday, by the Rev. A. Heron, to set apart a day "for the exercises of fasting and prayer" as not only unreasonable and improper, but also "the saddest evidence that had yet been given, that war, even to extermination, was in their hearts!" That a minister of the gospel should condemn any body of men for declining these solemn religious duties, in connection with men who had nothing better than a spirit of mutual extermination towards each other, may well be looked upon with surprise. Such a fast would have borne a striking resemblance to a certain fast spoken of by the prophet Isaiah:—"Behold, ye fast for strife and debate; and to smite with the fist of wickedness." Conscientious men might, without any stretch of charity, be excused for declining such a fast.

Again: there was reason to apprehend that those who were so urgent for this fast, had neglected this duty too much in private, and had

not attended sufficiently to that preparation which is necessary for its right observance, or they would not have appeared in Synod in battle array, manifesting predetermined resistance to her orderly proceedings. While they were laying schemes in anticipation of Synod's meeting, the friends of truth retired to a private room, and without any ostentation, humbly and fervently implored the divine aid and counsel; and the result of that meeting demonstrated that they had not implored in vain. May they follow the same rule in time to come.

Again: It was now the fourth day of the meeting, and almost nothing had been done; some brethren were more than a thousand miles from home on expense; and it was well known, that with the greatest possible despatch, much important business would lie over undone. Solomon tells us, that "to every thing there is a season and a time." It was then a time to work. Had the Synod adopted their resolution, it would have been like the crew of a sinking vessel, that abandoned the pumps to *keep a fast*. Besides, it was well known, that the two-fold object of that resolution, was to retard the business and cast odium upon the character of Synod for piety. These, and other like considerations, influenced me to vote against it, and I suppose might have influenced others.

It was intended to notice a number more of these specimens of *trifling* and *dodging the question*, and *perversions* and *unfounded falsehoods*, with which this strange Magazine abounds; but this paper is already extending to too great length. And besides, it appears to me, that a mere specimen of such *wares* is enough for sensible men; as for others, these *wares* were designed for them; and if they choose to appropriate them to their own use, they have no body to blame but themselves, should they suffer loss in the end.

SIMPLEX.

---

#### ART. VII. *The Pittsburgh Convention.*

It appears that the notice we took of the proceedings of the above Convention, has given dissatisfaction in certain quarters. And we are free to acknowledge that we were mistaken with respect to the nature and meaning of the Report that we published. This acknowledgment we make on the assurance of those, who, from their position, ought to be better acquainted with the views and designs of the Convention than ourselves.

About the middle of January we received two letters respecting this matter; one from Dr. Pressly, the President of the Convention, the other from the Rev. Hugh McMillan; and which we promised to publish as soon as was practicable. But to our great surprise, we have found that Dr. Pressly could not wait the fulfillment of this promise, but has published a copy of the letter, addressed to us, in the *Christian Magazine* for March. This conduct on the part of Dr. P. we consider as very discourteous, and his apology for it, disingenuous. He says: "I expected that the editor of the Monitor would consider himself under obligations to do justice to the Convention immediately. But the

number for February appears without even a promise of its publication."

It is a little singular that while the Doctor should be taking us to task about a misrepresentation, he should fall into a far more palpable one himself. In our No. for February, we gave notice that "the *Letters* lying on hand would *all* be attended to as soon as practicable." Here was a distinct *promise* that *all* the *letters* on hand would be published: And we even *italicised* the word *Letters*, to show that they were of a particular import, and consequently would be published without fail; and that too, "perhaps in the next number." Now this ought to have satisfied any reasonable person, and especially when it might easily have been seen from the contents of the February No., that there was no room in it for the letters referred to, with the necessary explanations.—We, therefore, say that Dr. Pressly has entirely misrepresented us, in saying that we did not *even promise the publication* of his letter. But as he says of us; "Christian charity will not allow us to suppose that he *intended*" to misrepresent us.

The charge brought against us is, that we represented the Convention as adopting the principle of "Catholic Communion." This was, indeed, our understanding of the Report. We sincerely thought, that the Convention had, though rather slyly, adopted the Free-Communion scheme. And the following things led us to this way of thinking:

1. It appeared to us, that the two principal churches represented in the Convention, viz: the Associate Reformed Synod of the West, and the Associate Reformed Synod of New-York, which are sometimes claimed to be one church, and which really have the same identical creed and make the same identical public profession, could not "approximate" much more nearly to one another without holding sacramental communion together. We supposed that they did already do all, that, it is now said, was the object of the Convention to recommend, viz: "uniting together in reading the scriptures, prayer, and such like religious exercises."

2. It appeared to us, that the Convention by "ecclesiastical communion" meant communion in the government and discipline of the church. They say, "all christians may hold fellowship together in all religious exercises, which do not embrace ecclesiastical communion." Then, the question with us was, what do they mean by "ecclesiastical communion?" And we confess, the question puzzled us a good deal,—But we concluded that they explained themselves in the words following: "There is a communion which may be called ministerial, which adds to mere christian fellowship that which is official and yet not ecclesiastical communion. The organization and government of the church is more than ministerial. It is Presbyterian. Ministerial communion is, therefore, not organical. Ministers, *therefore*, though belonging to different denominations, may, nevertheless, have intercourse with each other in all those official duties not embracing ecclesiastical communion."

Now it appeared to us as plain as day, that the terms "Presbyterial," "organical" and "ecclesiastical," in this series of argumentation, did all signify one and the same thing, otherwise the reasoning of the Convention was sophistical and inconclusive. For the design is to show that "ministerial communion" is not "ecclesiastical," because not *Presbyterial* or *organical*. Well, ministers by the Report are allowed to hold "official communion" with one another; that is, communion in the performance of their *official* duties, saving those which pertain to

“the organization and government of the church.” But do not ministers act *officially* in dispensing the Lord’s Supper? We, therefore, very naturally concluded, that the Convention allowed them to hold communion together in this official act and in every thing else pertaining to their office, except in what relates to “the organization and government of the church;” which, the Convention say, “is more than ministerial—it is Presbyterian.”

3. We know that sacramental communion, in many churches, was not regarded as the same with organical communion; but only as a means of the “nearer approximation” of the churches.

4. Two clerical brethren happened to call on us, at the time we were studying out the meaning of the Report in question, to whom we showed it and asked their opinion in relation to its meaning; and after puzzling themselves some time with the thing, they expressed their entire concurrence with our views on the subject. And it may be added, that these brethren are perhaps not greatly inferior to Dr. Pressly himself in ability to understand the English language.

Dr. Pressly is not satisfied with our use of the term “inter-communion.” He says this term “as used in the Monitor evidently refers to communion in the Lord’s Supper betwixt the members of the different churches, while they remain ecclesiastically distinct.” We used the term to express all the different kinds of communion among christians referred to in the report. According to Webster’s Dictionary it signifies “mutual communion.” Now the Report speaks of “civil communion,” “religious communion,” “christian communion,” “ecclesiastical communion,” “ministerial communion,” “official communion,” “Presbyterial communion,” and “organical communion.” Our intention was to use a single term to express the whole. But while we said that the Report was on the subject of “inter-communion,” we also at the same time gave the very words used by the Convention itself as expressive of the subject of that Report. Hence, there was no particular call for Dr. Pressly’s exclamation—“A Report on the subject of inter-communion! Why, sir, there was no Report on this subject submitted to the Convention.” Now he might with equal propriety express himself in the same exclamatory style, in relation to what Mr. McMillan affirms was the subject of that Report, viz: “the intercourse of christians,” &c.

That there is *ambiguity* about this Report no candid person will deny. We verily believe that few, who were not previously acquainted with the views of the Convention, would have understood it differently from us. We are certain that almost all, with whose opinions on the subject we are acquainted, have taken the same view of it we did.

A Report on a subject of this nature ought to have been very plain. And doubtless perspicuity on this subject is entirely practicable. The terms employed should have been well defined, especially terms that are susceptible of different meanings.—But if people will write ambiguously; if they will heap together a great number of words and phrases of doubtful signification, they must not complain should they be misunderstood. The use of the *et cetera* in the Report, being an exceedingly ambiguous character, was very improper. It reminded us of the Dutch minister, not far from Albany, who was wont to use the “&c.” in prayer. He would say “Pardon our sins, &c.” “Deliver us from evil, &c.”

We are not without hopes, that our misunderstanding of the Report will lead to greater precision and accuracy in the use of language in

the proceedings of the Convention hereafter. We must also, say, that we cannot see how any particular injury to the Convention could arise from our remarks, since we laid the Report itself before our readers, who were capable of judging for themselves of the correctness or incorrectness of our remarks on it.

Our readers and all others concerned must excuse us for not publishing Dr. Pressly's letter, after the ungentlemanly manner in which he has treated us. But we take pleasure in laying before our readers the following letter from Mr. McMillan. It is courteous; it seems to breathe a christian spirit; and with the exception of two or three things, we highly esteem it. When we err, and it is hardly possible to avoid errors in conducting a work of this kind, we would wish to be informed of it in the manner and style of Mr. McMillan's letter.

XENIA, Dec. 21st, 1838.

*To the Editor of the Religious Monitor :*

SIR—The December No. of the Religious Monitor has been received, and looking over its contents, I turned to the article, *Proceedings of the Convention of the Reformed Churches, &c.* Upon reading the above article, I was forcibly impressed with the thought, "How long will the friends of truth misunderstand each other, and be kept asunder by imaginary differences?" How stands the case betwixt the Monitor and the Proceedings of the Convention? Does not the Monitor represent the Convention as laying down and supporting the position, "that professing christians of different denominations, may join together in the reception of the Lord's Supper, provided they agree in their belief that Christ is the only Saviour?" With the correctness or incorrectness of the principle and practice involved in the above position, I have, at present, no concern. My concern is, *does the Monitor present a true statement of a matter of fact? Do, or do not the Convention lay down, explicitly, or even implicitly, the above position? You say, the Convention do, and I, having read the proceedings in the Monitor and in the Pamphlet, affirm the very contrary.* In doing so, I have no other notion, than that you as verily believe your assertion, as I do mine.

Now as you have no desire to misrepresent the Convention, and certainly would be among the last, knowingly, to do so; yet if it be done, however unintentionally, or even with the best intention, it does not alter a matter of fact, nor will it prevent injurious consequences to yourself, your readers, and all concerned. The Monitor misunderstands the Convention, and their Report, in its very title. It is not a report on *inter-communion*, but on the *intercourse* of christians or members of the churches represented, whilst yet, they maintain separate communions. That they can not have communion at the Lord's table, is taken for granted, whilst each denomination adheres to its respective terms of communion. Still, as christians, it is taken for granted, that there are many duties in which they can and ought to have intercourse with each other. What are these duties? Are they now practiced, or are there some that may be done, which hitherto have been omitted? This is the inquiry before the Convention.

Now what does the report say on this subject? That the members of these, or other churches, may have inter-communion at the Lord's table? No. Not the slightest intimation of such a thing is contained in the Report. It states, that ministers and members of different denominations may have *intercourse*, not *inter-communion*, in all duties not strictly ecclesiastical. But what duties does ecclesiastical communion embrace? Evidently, communion at the Lord's table; for this is one of the highest and most exalted parts of ecclesiastical communion. The notion that ecclesiastical communion includes only *fellowship in government and discipline*, is, not only erroneous in itself, but, in the present case, is wholly gratuitous, and even at variance with the well known and often publicly expressed views of the members of the Convention, and of their respective churches.

The members of the Convention met as friends of the truth, of the church's unity, and being desirous of doing all in their power, not only to hasten the restoration of the church's unity, but also to promote her edification and peace, and general prosperity, in the land and throughout the world, reported and adopted a number of duties that had been virtually practiced, and mentioned others, in addition, such as—the optional or discretionary exchange of pulpits, the more frequent meetings of christians for prayer and conference, and mutual assistance in diffusing the light of the gospel over the earth, as they had, or might have opportunity.

Now the propriety or impropriety of intercourse in one or all of these duties, is not the question; but that these, and such like duties, include communion at the Lord's table, or ecclesiastical communion, in any degree, is, what I affirm, to be not contained in the proceedings of the Convention, according to their true intent and obvious representation.

There are sundry other things in the few remarks of the Monitor, which I consider equally exceptionable, and not to be in accordance with matter of fact. It is stated for example, "that the object and labors of the Convention were to consummate a union betwixt the bodies represented in the Convention." Do they any where say so? Were no other bodies than themselves addressed on the subject of the Convention? Did the Convention, on adjourning, contemplate at their next meeting, the appearance of delegates from no other churches than their own? Was it not the desire of the Convention, that then, or at its future meetings, something might be done, that would bring together, on a proper basis, the friends of truth, especially the churches denominated Reformed?

It is also parenthetically stated in the Monitor, that the churches represented in the Convention, "are not over-much strict." What does this mean? Is the notion of strictness to be regulated by a conformity of conduct to the Divine law? Are the readers of the Monitor to understand,

that these churches are not *over-strict* in their obedience to the law of God, that they do not *over-much* love God or their neighbor? They doubtless, in this respect, will not plead perfection, but will admit, that in all things, they come short of their duty.

But perhaps the idea may be restricted to some other rule. If so, it ought to be stated, for such innuendos always convey more than direct assertions, and they give a tone and character to the Monitor which its best friends do not admire.

In all that is stated, I am fully satisfied nothing was designed at variance with the truth; and for this very reason I am concerned in the matter. From a common infirmity, the very best of men often, unintentionally, injure the cause of truth. This revives in the mind the thought with which I commenced, viz: How long will the friends of truth be kept separate by misapprehensions of each others real meaning? The Monitor and the Convention are equally opposed to inter-communion; yet they are represented as quite at variance. What notions will be adopted by the readers of the Monitor, say of a majority, as to the doings and character of the Convention? Why, that they and their churches are not *over-strict*, are *vague* in their views of church fellowship, and even advocate the principle of inter-communion betwixt different denominations, even whilst they hold sentiments that are irreconcilable with one another, and with the word of God. Certainly from such people, and from all such attempts to heal the breaches of Zion, we Seceders are to keep at a distance, and to make no attempt, by friendly interview, to hasten the time when the watchmen on Zion's walls will see eye to eye.

I would respectfully suggest if it would not be well to make the inquiry, whether differences, that are represented as dividing the Reformed Churches, upon a candid examination, are not in whole or in part, as *imaginary* as that betwixt the Monitor and the Convention of Reformed Churches? Is it not likely, that were these churches to meet in Convention, in the proper spirit of brethren, and to patiently hear each other's views of truth and duty, with a desire to know the same, irrespective of party, that a great, a surprising degree of unanimity of sentiment would be the result? Is it not worthy of a fair experiment; and if it did but fail, would it not do much to weaken the vexings of Judah, and the envyings of Ephraim? Is not such a meeting greatly needed and loudly called for, by the divided and distracted state of not one, but all churches? God certainly has a controversy with his church for some cause or causes; and may not the *useless*, the *ruinous* divisions of the church, be one? Will the Associate Church not delight to come forward and to give her aid in effecting a better state of our christian commonwealth? Blessed are the peace makers. The fruit of righteousness is sown in peace of them that make peace? Let all remember that it is an easy matter to find fault, and to make exceptions. Can we do better. Are we at our post? Watchmen, what of the night?

H. McMILLAN.

We have but two or three remarks to offer on the above letter, in addition to what has already been said. The writer founds a charge against us which has no existence, if we be *fairly* quoted. He makes us say that "the object and labors of the Convention was to consummate a union," &c. But what we said was, that "the object to which the labors of the Convention were *particularly* directed, was to consummate," &c. Now the Report on which we remarked, has expressly for its object "the nearer approximation of the several churches *represented in this Convention.*"

In relation to the phrase "over-much strict," which we used, our reference was to *explicit and consistent testimony-bearing*; and we thought we were in possession of facts that would warrant the use we made of it. But perhaps it had been better to have omitted it; we are, therefore, willing to recall it.

The charge, that "innuendos give a tone and character to the Monitor," we do not hesitate to say is entirely gratuitous. We have often been blamed for our *plainness*, but never before for using "*innuendos*," that we recollect of. Indeed, we do not deal in insinuations; we are in the habit of speaking our mind openly and frankly. With respect to the "best friends of the Monitor" alluded to, it is very problematical whether they be its friends at all.

With respect to the *innuendos*, that Seceders, because not represented in the Pittsburgh Convention, are careless about "healing the breaches of Zion," we do not consider it worthy of particular notice. A fact or two, however, may be stated as matters to be reflected on by Mr. McMillan, and all others concerned. Some ten or twelve years since, the Associate Synod, for the "nearer approximation of the churches," entered into a correspondence with the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, of which Mr. McM. claims to be a minister, in order to prevail on said Synod to correct certain misrepresentations embodied

in their Standards, in relation to some of the principles of the Associate Church. Such correction, however, was refused to be made. The *disclaimer* of the Associate Synod was not deemed *sufficient*. And the misrepresentations complained of are still continued. Now, is it probable that the statements of two or three delegates from our Synod, in relation to those points, would be believed by Reformed Presbyterians in a Convention, any better than the same statements when made by the whole Synod in letters of correspondence? Is a Convention to work a charm?

Again, at the instance of the Associate Reformed Synod of the West, about eighteen years since, a correspondence was opened between that Synod and the Associate Synod on the subject of a Union. Our Synod entered into the measure *sincerely* and in *good faith*, but not meeting, as was thought, with a reciprocity of good faith, frankness, fairness, and honest intention, they felt themselves obliged to abandon the project. But what was only then suspected has since been proved. The measures which our Synod, for the sake of a union, declared themselves ready to adopt, have since been cast in their teeth as departures from some of the Synod's former positions. It is, therefore, not to be wondered at, if our Synod should feel some little *shyness* about again responding to a call from that *quarter*, respecting the subject of a union. Whether, however, the above facts had any influence in preventing our Synod from appointing delegates to the Pittsburgh Convention, we do not profess to know. This may have been *entirely* owing to mere oversight. But we apprehend that the Convention, by adopting the Report of which so much has been said, has prevented the Associate Synod from co-operating with them in time to come. According to their own account of that Report, it strikes a blow at our Testimony on the subject of *communion*.

---

#### ART. VIII. *Mr. Stark and his Credentials.*

It has been our determination hitherto, to take no notice in the Religious Monitor, of any thing, which might appear in the *Associate Presbyterian Magazine*, or elsewhere, professedly from the pen of *Mr. Stark*; believing that his conviction by the Associate Synod on sundry charges of lying and slander, and his suspension therefor from the fellowship of the christian church, would be sufficient to prevent all, whose opinion was of any consequence, from giving credit to any of his statements. We must, however, deviate so far from this determination, as to notice some things, which he has put forth over his own proper signature in the *Associate Presbyterian Magazine* for February—not so much because those things affect us personally, as because they affect the cause of truth, in which we have embarked our all.

In his Letter to "The Editor of the Associate Presbyterian Magazine," headed, *Mr. Stark and the Religious Monitor*, he charges Mr. Webster with slandering him, in stating, in his Pamphlet, that Mr. S. "left his congregation in England without leave or license; and from that time had no regular connection with Seceders, till he migrated to the United States, and was by the management of a committee, with-

out proper credentials, admitted into the communion of the Associate Church." He then in the most artful and deceptive manner endeavors to blind-fold his readers and create the impression in their minds, that the only testimony Mr. Webster was able to produce on his trial before the Presbytery of Albany in defence of his statement, was that of Mr. Irvine, who only testified that "he had heard it reported that Mr. Stark left his congregation in England in an irregular manner." And he adds, that "Mr. Webster admitted the falsity of the slander in the fullest manner," by his non-appearance in the civil court (we suppose he means) to defend himself.—He next states his charge against us, saying—"With a full knowledge of all these facts and circumstances, Mr. Martin has again published the same slander." And afterwards—"I think it will be admitted, that this libel has been republished by Mr. Martin under circumstances of peculiar aggravation. It is not, however, my intention to say any thing at present about its falsity or its malignity. These I should think are sufficiently apparent. Besides, the respect that I owe to myself, would prevent me from entering into discussion with any person who may appear to be an obstinate and wilful slanderer. The things asserted by Mr. Martin must be either true or false; and it will be proper that he should be made either to establish or retract his assertions."

It is, indeed, but fair that we should "either establish or retract our assertions." We are glad that we are allowed an *alternative* in this matter; and what we cannot establish we shall cheerfully retract. Hence, our readers will perceive that Mr. Stark has forced upon us, (in order to defend our character against his merciless attacks and slanderous allegations,) the necessity of publishing the following *testimony*, all of which Mr. Webster presented to our Presbytery, at the time he was tried for having slandered Mr. Stark, in the words above quoted from his pamphlet:

1. The Report of the Committee of Missions, printed with the Minutes of Synod for 1821, a portion of which is as follows:

Applications were repeatedly made in behalf of Messrs. Stark and Ferrier, who were at the time of the applications, in New-York, for admission, but as they had no regular certificates of character from Presbytery or Synod, your committee conceived they could neither give them appointments nor money. The principle had been settled in a full meeting of Presbytery, in Dec., in the case of Mr. Williamson, for we had no other reason for refusing to admit Mr. Williamson, but the want of proper credentials; on repeated consultations we judged it correct, and firmly adhered to it, believing it was the mind of Synod, by whose authority we were acting. The principle appears necessary for the credit of this Synod, as well as to prevent similar applications in time to come, with which your committee have been harassed: no injury can arise to the applicants, for if any inconvenience should arise to them, who is to blame? Not the committee, but themselves. Besides, if they are in good standing and entitled to certificates, they can easily obtain them from their Presbyteries, and it is very unministerial to come to a foreign country without certificates. Your committee was, however, surprised to receive a letter from Mr. Pringle, when in New-York, that after all this he had invited these two men to preach. There is this peculiarity in the case of Mr. Stark, that after your committee had examined his papers, and found them insufficient—he was officially desired to write for his certificate to Scotland. But returned for answer, that he had no objection that others should write about his character to Scotland, but he did not think that he himself ever would write.

What was the meaning of this? After I am desired by the proper authority to write for a certificate, I will not be at the pains to write, let them write themselves: Yet I apply to be admitted and others urge my admission. This we think was rather extraordinary conduct: We request the Rev. Synod to take Mr. Stark's case, and also the general principle under consideration, and give to your committee distinct and definite instructions.

JOHN BANKS,  
JOHN M'ULLOCH.

2. The action of the Synod on the foregoing Report, which was referred to a Committee, consisting of "Messrs. W. Wilson, Ramsay and Heron," whose report was adopted by the Synod, and is as follows:

With respect to the admission of Messrs. Ferrier and Stark to officiate as preachers in our connection, the committee beg leave to report:

That while there appears to their view some difference between the two cases, there is a sufficient similarity in their circumstances, to warrant the application of the same general rule to both, viz: That satisfactory testimonials of one description or other, should be produced, before any preacher from foreign shores be authoritatively permitted to officiate in any of our churches.

That the Synod should approve of the conduct of their committee of missions, in applying with fidelity this general principle, to both of the aforesaid cases.

That on the part of the members of the committee by whom they were received, their admission was rendered more delicate from the circumstance of their having been previously rejected.

That in the case of both, there are two questions which necessarily present themselves to view, viz:

1. Whether due order was observed in their admission.
2. Whether they are now in regular standing as preachers in our communion.

With respect to the first your committee are of opinion that neither the credentials of the one, nor the other, were at that time satisfactory, the conduct of those members by whom they were received, was scarcely defensible on the score of strict order and propriety.

With respect to the second inquiry, it seems necessary, to be more particular. It appears in the case of Mr. Ferrier, that testimonials amply satisfactory, have been received by him since his admission, and therefore he must be considered as in all respects in regular standing as a preacher of our connection. With regard to Mr. Stark, the committee recommend that the Synod leave the case simpliciter to the Presbytery of Cambridge, to decide as they shall think fit. The report was accepted.

### 3. An extract from the Minutes of the Presbytery of Cambridge in relation to Mr. Stark's admission:

June 11th, 1821.—Argyle.—Mr. Stark being present, and members understanding from Mr. Millar's\* letter that his case was referred *simpliciter* to this Presbytery by Synod; and he also stating that he had his papers with him, and from them was satisfied, that Mr. Stark, when he left the British shores, was in the full exercise of his ministerial office; the Presbytery† called him to take a seat in their meeting, which he took accordingly.

(A true copy)

A. ANDERSON, Presbytery Clerk.

### 4. The Testimony of the Rev. A. Gordon:

Rev. Alexander Gordon sworn, saith: I was a member of the Synod's Committee of Missions, and also of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, when Mr. Stark came to this country. Application for the admission of Mr. Stark was made at the same time with Mr. Ferrier and David Williamson. The Presbytery voted Mr. Stark's credentials presented insufficient and requested further testimonials. It was stated before us, that he came to this country to teach, and not to preach. This was one reason why I voted not to receive him. An answer to the requisition for further credentials, was returned, as we understood, from Mr. Stark, that if we wanted more papers we might send for them. The matter was not then definitely acted on, but referred to the Synod. The Synod referred the case to Cambridge Presbytery. I asked Dr. Bullions, a member of the Presbytery, how they got over the difficulty, which the Presbytery of Philadelphia, or Synod's Committee had had; but received no answer. Mr. Stark did not appear personally before the Committee; and it was understood by us, that the application came through some of his ardent friends in New-York.—My impression is, that we were to send to Britain for further credentials, if required.

### 5. The testimony of the Rev. P. Campbell:

The Rev. P. Campbell, recalled, says, that the case of Mr. Stark's leaving the congregation of South Shields, came before the General Associate Synod. There was blame attached by the Synod to both Mr. Stark and the Presbytery. This was told me by Mr. Wallace, of Dunblaine.

### 6. The testimony of Dr. Andrew Buckham:

Dr. Buckham, being duly sworn, deposed, that Mr. Stark told him that he left his congregation in Shields, near Newcastle upon Tyne, in a very abrupt manner, without being regularly loosed by the Presbytery.—That he has in his possession a letter from a friend in Scotland, stating that Mr. Stark, on a certain day, called the session of the congregation of Shields together, and informed them, that he intended to leave them in the morning, and that his baggage was already on board a vessel.—And that he acted accordingly, having never assigned to the congregation any reason for the step he took.—Further, that Mr. Stark told him, that after leaving Shields he went to London, and engaged with Sir Frederick Vane, as tutor to his son, with the view of preparing him for entering Eaton College; that he remained in Sir Frederick's employment for some time; that Sir Frederick and his son and Mr. Stark traveled on the Continent; that they were in Paris. That Mr. Stark also told him, that he was in Sir Frederick's employment eighteen months or two years, and that during that time he had no regular connection with the Secession Church.—That Mr. Stark also told him, that he came to this country with the full intention to teach and not to preach.

We are authorized to add, that Dr. Buckham testified that the above

\* This was the Mr. Millar who was formerly settled in Putnam, N. Y., against whose deposition, in 1828, Mr. Stark voted.

† The ministers present at this meeting, were Messrs. A. Whyte, A. Bullions and P. Bullions.

mentioned conversation with Mr. Stark, happened after Mr. Stark came to this country, and before he was settled in his present charge. We may also add that we have omitted a part of Dr. Buckham's testimony, as not bearing directly on the present case, but if Mr. Stark should complain of this omission, which we have supplied with *asterisks*, he can have the gratification of seeing it in print.

When the foregoing testimony was under consideration in Presbytery, Mr. Stark produced the papers, to which we referred in our Review, and which were looked upon as strongly corroborative of the main points presented in said testimony. Whereupon the Presbytery, with a remarkable unanimity,\* immediately decided that Mr. Webster had not slandered Mr. Stark in the instance specified.

From the testimony above given, our readers, without the assistance of any comment, will be able to judge for themselves—

1. Whether Mr. Stark "left his congregation in England without leave or license:"

2. Whether he had any "regular connection with Seceders," during the time he was in Sir Frederick Vane's employment :

3. Whether he presented satisfactory credentials to the Synod's Committee of Missions, when application was made for his admission into our church :

4. Whether the Synod had any satisfactory evidence of his ministerial standing, when they referred his case to the Presbytery of Cambridge :

5. Whether the Presbytery of Cambridge admitted him on the presentation of satisfactory papers, or whether they admitted him simply on the statement contained in Mr. Millar's letter, that "he [Mr. Millar] was satisfied that Mr. Stark, *when he left the British shores*, was in the full exercise of his ministerial office:" And

6. Whether he came to this country to *preach* or to *teach*.

It is somewhat amazing that Mr. Stark, knowing, as he did, that the foregoing testimony was in our possession, should have ventured to write the following paragraph, almost every line in which contains a palpable untruth :

When I joined the Associate Church, I gave in my certificate to the Presbytery of Cambridge, and with which that court professed itself to be perfectly satisfied. I was desirous that this certificate should have been produced on Mr. Webster's trial, which would have shown that the slander must have been unfounded. This, however, was not done; and those persons who were connected with Mr. Webster's pamphlet, spread a report through many parts of the church, that I had come to this country without any certificate of ministerial standing. I was not aware of this till I went to attend the meeting of Synod in Pittsburgh, in 1837. I then thought of using some means to repel the slander; and believing it would be in vain to apply to the Presbytery of Cambridge for the original certificate, which ought to be in their possession, I concluded to apply to the Clerk of the Presbytery to which I belonged when in Great Britain, &c. (Mag. p. 222.)

On this extract we offer no comment, only we would ask Mr. Stark, Whom he means by "those persons who were connected with Mr. Webster's pamphlet?" We call upon him to name the persons whom he thus accuses. He must stop this *wholesale* slander. We demand the names: and until he gives the names we shall hold him as a heartless calumniator; and so he will be held by an intelligent community.

Mr. Webster's statement, given at the beginning of this Article, is called by Mr. Stark a "libel," and he accuses us of "republishing" it. But this is not so; for we only introduced a single item contained in

\* Dr. P. Bullions and Mr. Stark's elder *only* voting on the other side.

that statement, viz : that which represents Mr. Stark as leaving his congregation "without leave or license." It was in the way of self-defence that we were led to notice this matter at all. Dr. P. Bullions, in his Magazine, had not only charged Mr. Webster with having slandered Mr. Stark in saying that he left his congregation without leave or license, but had also charged the Presbytery of Albany with great injustice in sustaining Mr. Webster's defence. He said the Presbytery did this simply "on the ground of some testimony given by the Rev. Mr. Campbell, though extracts from the minutes of the Presbytery to which Mr. Stark belonged were laid on the table, containing the following statement, viz : 'After some consideration on this motion, the vote was put, Loose Mr. Stark's pastoral relation to the congregation of South Shields, or not; and it carried unanimously, Loose.'" (Mag. p. 138.)

We considered the editor to be guilty, in his account of this matter, of a wilful misrepresentation. It was not denied that Mr. Stark had been loosed from his congregation. That was not the question; but whether he had been loosed in a regular way *before* he forsook his charge. This the editor would have his readers believe; but this we knew to be an artful perversion of the truth in the case. And as the editor had referred to the papers which Mr. Stark laid before the Presbytery, we contented ourself with merely giving our recollections of the contents of those papers; and this was done, as we stated, subject to the correction of our brethren. And while we were in the main correct in our recollections, we find, from corresponding with brethren, that we were somewhat in error in one or two things, which, however, by no means affect the principal point. It seems, it was *not* "so much as a *whole* year" from the time of Mr. Stark's leaving his congregation till the dissolution of the pastoral relation! Neither did he embark for this country at the time we specified: for it seems the pastoral relation was dissolved before his embarkation for the United States, and probably while he was in Sir Frederick Vane's employment. The "some charge" to which he was cited to answer, and which we had forgotten, is said by a brother to be the charge of leaving his congregation in an abrupt and disorderly manner. We might here introduce extracts from letters containing the recollections of some of our brethren on the same subject, but as they do not differ materially from our own as given in our Review, (p. 404,) except in the instances just mentioned, perhaps they might be considered as unnecessarily burdening our pages.

As it regards the certificate which Mr. Stark publishes, we have only to say, that a certificate written in 1837, will never prove that he brought one with him to this country in 1821! And why did Mr. Stark not rest satisfied with the extracts which the same Presbytery Clerk sent him in 1834? As it was our recollections of the nature of those extracts, together with a letter to him from the said Clerk, that made him so wrathful, why did he not publish them instead of this more recent document? We challenge him to publish those papers which he laid before our Presbytery. And till he do this, let the terms "obstinate and wilful slanderer" be returned to the place where they properly belong.

ART. IX. *Mr. Stark and his Protest.*

In reviewing the Magazine, we were led to quote the following minute from the records of the Presbytery of Albany: "Mr. Stark asked leave to protest, if he see cause, against this and any subsequent decision in the case." And we remarked, that "Mr. Stark never saw cause to enter a protest against any of those decisions." This, Mr. Stark, in a letter to the editor of the Magazine, calls a "falschood," and says, "it has been made the foundation of many others." Then, on the contrary, he affirms that he protested against "all the decisions made in the case of Mr. Webster."

The difference between Mr. Stark's statement of this matter, and that of Dr. P. Bullions, as contained in his letter, on which we animadverted in our Review, is very striking. The Dr. says, Mr. Stark protested against *some* of the decisions of the Presbytery in Mr. Webster's case; but Mr. Stark says he protested against them *all*. The Dr. says he joined Mr. Stark in protesting against *some* of the decisions in question; but Mr. Stark says the Doctor did not protest at all, but only "obtained leave to join in any protests that I *might* enter." We leave them, however, to settle this difference among themselves; only remarking that, though Dr. B.'s subserviency to Mr. Stark is well known, we were somewhat surprised to hear Mr. Stark thus complacently declare it to the Dr. himself.

He represents the Dr. as so entirely subservient to his will, as so ignobly servile as to ask leave to do whatever Mr. Stark *might please to do* in a given case—as so fully persuaded of Mr. Stark's infallibility as to be ready to second him in whatever protest he might, in his lordly pleasure, choose to enter. The question with the Dr., according to Mr. Stark, was not, whether Mr. Stark would be right or wrong in protesting, whether he would have any ground for a protest or not, but simply whether Mr. Stark *would protest*. "He obtained leave," says Mr. Stark, "to join in any protests that I [yes, *I myself*] might enter." It may be added, however, that the Presbytery knew nothing of this instance of servility, and consequently no notice is taken of it in their minutes.

But Mr. Stark further says: "I got a friend to give notice of protest against all the decisions made in the case of Mr. Webster"—And in the last No. of the Magazine, we are told who this friend was, viz: the Clerk of the Presbytery, Mr. Smart. Here we only remark, that Mr. Stark has not treated his *friend* in a very *friendly* manner, in more respects than one. But letting that pass, we must not forget that Mr. Stark protested (if any body believes him) against *all* the decisions made by the Presbytery in Mr. Webster's case! For example—the Presbytery decided that Mr. W. was censurable for "reviving and publishing matters which were legally dead or had been judicially removed;" that he had slandered Mr. Stark in saying that "he was a man of over-reaching avarice;" that he had injured Mr. Stalker in charging him with being moved with "zeal against his own church;" that he was wrong in calling a certain personage "a slippery subject," &c. &c. —yet against all these and similar decisions Mr. Stark says he protested! And not only so, but that *Dr. P. Bullions* expressed an entire willingness to unite with him in this universal protest!!

Our readers will see that Mr. Stark, in order to father a falsehood

upon us, does not hesitate to *stultify* himself and get the finger of scorn pointed at his *most humble servant* the Doctor. Would it not have been full as creditable to both these gentlemen to have left the matter as we in truth stated it, as to represent themselves as protesting against decisions made in their own favor? They surely cannot blame the public for believing that they were *conscious* that those decisions were wrong, though made in their own favor, when *conscience* led them to enter their solemn protests against such unjust decisions!

Besides, is Mr. Stark aware how ridiculously childish he makes himself appear, in affirming that he protested against some *eighty* or *ninety* decisions, without any discrimination or specification? Indeed, he represents himself as saying, "I protest against the *whole, en-masse*, be the same more or less, be they *pro* or *con*, be they already made or about to be made hereafter; and my faithful friend, the Doctor, also, begs leave to join me in all that I now do, or may or can do, in the way of protesting!"

And now, supposing that he did do as he says, give notice by his friend the clerk, that he protested against all the decisions made in Mr. Webster's case, could the Presbytery regard this notice in any other light than as one of his little *quizzes*? Could they take any notice of it consistently with their character and dignity as a court of Christ's house, unless it were to resent it in a proper manner as a *designed contempt*?—We therefore assert, that the Presbytery did not consider Mr. Stark as having entered any protest against any of their decisions; and accordingly the *last* thing they did at that meeting, was to suspend (as we stated in our Review) a former vote granting him the *testimony*, on the ground that he had not entered any protest in a specific form. They decided as follows: "Resolved, that the above grant be suspended, as far as a copy of the testimony is concerned, till he state the particular decisions against which he *may protest*." This, be it recollected, was the very last business transacted by the Presbytery at the meeting at which Mr. Stark says he protested against *all* their decisions. And this resolution was communicated by the clerk to Mr. Stark, together with all the extracts from the minutes which related to himself personally, in order that he might, if he chose, enter protests in a *regular, serious* and *specific* manner, against any of the decisions the Presbytery had made.

What he quotes from Mr. Smart's letter as bearing on this case, appears to have been written in a *satirical* manner, in reference to some *quizzical* statement that Mr. Stark had made in a letter to him, but which he did not consider himself warranted to lay before the Presbytery. Mr. Smart says in a letter to us, just received, "I did not consider myself the Presbytery, and, therefore, whatever I *may* have said, in my communications to Mr. Stark, could not possibly have made him a protester against decisions, about which he said nothing in his communication to Presbytery, on which they acted in the directions given me as clerk."

Now let our readers judge of the warrant Mr. Stark had to charge us with falsehood, when we said, that he "never saw cause to protest against any of the decisions" in the case referred to—and also of the *sincerity* and *piety* displayed in his concluding sentence, which he thus *whines* out: "It is rather unpleasant to think of a minister of the gospel acting in this way. I should think, however, that with those who owe the truth, it must surely be in the end more injurious to Mr. Martin

than to us, for him to publish such falsehoods in his Religious Monitor."

Mr. Stark refers to another matter which requires a brief notice. He represents us as giving as a reason, (he does not say where,) why the whole testimony was not given him, that there was reason to believe that he would not remunerate the clerk for the labor of transcribing it; and this, in his usual style, he pronounces to be "wholly false." When a copy of the testimony was first asked for in behalf of Mr. Stark, as far as it related to him personally, the clerk objected on account of the labor it would require to transcribe it. Dr. P. Bullions then said that Mr. Stark told him to state to Presbytery, that he would compensate the clerk for his trouble in transcribing the testimony, and, says he, If Mr. Stark will not do this, I will. We will now let Mr. Smart tell the rest of the story:

In reference to the matter of remuneration to me as clerk, for writing done for Mr. Stark, I am sorry that he has seen meet to refer to it in his letter to the Editor of the Magazine. It is necessary, however, seeing he has referred to it, to state the whole of the facts. The last writing that I did for Mr. S., was transcribing the testimony of the Rev. J. Irvine and Miss C. McLaren, on Aug. 23d, 1837. In my letter I remarked, that I believed he was in possession of all the testimony necessary to his defence, and at least, of all that he would receive through my agency, as I intended to resign the clerkship at the next meeting of Presbytery, and then stated to him that my charge for what I had done was six dollars. In his answer to this, dated Aug. 31st, 1837, he says: "A few years since, when you ay sick at my house, and both needed and requested services which none of my hired people would perform, I performed some of them myself, for which I did not make any charge, although I believe they were twenty times more valuable than merely transcribing a few pages from a written record."

I considered this, after what I had told him, as manifesting a disposition to avoid the payment for services rendered, for I only charged him for what I had done, and not for what I had not done, and therefore under date of Sept. 4th, 1837, wrote him, in part, as follows: "Your offset against my charge for copying Presbyterial documents for you, I very readily admit as valid. You may, therefore, make yourself easy on the subject, as I am very willing that my charge for writing should go as far as it will towards the satisfaction of your demand." It is true in the above letter, and subsequently he continued to declare his readiness to pay the fee as soon as the service was performed; but he must in a very few days have been made acquainted with the fact, that I had not only ceased to be clerk, but also to be a member of the Presbytery, yet he has not to this day offered to pay me, otherwise than he has done in his letter of Aug. 31st, which rendered it impossible for me to receive any compensation had it been offered. That I did receive kindness from Mr. S. I freely admit and feel grateful for, but the arduous services laid upon me at his request, were not placed by either himself or Presbytery, at the outset, upon the principle that I owed Mr. S. a debt of gratitude, and had better take this opportunity of repaying it. It may not, however, be amiss to state, that at the time referred to, I served Mr. S. in the way of preaching for him.

---

ART. X. *A Letter from Mr. Webster relative to one of the Forgeries.*

DEAR SIR—I now have it in my power to communicate all the facts in relation to the saying against "*the Scotch*" which has been ascribed to me, and published under my signature by the editor of The Associate Presbyterian Magazine. And it furnishes another chapter in the history of recent transactions in the bosom of the Secession Church, which humanity and piety would gladly suppress, were it possible. "It is for a lamentation, and shall be for a lamentation." But as my name has been dragged before the public, in connection with an odious and even contemptible sentiment, there is no alternative left me. I must either give the whole truth, or rest under a foul and unwarranted aspersion, which has a powerful tendency to injure the cause of truth and the influence of christian brethren, who entertain views of church government similar to my own.

The first time I heard of this saying, was in June, 1837, when Dr. P. Bullions laid it in as a charge against me in the Presbytery of Al-

bany. Knowing that I had not any prejudices against Scotch people *as such*, but was contending against a number of Scotsmen, in common with their own "kinsmen according to the flesh," (to use their own quotation,) I promptly denied the charge; and it now appears that I did right.

It appears that I accidentally fell into the company of James Maxwell and John G. White, of Albany, some time during the pendency of Mr. Stark's civil suit against me, through the agency of Rev. Dr. P. Bullions; probably in the summer or fall of '36; the time is not given by Mr. White, and I have not the most distant recollection either of this casual meeting or of the words then spoken. With these gentlemen I have been acquainted from boyhood, and have always been on intimate terms of friendship with them, without any interruption. Mr. M. was a brother elder in the same session for more than ten years; and he, like myself, has *no recollection* of any conversation in which such words were used by me. Mr. White writes me as follows:

ALBANY, 15th February, 1839.

DEAR SIR,

The "Scotch saying" alluded to in your letter, was made use of by you in Mr. Maxwell's shop; I must confess it surprised me very much, when I heard that you denied it, by calling it "*a base falsehood*." The expression was used by you in a conversation between us, on the subject of the controversy between Messrs. Stark, Bullions, and yourself, in, as it were, a summing up of the conversation on your part, and in answer to an expression made use of by me—"that you was contending with men that were possessed of a great deal of cunning and shrewdness;" to which you replied—"we have got the Scotch exactly where we want them, we have our feet on their necks and we will keep them there."

Some few days subsequent to the above conversation, I was talking with Mr. James Walker on the subject of your pamphlet, to whom I remarked that I thought you had made use of some unguarded expressions in that publication—telling him at the same time the manner in which you expressed yourself in Mr. Maxwell's shop; and that I was surprised and astonished that some of your more prudent friends did not caution you against making such rash and imprudent expressions.

I heard nothing more on the subject, until called upon by the Rev. Mr. Blair, who told me that he had understood that you had, in conversation at Mr. Maxwell's shop, (at which I was present) made use of the within expression, which he asked me in a christian-like and gentlemanly manner, if it was *true or false*; telling me at the same time, that the *INQUIRY WAS NOT MADE WITH A VIEW OF INJURING YOUR CHARACTER, USEFULNESS OR REPUTATION*, but merely to protect the innocent; to which I replied, that it was with a great deal of reluctance that I said any thing on the subject; particularly as it was a *part of a private conversation*; but if called upon to answer yes or no, my reply would, in strict accordance with truth, be necessarily given in the affirmative, and at the same time explaining to him the manner in which the expression was made, and that the allusion was made to Messrs. Stark and Bullions.

I was again called upon by the Rev. Peter Bullions, who, in a very polite and gentlemanly manner, asked me if I had any objection to giving him in writing the exact words used by you in the above alluded to conversation respecting the "*Scotch*," *AS HE WOULD MAKE NO OTHER USE OF IT THAN MERELY TO PREVENT YOU FROM VOTING ON ANY QUESTION IN WHICH THE SCOTCH WERE INTERESTED*, as he thought you was prejudiced against them. I then explained to him as I did to the Rev. Mr. Blair, the manner in which you made use of the expression, and told him that I would endeavor to call to recollection the exact words, and accordingly did so, and wrote him a note, of which the following is a copy, as high as I now recollect, viz:

DEAR SIR—In compliance with your request, I have endeavored to call to recollection, the exact words made use of by the Rev. C. Webster, in a conversation with him at Mr. Maxwell's shop, in relation to the publication of his pamphlet, and the controversy between the Rev. Mr. Stark and himself, which is as follows, viz: [Here follows the saying given above.]

Yours respectfully,

JOHN G. WHITE.

Rev C. WEBSTER, Philadelphia.

On this transaction, as detailed above, a few thoughts may be offered, without, it is hoped, transcending the rules of propriety.

1. *Mr. White's testimony exonerates me from the sweeping charge published in the Magazine.* He tells both Mr. Blair and Dr. Bullions, that my allusion was to Messrs. Stark and Bullions, and I suppose it will not be pretended that they comprise the whole Scotch nation. And according to the connection, it is probable the words "these Scotchmer," instead of "*the Scotch*," were used. And this supposition does not impeach the integrity of Mr. White in the least. He craws from memory, and that too, long after the event. And neither myself,

nor Mr. Maxwell, have the least recollection of any such words. Mr. White manifests a becoming concern respecting my rashness and impudence, but probably not being in communion with the church, he did not think himself warranted to speak to me *privately*; and as he knew Mr. Walker my friend, I suppose no blame can attach to him for speaking to Mr. W.\* It seems, however, it is imprudent in these days for a man to speak unguardedly even in the presence of those with whom he has held familiar converse from childhood. The mind must be ever strung like a violin in tune. (Is. xxix. 21.)

2. *Mr. White's testimony convicts the Rev. Mr. Blair of jesuitism and Dr. P. Bullions with lying.* Mr. Blair desires in a "christian-like" and even "gentlemanly manner" not to injure my character by invading the sanctuary of private life. But he was only electioneering for Mr. Stark. Let his history in New-York and his special mission in the West, in 1839, tell the rest. Dr. Bullions would "make NO OTHER USE of it than merely to prevent me from voting," &c. How did it get into his Magazine? One can hardly fail to be struck with the similarity between this and Mr. Stark's pledge respecting the pretended retraction.

3. *Mr. White's testimony convicts Dr. Bullions of forgery.* Though the saying ascribed to me were proved by a hundred witnesses, no man could put my name to it, as is done in the Magazine, without incurring the guilt of forgery. Suppose A. promise B. a sum of money, and B. commits that promise to writing, affixing A.'s name to the writing, in what light would B. stand before a civil tribunal? can Dr. B. inform us?

4. *Dr. B. practiced a gross imposition upon Mr. White.* First, by endeavoring to make Mr. W. believe that I had impeached his veracity; and, secondly, by asserting a direct falsehood respecting the design of procuring the statement from Mr. White. But I have not impeached Mr. W.'s statement; neither does Mr. White's testimony confirm the slander of Dr. B. against me. But the Dr. is a poor, persecuted Scotsman! Read his graphic description of a spirit of persecution.—"Let the most innocent, the most upright, the most circumspect in his walk and conversation, once become obnoxious to this spirit, his integrity will prove but a feeble protection. It will watch his steps—it will wrest his words—its thoughts will be constantly against him for evil—it will make him an offender for a word—it will devise mischievous calumnies and send them abroad through the earth." (A. P. Mag. vol. i. p. 3.)

---

\* Mr. Walker, who is a Scotsman or a Scotsman's son, I am not positive which, but have heard him hold conversation in the Gælic language, and who was a brother elder with me for more than ten years, writes as follows:

CALEDONIA, Oct. 31st, 1838.

R. V. SIR—I have seen Dr. Bullions' pamphlet, in which the charge against you of assertions against the Scotch is published to the world. Nothing short of good proof, or your own acknowledgement, would make me believe you ever said or thought as they charge you. It is wholly unfounded and wholly false, that you at any time, or in any place, made the assertion with which you are charged, in my hearing, unless my recollective powers are exceedingly treacherous. My acquaintance with you was not trivial nor of short duration; associated as we were, for such a length of time, I well remember how often we rejoiced together, that amongst many difficulties which we had to encounter in the church, national prejudices made no part of our troubles. If you had prejudices against the Scotch as a people, you must have had a better faculty of keeping it out of view in that particular case, than you had in almost all other cases. Reservedness was no fault of yours. From what I know of you, if you were charged with prejudices in favor of Scotemen and Scottish ministers, their sayings and doings, I could easily be made to believe, that probably there was some reason for the charge.

Yours affectionately,  
JAMES WALKER.

Rev. C. WEBSTER.

It appears to me that the Dr. must have penned this paragraph about the time he paid his visit to Mr. White, or he could surely never have characterized that transaction in such glowing terms—"thoughts that breathe and words that burn." Or, is it not possible that this odious spirit of persecution has haunted the Dr.'s imagination till he has fancied himself its personification? But who can suspect the Dr. of indulging such a spirit?

5. I will not degrade myself, nor insult honorable and christian Scotsmen, by any argument on this subject. Those who *know* me, know my views respecting it; and as for others, I need not be much concerned. But I may say that the language imputed to me is common in this country. We are composed of a mixed population—English, Irish, Scotch, Low Dutch, German, French, Swiss, native Americans, &c. And you may hear individuals daily spoken of by the name of their native country, both in a way of praise and contempt, without any reflection whatever upon the people of the country to which they belong. None is intended, none is understood. And the words in question, if spoken by me, were applied to only two individuals.

And all that I have to say in conclusion, is simply this, that this unholy warfare, from the autumn of '34 till the spring of '39, was neither courted nor begun by me. And it rests with my enemies to say when it shall terminate.

The war was declared upon me, at first, because I refused to pollute the pages of the Religious Monitor with the ebullitions of their spleen, which have since obtained vent through other channels. And this I am prepared at any time to prove. And for this offence I must be put out of the way. And these Rev. gentlemen undertook to despatch me; but devout thanks be to the good and over-ruling providence of God, their "cunning and shrewdness" has not availed them. "How dangerous is it," says the learned and pious Dr. McCrie, of Edinburgh,\* "to enter on a wicked course, especially in concert with others! Persons go from evil to worse; they encourage one another in mischief. This is especially true as to those practices which originate in malice, or to which, the devil, who was a murderer from the beginning, exerts a peculiar influence, in urging his children to the most violent extremes." (Lect. on Esther, p. 264.)

Yours truly,

C. WEBSTER.

Philadelphia, March 13, 1839.

#### ART XII. Notice—*A New Book.*

*Biographical Sketches and Sermons of some of the first Ministers of the Associate Church in America: To which is prefixed A Historical Introduction:—Containing an account of the rise and progress of the Associate Church, for the first half century of her existence in this country. By James P. Miller, Pastor of the Associate Congregation of Argyle, N. Y.*

This valuable work is just published. It contains 515 pages. The Historical Introduction covers 100 pages. The Sketches and Sermons nearly 350. To which is added an Appendix of 65 pages, containing a variety of useful and interesting documents. It is long since the press has furnished to Seceders a book so interesting; and as we have said before, every family in our communion should obtain a copy of it.

\* I hope they will excuse me for quoting from their "kinsman according to the flesh."

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,  
AND  
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

MAY, 1839.

---

ART. I. *Case of the Rev. A. T. McGill.*

(Concluded from page 495.)

Some attach the same idea to *freedom* in matters of religion, as in politics; that is, liberty for every one to do as he pleases. Nothing can be more fashionable than the prevailing spirit of our times, which rejects with decided abhorrence those civil requirements which enforce a strict conformity to the upright rule of moral action. The exhibition of this doctrine is not confined to the political arena. Many seem to think that the church is an association designed to foster *libertinism*, and in which the divine love reigns in such bold triumph, as to justify a *magnanimous* disregard of the rules of rigid discipline. But a serious reflection should convince the judicious, that the nearer we approximate to the standard of perfection, the greater will be our conformity to rules and requirements of inconceivable strictness. Even Jehovah himself, is, speaking after the manner of men, under the law of his own holy nature, which regulates all his acts, and a very brief transcript of which is revealed to us, for our rule of action. The society of heaven have rules very rigid indeed, insomuch that all who do not conform perfectly to them, are excluded from its privileges. Their communion is emphatically restricted. Myriads of spirits of high order were ejected; and their rigid rules of admission exclude from their fellowship "any thing that defileth," the least moral stain, all characters in the least defective. Were some of our modern *liberals* there with their present sentiments, they would surely take umbrage at these *narrow* minded "exclusive measures," and in the exercise of their *extended* love, would propose some important amendments. The more any religious community resembles the society of heaven, the greater is her advance to perfection; but a quondam Seceder makes a grave objection

to this regulation of our church, which fails in this resemblance only in point of strictness; and as he deems this a sufficient *reason* for leaving our society—*Query?* Were he now translated above, would he think this a sufficient *reason* for leaving that society, and seeking one of a more *liberal, open, generous* character?

Experience sometimes teaches, when plain scripture precepts fail. The extraordinary history of the Presbyterian Church for several years past, her full developement of the native tendency of *free communion* in its practical operation, have taught many, who refused instruction in any other than in this school. It is truly astounding that any person, long warned of the evils of *latitudinarianism* by approved scriptural theory, and being an observant witness of its corrupting, distracting influence in that church, should espouse this scheme with so much fervor, making it a prominent reason for entering that body, as if it could be much longer tolerated therein. It is probable that a knowledge of this fact will equally surprise his new brethren of the orthodox stamp, for when Mr. McGill's sentiment on this subject was stated to one of the most eminent fathers of the Old School, he observed with a manly firmness, "I can not go that far with him;" and it is beyond a probability that in this he expressed the views of a decided majority of his brethren. After trying the experiment, and seeing its dire effects in producing discord and division in their Assembly, they now stand out on the wreck, and, as if for the first time, open their eyes on the scene of injured weeping truth, and disunion, and fearful ruin. This was long predicted by their Seceder brethren, as the legitimate result of the scheme, and we are happy to find that so many of the leading members of the late Assembly evince their conviction of its truth, and their determination to carry out a reform, by resuming their old stand on this subject, and by "inquiring for the old paths," and walking in the "old way." Nothing can establish peace and unity among them but some such "exclusive measures," as shall separate from their communion those disagreeing in doctrinal sentiment with them, and shall secure a union of heart, of spirit, a oneness of views.

A few observations shall be submitted here to the consideration of the candid:

1st. The names by which God designates the church evidently express his will, in opposition to *free communion*. The term "*Church*," signifies "*Called out from those unworthy of her association.*" "My people—holy nation—chosen generation—peculiar people—the righteous nation which may enter—my vineyard," which is said to have "a wall or hedge planted" around her, to keep out unworthy characters. In Songs iv. 12, she is called "a garden inclosed" from the commons of the world, "a spring shut up," her waters of joyful consolation, her privileges are shut up, denied to such as are rendered unworthy by corrupt faith or practice. She is styled "one-undefiled," she can not be defiled by admitting into her bosom such as are not *one* in sentiment with her. She is "an orchard of pomegranites," of choice plants, not to be filled with the corrupting weeds and strange wild plants. She is the sheep—"fold," into which none but the "sheep" must enter. She composes the great family of God, his "children" bearing the likeness of their Father; if, then, any come, and wish to *sit among his children*, but have not the image of Christ on them, or do not evidence their oneness with him by a corresponding faith and practice; if such come up "with the sons of God" to feast at his table, and have not "on a wed-

ding garment" of a pure profession of faith in Christ's righteousness, they must be rejected as *false friends*. For the character given of them is "children that will not lie," will not give the honor and the truths of God the "lie" by erring in either doctrine or practice.

2d. The example of Jehovah in the government of his church expresses his will against this scheme of free communion. This is evident, not only from his forbidding his chosen Israel to have any fellowship with the surrounding nations, but also from all the ceremonial laws and moral prohibitions, actually rejecting all such characters in Israel as were ceremonially or morally unclean, denying them the privileges of Zion. How plainly was this inculcated in the law of leprosy? Though many a leper might have been still in covenant with God, enjoying the sweet communion of his Spirit in secret, yet the court judging from his external appearance, must pronounce him unfit for their fellowship, and keep him "without the camp." In Neh. xiii. 23-30, it is recorded, that a solemn appeal being made to God, and with his approval, all such as "spoke half the language of Ashdod," were not pure Israelites, or had intermarried among strangers, were deprived of the privileges of the sanctuary, were "chased out." In Hosea xi. 12, we find that "Ephraim," or the ten tribes, the great majority of God's professing people, had become corrupt, "compasseth me about with lies," but that "Judah," a small number of true worshippers, witnessed faithfully for the truth, "yet ruleth with God, and is faithful with the saints." Did God allow Judah to have fellowship with Ephraim? By no means. Though Ephraim remained sound in many important doctrines of worship, yet because she was defiled with moral blemishes, Judah is forbid to have communion with her: "Though thou, Israel, play the harlot, yet let not Judah offend." (Hosea iv. 15.)

And look at the example of our Saviour, who should be esteemed *liberal, of expansive love*, though some modern liberalists must charge him with *contracted views*, unworthy of this age of *generous feelings*. When he instituted his church, and gave her form, and rules by which she was to be regulated, did he admit into her embrace the Pharisees and Sadducees? These professors, though corrupt in many points, yet at the Saviour's advent, retained many of the truths and leading doctrines of divine worship, and at that time constituted the only true church on earth. Now the writer of the article under review, thinks it is only necessary to ask, is "that church a church of Christ?" if so, its members must be admitted to our communion, no matter how corrupt in many leading doctrines of grace. How much wiser and more generous in his fraternal love is he, than was our Saviour, who refused such admittance into his religious community?

And after the christian church was organized, and her officers intrusted with authority to enforce her rules, after being some time in operation, do we not find our Saviour descending, after his ascension, and giving her correction and instruction on this very subject? (See his "Epistles to the seven churches," in the first three chapters of Rev. specially the ii. 12-17.) The church of Pergamos was considered fruitful, had "not denied his word," how highly does God commend her? But a reproof is administered; for what? For being like the Secession Church, too strict in her rules of admission? No. But for being too much like some liberal churches in our day, too *loose, too loving and free* in admitting persons to her fellowship. She had admitted the Balaamites and the Nicolaitans, "which thing God hated," and for

which he calls her to "repent." Surely Mr. McGill, with some others, would have thought this a noble trait in her character, so excellent a quality as would have justified him in leaving the communion of some church more strict in this point, and in joining her. And, doubtless, with his present views, he could not have remained in her, after Jehovah had reformed her, and enforced her rules of *close communion*.

3d. The common sense of mankind, as manifested in the affairs of life, condemn this favorite theory. Does not every decent family have certain rules of propriety, which must be complied with by friends or strangers, when admitted to their common privileges, and which, if violated, will exclude all, even an inmate of the family? Have not every civil community similar rules, in granting the rights of citizenship? Would a Republic admit as citizens the avowed enemies of Republicanism, who still boast of their preference or allegiance to some foreign despotic power? Is this prudent, is it *common sense* in civil affairs? If so, why not also in the church? Why should she admit to her privileges, the avowed enemies of her purity, her chief glory?

4th. The character given of the church in her greatest advance in holiness while on earth, and of her perfection in glory, is that none but the "pure," pure in faith and practice, should gain admittance to her privileges. Her state during the *millennium* is set forth by such figures as express her *oneness*, her identity in the views and principles of all her members. That discord and strife which now mark her *divisions*, and exhibit too much of the spirit of the devouring beasts of prey, shall cease; for "the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid—they shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountains." Her "watchmen shall lift up their voice together—shall see eye to eye." And in Rev. xx. 3, 4, we learn that Satan shall not be permitted to "deceive" her members, that they shall not bear any impress of the beast's "image," but shall live and "reign with Christ." Now, were the Presbyterians, and Arminians, and Hopkinsians, thus free from hostile divisions, united, their "watchmen seeing eye to eye," free from conflicting sentiments, dangerous errors, the beast's image, were none of them *deceived* by Satan, but "reigned with Christ" in maintaining the purity of his sacred truths, inter-communion among them would be proper in the highest degree. But their present walls of separation should be removed, and they *merged* into one body. Such unity, and such communion, have the seal of God's approbation; and it is the duty of all branches of Zion to seek this with fervent aspirations. But to sit as *one* at the Lord's table, whilst they retain their *wolfish* natures, their leopard spots, discordant spirits, ill comports with that scriptural unity and communion approved by God.

But some will say, the millennial state of the church, and her perfection in heaven, are no rule for her now, being a greater advance in perfection than is now attainable. Grant this last; still she should "go on to perfection," aim at it, and "hold fast" her attainments. She will be under the same law and regulations in heaven which she has here, or at least *should have*. If perfect strictness in this point be her glory in one stage of her existence, surely she should ever aim at attaining this glory. And doubtless, if God's direct government of her on earth, or in her heavenly, perfect state, be received as a rule on this subject, the Associate Church will never be censured for being "followers

of God" in rejecting from her communion impure, unworthy applicants.

5th. In fine—The scriptures contain an explicit declaration of the will of God on this subject. This should decide every controversy. The Spirit directs the church of Thessalonica (2 Thess. iii. 6) to "withdraw from every brother that walketh disorderly"—and in v. 14, 15, to "have no company with him, that he may be ashamed. Yet count him not an enemy, but admonish him as a brother." Now we have "withdrawn from our Presbyterian, Methodist and Hopkinsian brethren, and some others, esteemed branches of Christ's true church, because we think that in several particulars they "walk disorderly." And why do we thus? Is it because we consider them "enemies?" God is our witness, that it is from the purest motives of love to them, which constrains us to do the office of a faithful friend in telling them their faults, that they "may be ashamed," and brought to the truth. The same injunction is repeated to Timothy, to "withdraw himself from such as were of "corrupt minds, destitute of the truth." When the majority of a church becomes corrupt, the faithful minority are commanded to "come out of her." (Rev. xviii. 4.) And we have already adverted to the reprimand given to the church of Pergamos, (Rev. ii. 12-17,) for holding communion with such as were impure. We shall now notice only one more passage, (2 Cor. vi. 14-17,) in which it is pertinently declared that "light and the temple of God can have no communion with the darkness" of error and immorality, "no agreement," no fellowship with such persons, or societies, or systems, as disagree with the word of truth and sound doctrine. "Wherefore," says God, "come out from among them and be separate." Not so, says Mr. McGill; it is "too restrictive." We leave him to settle the point with the Holy Spirit. If conscience, and candor, and truth exert their proper influence, the decision may easily be anticipated.

A very brief allusion may here be made to the most plausible plan urged in favor of this popular scheme, viz: "That our church should hold communion with all with whom God holds communion." Though this seems a plausible argument, still we think it based on false assumptions. It assumes that the officers of Christ's house can discern, as well as God, the persons in secret fellowship with him; as also that this secret communion of the Spirit is a correct rule for admittance to church privileges, both of which are false. Church officers can not judge of the inward state of the applicant's heart, which is known to God only. They have two means by which alone they can judge who are worthy, their profession and practice. If an applicant make a sound profession of his faith in the truths of God's word, and if his conduct in life be according to godliness, they must consider him worthy of their communion, although the searcher of hearts should know him to be an hypocrite. Such was Judas, whom our Saviour, God, knew to be in league with Satan; but because his outward conduct was becoming him as a follower of Christ, whom he professed to love and honor, he was admitted to his holy communion. Likewise, many have secret fellowship with God, who still should not be admitted to church fellowship. Thus, in the former dispensation, many righteous persons were excluded, because ceremonially or morally unclean, as lepers, or such as had touched a dead body, &c. Miraim, sister of Moses, was shut out of the camp, though a true believer. These "secret things belong to God," and can be no rule for us. And when "holiness shall be writ-

ten" on the doors of admission into God's house, on its altar and furniture, and on "the thrones of judgment" therein, "in that day there shall be no more the *Canaanite* in the house of the God of hosts." (Zec. xiv. 20, 21.)

The third reason assigned by the writer of the article here noticed, for leaving the Associate Church, is her exclusive use of the divine songs of scripture, in worship. He grants that these may be used, but thinks human hymns, the poetic effusions of any uninspired man, equally proper. Well, the public voice is in his favor. With two or three other branches of Christ's church we now stand almost alone, pitied, calumniated, despised, for retaining this *bigotted* singularity in our profession. Without hoping to be able to stem the tide of popular opinion on this subject, or to say any thing which might be esteemed a ray of light on this subject, after the sudden influx of such a flood of light, as, within a half century, has overwhelmed the churches, and made them *wise above the ancients*, the few subsequent remarks are submitted to the honest enquirers of "the good old way" in which "our fathers worshipped" with divine approbation.

1st. In the solemn act of worship our ascriptions of praise, celebrating the perfections of God, and exulting in the glories of redeeming love, should possess a purity and dignity suited to the object, and corresponding in elevated worth to its infinite importance. Hence all heathen nations, with much industry and talent, have selected their loftiest strains to celebrate their deities. Hence, also, the church of God, in every age, has evinced much care and holy jealousy respecting her songs of praise.

2d. As God is infinite in all his perfections, no finite mind can conceive, or set forth in appropriate expressions, the glory of his character. None is adequate to this but a mind aided by the unerring spirit of infinite wisdom. We can in some proper manner celebrate the goodness and noble deeds of a fellow-man justly renowned; but when we look up to him who fills heaven with his glory, and contemplate the glorious things provided for us, and which we crave, but "which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath it entered into the heart of man," "who is sufficient" to indite a song corresponding in grandeur to the theme? Must it not require a large amount of vanity and presumption in any one to make the attempt?

3d. Jehovah, knowing the inadequacy of man to the task, prepared a book or collection of songs suited to his own worship, which he gave to his church, and commanded her to sing them in his praise. Could David, or any other man, have composed these, he would not have dictated them by his Spirit. These, in loftiness of sentiment, intrinsic excellence, and beauty, bear the impress of their divine author, and are eminently calculated to inspire devotional feelings.

4th. As the object of her worship is unchanging, and as her character and relation to him are ever the same, her songs of praise should be still the same. It is shameful ignorance or willing madness which many betray, asserting a real difference between the Old Testament Church and the New, calling this the "*gospel dispensation.*" That, in respect to types and ceremonies there was a difference, is readily admitted; but both dispensations have the same Saviour, the same blessings, the same gospel. If her system of praise were in her former dispensation merely ceremonial, then indeed it should have been abrogated at the coming of Christ, the great antitype; but if it were spiritual and moral in its

nature, it must remain unaltered. We grant there are many expressions and allusions in these psalms of a typical nature; so also there are in many portions of the Old Testament. Must we now reject this part of scripture as unfit for New Testament times? It is indeed to be lamented that consistency, with this mode of reasoning, has led several religious denominations to consider the Old Testament scriptures as unnecessary at present. But this is too infidel to require refutation. With regard to all the expressions in the Psalms of a typical nature, pointing to a coming Saviour, or suiting the temple worship, it seems evident from their form and import that the Spirit designed them for the worship of both dispensations; for in some the Saviour's triumphs, his incarnation and sufferings, his death and glorious ascension, are celebrated as being then past. (See Ps. xxii. lxviii. 18, &c.) Can God put more appropriate words of praise into our mouth? But do some of these speak of the "altar"—and of "sacrifices?" So does the Spirit in the New Testament, (Heb. xiii. 10,) "we have an altar;" and verse 15, "By him let us offer the sacrifice of praise continually to God." Now if this language be fit to be used by the Spirit in this "gospel dispensation," why not also proper for celebrating his praise;—using it like the apostle in a spiritual sense? That the church ever sustains the same relation to Christ as his "spouse," and that the matter of her praise is in no sense ceremonial, but purely spiritual, is too evident to require proof. The conclusion, then, seems irresistible, that since God has given her a system of songs, perfect in their nature and suitability, and has commanded her to sing these, and since this command was not abrogated or revoked by God, she is still obligated to use these in his praise.

5th. Our Saviour and his Apostles, at the institution of the christian church used these. This is evident, if we consider that these were the divinely authorized hymns of Israel then in use, and that Christ or his Apostles composed no others. When it is said they "sung an hymn," can we doubt of what collection it was? And, as every one acquainted with the Greek and Hebrew languages will readily admit the Book of Psalms, are, by the Spirit, called "Psalms and Songs," and that "hymn" is a Greek term, signifying "ode" or song, which word would be quite appropriate to express a "spiritual ode," by the Apostles who write in Greek; when, therefore, they repeat the divine injunction to praise God "in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs," would not every unbiassed mind refer their allusion to those of inspiration, long known by that name? And until those who prefer human to divine hymns bring some evidence from history, the possibility of which is denied, that there were some other than the sacred psalms, which could have been used and referred to by the Apostles, we are bound to consider the sanction of their authority in favor of their continued use.

6th. Since neither Christ nor his Apostles gave the New Testament Church any new Psalms, nor authorized her members to alter or amend those in use, or to substitute others in their place, such an essay must be daring presumption in any. If none but divine songs were fit for the use of Israel, will any other be fit for his church now? Is she less holy than formerly? If he considered these not suited to his "gospel church," why did he not make provision for the defect? Do we now know, better than he, what is suited to her spiritual welfare? How could any, destitute of a divine warrant, presume this innovation, without a fearful exposure to the divine anathema, Rev. xxii. 18, 19? If neither David nor Asaph, without the aid of the Spirit, could compose appro-

prate hymns for Zion, can any blind erring mortals do it now? Or can any poet now have the presumption to lay a claim to inspiration?

7th. The fathers of the primitive church used the Scripture Psalms in worship. Their writings contain positive proof of this. Contradiction is challenged. We consider their example of great importance, as they were pillars of christianity in its original purity. And it merits special notice, that they punished with judicial censure such as introduced uninspired hymns, as dangerous innovations, tending to corrupt the church. Those acquainted with church history will not question the truth of these facts.

8th. Human hymns were sung during "the dark ages," when the church was flooded with the grossest corruption. Though probably the scripture songs were sung by some faithful worshippers in obscure places, yet the introduction of human hymns corresponded so fully with the genius of Popery, that they "grew with its growth," and spread with its corruptions.

9th. At the Reformation, the church returned to the use of the Divine Psalms. Luther, Calvin, and Beza, used careful industry to have these translated and adapted to her worship. And all are familiar with the remarkable attention paid to this subject by that pure and noble Assembly of Divines at Westminster. We here take occasion to notice a piece of *low cunning*, designed to deceive, employed by many in high repute, who assert that "Watt or Wesley, has as good a right as Rouse to make Psalms." Rouse did indeed draught a translation of the scripture Psalms in poetry, but this, like the translation of other parts of scripture, was revised and corrected by the Assembly, and received the same sanction as any other part of God's word. So that if we receive as divine the translation of Isaiah, we must, by the same authority, consider as divine this poetic translation of the Psalms. Do any pretend that these other hymns now in use are any thing like a translation from the Hebrew original? Or have these received as such the solemn sanction of Christ's house?

The Presbyterian Church used the Scripture Psalms in the time of her greatest purity, and till within better than half a century. Has her history since been that of a noble advance in reform and gospel purity? What are her attainments in truth and unity, and brotherly love? Ask her late Assemblies.

10th. The introduction of human hymns is calculated to corrupt the worship and promote divisions in the church. One man has as good a right as another to make hymns; Wesley was as fit as Watt; a Baptist as a Hopkinsian, a Unitarian or Universalian, as a Presbyterian. Accordingly, each of these sects have hymns containing doctrines suited to the peculiar views of each. If their conflicting sentiments be full of corrupting error, as each will admit in respect to the others, then their hymns are of a corresponding nature. Worshippers naturally imbibed the sentiments of their songs of praise. Can these, composed by erring men, under the influence of sectarianism, fail to disseminate the corrupting delusive errors? And must they not foster the present divisions? Did all worship in the words and elevating sentiments of the Spirit, might we not anticipate the happiest results from their healing, purifying, sanctifying nature? None can doubt, certainly, that when we praise God in the songs composed by himself, he will be well pleased

with this sacrifice; but it may be more than doubted whether he will accept the "lame sacrifice" of human works.

11th. We can not expect the glory of the millennium, until the churches unite in returning to the use of infallible divine songs of praise. Can it be possible that when "every one hath a psalm," every different minister and sect have a hymn of a discordant, contradictory nature, there can ever be unity and harmony in their worship? How can these "Watchmen see eye to eye—lift up their voice together, and with the voice together sing," whilst they continue the use of their present jarring false hymns? But who will renounce his favorite hymns? Are not Watt's as good as Wesley's? But can any claim to be as good as God's? When the Spirit shall be poured out from on high, and the creature abased, and God exalted, then all united in their living Head shall join together in putting the crown on Christ, and with their voices sing in concert the praise of his glorious deeds, in those lofty strains indited by his Spirit. These being divine, can be offered up with a divine faith; and all can unite with infallible assurance of divine acceptance. The Lord will hasten it in his time.

The objector seems in a doubt whether some common hymns might not have been used by the Jews and Christ's disciples. We cannot remove his doubts, for he might with equal propriety doubt whether there were not in the days of Moses two suns. He has the same right to suppose the one as the other, there being a destitution of any evidence from history which could warrant the supposition! Perhaps his ingenuity might, like a noted public advocate of human hymns, refer us to Israel, when Aaron made a calf, they "sung," they "shouted;" "what did they sing?" The suggestion is, that they might have sung some hymns, either made for the occasion, or formerly. Well, as it was the worship of the Devil, a human hymn would have been much more appropriate than "the Lord's song." Let his argument have full weight. But let the true Israel sing with gladness the "songs of Zion," and not "worship the creature more than the Creator."

HONESTAS.

---

#### ART. II. Obituary of Mr. Alexander Bachop.

This excellent man departed this life on Sabbath, the 2d day of December, 1838, at his residence in Argyle, N. Y.

The steady attachment which Mr. Bachop always evinced to the principles, and the liberality he showed to the cause of the Secession Church, render his name precious to those of our communion who were acquainted with him—and as he was in his whole life exemplary for unaffected piety and singular uprightness in business, a short notice of him may not be uninteresting to the readers of the Monitor generally.

Mr. Bachop was a native of Scotland, and came to this country either in 1801 or early in 1802, and shortly afterwards engaged in the mercantile business, which he continued to carry on until his decease. For the last few years of his life, his health was very feeble; at times

it appeared to his friends and himself, that he was almost gone—again he would revive, and be able, in some measure, to attend to his ordinary business, until the last summer, when he left his house but seldom, except to attend on public religious exercises, which he continued punctually to do, until within a few weeks of his decease.

Mr. Bachop was well known through an extensive community for his singular honesty in business; many anecdotes might be mentioned, which would exhibit this part of his character in a very interesting and amiable point of view, but as these do not seem to come directly within the scope of a religious periodical, I shall pass to another view of his character, and proceed to give a brief sketch of him as a religious man.

Mr. Bachop was born of religious parents, his father was an elder in the Associate (Anti-Burgher) Church in Scotland. Although Mr. Bachop had a high opinion of the religious character of his father, he resolved he would not adopt his religious sentiments as his own, or make the same profession he had made, without a careful examination of them by the unerring standard of the word of God. I am not certain whether he was admitted to full fellowship in the church or not, before he left Scotland; but have more than once heard him speak of the importance with which he viewed that step in his life. And particularly the importance of making a choice in the present divided state of the church. The examination of the grounds upon which the various denominations of professing christians differed, and the causes which produced the division, was a work of deliberation to him. After much serious and solemn investigation, he became fully persuaded of the truth of that profession made by the Associate Church. Before he came to this conclusion, there were two great steps which he most carefully investigated: 1st. The Secession from the established Church of Scotland in 1732-34; and 2d. The split which took place in 1747. All the points connected with these two events he carefully examined, until he became convinced of the warrantableness and necessity of the Secession; he was not less clear in espousing the side usually denominated the Anti-Burgher. His conclusions on these points having been the result of careful and prayerful investigation, were the more permanent; and he retained to the last the firm conviction, that the doctrine, worship and discipline of the Associate Church were in accordance with the word of God, and that he had been led to embrace them by the Spirit of God. His steadfastness in adhering to these principles was tried in different periods of his life, but particularly towards the last, when he withstood unmoved a blast which swept not a few others off their feet.

The agitated state of the church in this section, was a matter of deep concern to him; and as he formed his judgment from what he saw himself, and was a man of quick discernment, few persons better understood the true state of the controversy, or were less liable to be imposed upon. He was present at the meeting of the Presbytery of Cambridge, at which his minister, the Rev. Duncan Stalker, was deposed, and although a large majority of the congregation (few of them having made themselves acquainted with the merits of the case,) supported their minister in his non-submission to the authority of Presbytery and Synod, Mr. Bachop was one of those who immediately withdrew and never heard him again. Until within five Sabbaths of the time of his

decease, when he was wholly confined to his room, he attended on public ordinances at the Associate congregation of Argyle.

He took a deep interest in the concerns of the church at large, and not unfrequently attended the meetings of the Associate Synod. After the meeting of the Synod of 1837, at Pittsburgh, Mr. Bachop being deeply affected with the state of the church, and conceiving that Synod had come to some decisions which were injurious to the cause of truth; he expressed his fear that the ministers depended too much on one another, and not on the Head of the church, and that for this cause, God had suffered them to be visited with a spirit of disorder and confusion.

Looking upon the late meeting of Synod in Philadelphia, as one of the deepest importance to the cause of truth and the maintainance of the Secession Testimony; and believing that if the scriptural discipline and order for which the Associate Church had been enabled to witness as yet in this country, should now be abandoned, that its last foot-hold would be lost in America, as it was almost extinct in Scotland, it was his intention to attend it, though then in very low and feeble health. With this view, he spoke to the writer to engage him a lodging near where the Synod would meet. But before the day he had set for starting arrived, he became worse. The following extract of a letter, written after he found that his health would not permit him to attend the meeting of Synod, shows that his faith had been firmly fixed for many years on the Rock of Ages:

“I have a strong impression that my days are almost at an end; pray for me, that I may be enabled to go through the valley and shadow of death, and be kept from evil. Since the worthy Mr. Marshall dispensed our Lord’s Supper in New-York, in 1802, I have not been in doubts about an interest in Christ Jesus, which has been a great support to me; but I have often fallen into improper exercises; I could not believe a saint would forget himself so much, if I had not had the experience of it.”

Although his faith continued thus firm to the end, yet he often complained that his exercises were not of that heavenly nature that he could wish them to be, and thought there was a deadness on the church and people of God, and that there were not such outpourings and enjoyments of the Spirit given to christians now in their dying moments, as in the days of Halyburton and others. When reminded that he should not expect to meet with any thing perfect here—that the perfect enjoyment of God was reserved for a heavenly state—he said, ‘Perhaps I expect too much—If we had the joys of heaven here, we would not wish to go away.’ He improved the last moments of his life in giving advice to his family, warning them not to participate in the follies and fashions of the world, exhorting his little daughter, the only one of his children capable of understanding his exhortations, not to set her heart on dress, or waste her precious time in gay and thoughtless company, and in parties of pleasure—and to seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness. He also fully exhorted them to adhere steadfastly to the profession they had made, and under no circumstances or pretences to suffer themselves to be seduced from it; expressing a confident hope that he would meet with them at the right hand of their final Judge.

Respecting his liberality to the church, as Mr. Bachop was always careful not to let his left hand know what his right did in these matters,

the extent of his liberality cannot now be known. This much, however, is known to the writer, that for several years past he has carried to Synod at least \$100 yearly, and sometimes more, from Mr. Bachop, for the public concerns of the church; he is aware also, that Mr. Bachop gave very liberally besides, to help poor congregations and poor ministers.

He left a family, consisting of his wife, a sister-in-law, and three children.

J. P. M.

ARGYLE, *March 1st, 1839.*

---

ART. III. *Inceptum occultare proditores.*—No. 3.

MR. EDITOR,

I will only trouble you further with a brief review of "Article III." in the December No. of the *Associate Presbyterian Magazine*, entitled "The Rejected Resolutions."

And in approaching this article, let it be premised that it has such a dissimilitude of qualities, and displays so much more *keenness* than *argument*; *prejudice* than *principle*; *zeal* than *knowledge*; *error* than *truth*; that it will be necessary to quote from it largely, in order to treat it with any good degree of intelligence and justice.

He says these resolutions were presented "for terminating the ministerial strife which has, for a considerable time, distracted the Cambridge and Albany Presbyteries, and is now carried out into Synod. This strife and animosity can not be concealed from the church and the world. It has sought publicity from the beginning and obtained it"—"The resolutions"—"are the remedies, and the only proper remedies for these evils; but there was no place found for them in the minutes, as there was no place found for them in the minds of the majority; and they must have been doomed to oblivion, had they not been forced before the public on individual responsibility." On this extract we offer the following remarks:

1. He styles the matters of difference between the Synod and her delinquent members "ministerial strife." It is of very little consequence whether it is ministerial or *unministerial* strife, so long as it is strife, it must be removed from the church of God. But this nameless writer, whom for brevity's sake we shall call D. B., tells us that the *resolutions are the only proper remedies* for these evils. But we have already seen that certain of the ministers engaged in this "*ministerial strife*," are charged with exceedingly gross immoralities; and not only charged, but actually proved guilty; and these resolutions proposed to restore these ministers to good standing, without any satisfaction for these immoralities, and without even an acknowledgment of the injury they had done. But, says the Spirit of God—"He that covereth his sins shall not prosper: but whose *confesseth* and *forsaketh* them, shall have mercy." Again: the constitution of the church prescribes the appropriate remedy for the removal of strife, and it is not surely strange that the Synod preferred abiding by their own constitution to any new-fangled scheme of D. B.

Again: the cause of this strife is a want of truth and righteousness in those who are sinfully engaged in it; and there must be a return to truth and righteousness, or a total separation of the parties. I have often admired that part of the prayer of a respected brother for the removal of these evils, which supplicated for a removal of the *causes of division*. We wish no daubing with untempered mortar; and we will submit to no such daubing.

2. "There was no place found for them in the minutes." They were never entitled to a place in the minutes; had they been entitled to any such dignity, they would undoubtedly have found a place; for the predilections of the clerk for the accused brethren are not concealed. The following, I believe, is the true history of these resolutions; and I am confirmed in my recollections by the statements of another. After having debated the question at issue between the two parties in the Presbytery of Albany, from Thursday afternoon till Saturday, and after the previous question had been carried, and the Synod were ready to vote on the resolutions, which were ultimately adopted, Mr. Rodgers moved the resolutions; (having been out of the house when the previous question was carried;) he was told they were now out of order. He expressed regret for this, and obtained the privilege of reading them; and it was understood that these resolutions would come before Synod in case of the rejection of the resolutions then to be voted on. Thus, adds a somewhat facetious friend—"It would have been equally, if not more proper, to have published Mr. ——'s speech as a part of our minutes. He made his speech in order, though in the midst of some disorder. These resolutions were read as a part of a speech made out of order."

3. "It [this strife] has sought publicity and obtained it." Through whose instrumentality? That of the Synod? or that of the author of anonymous pamphlets and his co-workers? If a man commit offences against the community, and the authorized tribunals call him to account, the publicity of his shame is not usually ascribed to these tribunals as a fault, especially if the culprit publish his own shame after conviction, with the design of implicating the court.

But we must proceed to another extract:—

"The member from Albany (Mr. M.) arose and called them a libel, and expressed his astonishment that they should come from such a quarter. The previous question was then called and carried, which silenced all the rest of the members from being heard on the merits of these important resolutions, which, in all probability would have been carried, had they been duly considered." On this extract we remark,

1. That whether the member from Albany made the remark here ascribed to him or not, is not recollected; but the resolutions certainly did imply a libel. They assumed that every individual in any way concerned in this "strife" was equally guilty; and that the Synod in its great eagerness to do away *strife* was willing to cover up *iniquity*. Now will any man in his senses believe that any dozen or more men can be found at variance on any question, and all equally guilty? Do our church courts try their members in a lump, or by wholesale? Does any court on earth pronounce the accused innocent without trial? Does our law *judge* any man before it hear him? and these resolutions pronounced judgment without a hearing. They are too trifling for men. How much more, then, ought they to tinge with shame the cheek of an avowed Presbyterian?

2. "*The previous question was then called and carried.*" The previous question was NOT then called and carried. It had been previously carried! It appears almost useless to contend with men that pay no more regard to truth. This little anachronism changes the face of the whole transaction; but it was necessary, in order to create the false impression that the resolutions had been improperly excluded from the minutes. This is a *trick*, running through all the productions of all the contributors of this Magazine. It is a *wily trick*, and gives them a *nauseous savor* in the nostrils of all honorable men. And they are heartily welcome to all the glory and all the converts they make in the use of such means. But to what will not men descend, when once fairly on the downward road?

3. There is here an attempt to create the impression that the previous question was moved in an arbitrary manner. This is not so. The advocates of these delinquent brethren had occupied most of the time in desultory speeches, till the debate had run into the fourth day of the session; nearly one-half of Synod's whole time consumed and nothing done. But it may not be improper to remind D. B. of the scenes of 1837, when through the misrepresentations of Dr. P. B., his friends obtained a temporary majority. Then, when any measure was proposed, Drs. Bruce, Bullions, and one or two more of the same side, made speeches, and moved the previous question. On one occasion, in order to get an opportunity of speaking, a brother had to introduce a motion, and another having seconded it, he got the *privilege, usually allowed as a right*, to speak, not however without interruption and complaints. When done, Dr. Bruce arose, and said he had spoken twenty minutes! But some of the speech-makers, whose mouths were stopped by the previous question in 1838, had spoken three hours! Could any thing else be done? The members of Synod must return home and leave the church in a state of perfect anarchy, or stop the mouths of endless talkers by a resort to the previous question.

But D. B. still thinks the resolutions ought to have passed, because,

"1. It was good Presbyterial order to abandon all ecclesiastical proceedings against Mr. Stark, and declare him to be in good standing in our society."

We have already seen that the charges brought against Mr. Stark were numerous and of a highly aggravated character, and need not be here repeated—that he *refused* to be tried either by his Presbytery or the Synod, having declined the authority of the former, and *virtually* that of the latter; and D. B. himself disavows the design of justifying Mr. Stark; his words are—"These remarks we have been led into, NOT with the design of justifying Mr. Stark," and yet in the face of all this, it was good *Presbyterial* order, to declare Mr. Stark, without trial, to be in good standing! And not only so, but to prohibit the Presbytery from calling him to account! to command the Presbytery to receive into their bosom, without the least degree of censure, a man who had denounced them to the world as destitute of common honesty and even common decency! Need any thing surprise us after this? From my heart I pity the man that penned this article; and if he be a minister of the gospel, as I suppose he is, he ought to be suspended for *moral stultification*.\* But this is not all. While Mr. Stark must be *justified*

\* The reader will pardon us for coining a new word.

without trial, Mr. Webster must be condemned in the same manner! Yea, hung without the benefit of judge or jury! Hear his own words; for his sense of justice is so monstrous, that I am afraid the reader will be slow to believe his own eyes--"Mr. Webster calls Messrs. Miller and Anderson, of the Cambridge Presbytery, to Albany, to give testimony that will tend to justify the account he had given in his book respecting Mr. Stalker. Now it is no matter whether their testimony answered Mr. Webster's ends; we are not on the merits of their testimony, but the disorder of it. Good order required that they should not have been there on such an errand. They ought not to have been summoned by the Presbytery: Mr. W. should have had no such privilege granted him in behalf of his book. Presbytery should have summoned himself only, and censured him for his publication." Here we have the secret of all the hard things which have been said against our church courts. And here, also, we have a developement of the kind of justice which has been meted out to Mr. W. by these men. Mr. W. must not have the poor privilege of a trial! He must be "*Lynched.*" And when tried, he must not be allowed to bring exculpatory testimony! And after he was tried by the constituted authority of the church, in such a way, too, that even his enemies did not see it proper to offer any protest, this shall not be received as the least satisfaction! The law was not made for us; but was put into our hands to crush others who might have the temerity to cross our path! Would not any church court capable of pursuing the line of conduct here recommended, render itself an execration, a loathing, an abhorrence to all men? Slanderous, as they affect to regard Mr. W.'s "book," they *well knew* that it contained truth enough, which *could be*, and finally *was* proved, to cover them with confusion. Hence, their efforts to deprive Mr. W. of a fair trial. And hence, also, their refusal to be tried themselves. Mr. W. *demand*ed a trial; they evaded a trial. And it is not the *innocent* but the *guilty* that tremble at the approaching investigation. The inference is plain.

But, says D. B., "it was good Presbyterial order to abandon all ecclesiastical proceedings against Mr. Stark, and declare him to be in good standing in our society."

The *first* argument adduced in support of this strange position, can only be accounted for on the supposition that D. B., although present, really did not understand the business in hand; for we are unwilling to believe him deliberately guilty of such a gross departure from truth as is contained in this reason. But lest it should be thought that we do him injustice, it shall be given in his own words. "Drs. A. and P. Bullions were the only witnesses mentioned in the libel." "Dr. P. Bullions was suspended." "Dr. A. Bullions was deposed." "These were the only witnesses, and we ask men of order, would it be orderly to try a cause where the prosecutors had, immediately before the trial, disgraced their own witnesses?" (Mag. pp. 150, 151.) The libel here spoken of, was put into the hands of Mr. Stark by the Presbytery of Albany, in 1836, upon which he declined their authority, and was tried and suspended on it by the Synod, in May of the same year; and that libel was *not* before the Synod of 1838! In 1838, Mr. Stark and others were suspended for holding or declaring the decision of Synod respecting the Presbytery of Albany "*null and void, and of no force or effect whatever!*" Now we respectfully request any man in his senses, to tell us what the suspension of two witnesses, whose names had been appended to a libel

not before Synod, had to do with the suspension of men for resisting the acts of Synod on a totally different question?

His *second* argument is like the first, an untruth, viz: "Mr. Stark said, the Presbytery of Albany, together with some ministers in the Presbytery of Cambridge, are the true authors, [of Mr. W.'s pamphlet] and that he was able to prove it by his own words, given in writing." As Mr. W. has called upon them for this writing, we may safely deny it till the writing is produced. But even if true, it has no connection with the question on which Mr. Stark was suspended in 1838.

His *third* argument, that Presbytery *refused Mr. Stark the means of making his defence*, is in all respects like the second, as has been fully shown in the Religious Monitor for February, to which the reader is referred.

Argument *fourth*. "This business of ministers libelling one another is certainly very unfavorable to religion." Not always; but sometimes not only highly favorable, but absolutely necessary, "For it must needs be that offences come." And when these offences come, they must be removed, or our religious profession becomes a mockery, offensive to God and loathsome to men. At least, so say *all* the Protestant Churches. But this argument betrays the secret of this whole controversy. Two parties have arisen in the Associate Church: the one resolutely bent on the destruction of her discipline; the other equally resolute in maintaining that discipline. And although some may be dubious as to which side victory will ultimately incline, yet *all* who suppose that these parties can be united in the same communion, do but dream. Their mutual repulsion is insurmountable. But the wo is denounced upon such as cause these offences, not such as are faithfully applying the divine law for their removal.

Argument *fifth*. "If there were any doctrinal errors taught by any of the ministers now under censure, or if their lives and conversation were blamed by their people, the resolutions for peace without further ecclesiastical investigation, would not have been offered." This reason virtually asserts, that the ministers under censure are not chargeable with error, and that their moral conduct is not blamed by the people. On these two positions, the following remarks are believed to be applicable.

1. The errors of these brethren respect discipline, without which it has ever been contended by Seceders, and others, that doctrinal purity cannot be long maintained. They have acted on the following principles of discipline:

1. That a minister may decline the authority of a Presbytery without an appeal to a higher court, and still maintain his standing.

2. That the withdrawal of a protest and appeal nullifies the deed against which such appeal had been taken!

3. That a minister has the right to declare in writing, under his own proper signature, that he will treat as "*null and void* WHATEVER *decisions*" his Presbytery may make, and yet claim a seat in Presbytery, without a withdrawal of such declinature!\*

4. That a *Presbytery may remove* a sentence of deposition which had

---

\* The 2d and 3d principles constitute the basis of their self-constituted and unauthorized Presbytery. The Synod's refusal to recognize these principles was the ALLGED *cause* of their declinature.

been inflicted by a co-ordinate Presbytery in the same body, and confirmed by the supreme court of the church.\*

5. That a minister charged with immorality shall be acquitted without a trial!

6. That a *lay member* charged with immorality shall not be permitted to offer exculpatory testimony!

7. That an *offence* legally removed by submission to the requirements of a church court shall not be forgiven; or in other words, that scandals judicially removed may be revived to any extent, unlimited by time!

8. That ecclesiastical courts may be passed by, and a resort had to civil tribunals *in the first instance*, to settle matters of difference between brethren in the same communion, affecting only character and standing in the church!

9. That persons are to be held guilty of *slander* for testimony given in court under oath!

Now it is cheerfully admitted that D. B. and his coadjutors have a perfect right, so far as human authority is concerned, to hold and act on these or any other absurdities they deem proper; but that they have the right to impose these principles upon me, or to abuse the Associate Synod for excluding them from her communion is utterly denied. Indeed, this whole paper of D. B.'s brings to recollection a remark I heard more than two years since, that while the General Assembly was struggling to clear her skirts of *heresy*, the Associate Church was equally convulsed by her efforts to purge her communion of *immorality*.

2. *Their moral conduct is not blamed by their people.*—This is true only in part; for a large number of the people of Cambridge have withdrawn from their ministrations. But this argument is unsatisfactory. For it is well known that people are often misled by the *ex-parte* statements of ministers. It is also well known, that Mr. Stark's people resolved, in a congregational meeting, to sustain him, before any step had been taken for investigation; and it can be no breach of charity to say that they must have overlooked or disregarded the declaration of Solomon. (Prov. xviii. 13.) Further, it is known that the people in the church of Rome yield a subjection to her priesthood, as debasing as it is demoralizing to the souls of men. This argument, drawn from the people, may be conclusive to the mind of D. B.; with us it has no weight; especially when we reflect that premature and crafty appeals were made both to their passions and prejudices.

Argument *sixth*. "The present troubles in the Presbytery of Cambridge and Albany are to be traced back no farther than to the date of the slanderous pamphlet published in the name of Mr. Webster. "Here lies the beginning of the whole troubles." "Mr. W. calls Messrs. M. and A. of the Presbytery of Cambridge, to give testimony that will tend to justify the account he had given in his book respecting Mr. Stalker." "Mr. W. should have had no such privilege." "Presbytery should have summoned himself only, and censured him for his publication." "Had this been done, Dr. A. Bullions' case would have had no existence, for his case and Mr. Stalker's are intimately connected, the one alternately arising out of the other; he is deposed for words spo-

\* See Associate Presbyterian Magazine for August, p. 64.

ken in debate, in the case of Mr. Stalker, (I beg the attention of the reader.) Had Mr. S. not been tried, Dr. B. could have used no words on the trial; and if Messrs. M. and A. had not been called \* \* to give testimony \* \* Mr. S. could never have thought of libelling them for their testimony. Mr. S. could not then possibly have been libelled for *faulting the testimony of these brethren*; and Dr. B.'s case, "which grew out of Mr. Stalker's, could have had no existence."

Here we have a train of reasoning which defies all the known principles of logic and metaphysics, and it would be truly amusing did it not involve weighty matters. And if D. B. has cleared the suspended brethren of "doctrinal errors," it is feared he will find some difficulty in extricating himself. Adam referred his sin, which "brought death into the world with all our wo," to the woman which his Maker had given him. And the woman, in her turn, referred her sin to Satan. David, had he possessed a knowledge of D. B.'s logic, might have referred his sin to Bathsheba's bathing, and Peter, his, to the damsel that accused him of being "with Jesus of Galilee." It is charging sin upon the providence of God, and if carried to its legitimate result, would make God the author of sin. If any people have been long accustomed to such instructions, it is not surprising if they should see no cause to blame the lives and conversation of such as are highly blame-worthy. Yet it is a little surprising that D. B. did not carry back his concatenation a little farther; at least to the anonymous pamphlets, and the attack of Mr. Stark on Mr. W. in the Christian Magazine, which were the immediate cause of Mr. W.'s publication, which would have made his *magic chain* more complete. I suppose this would not have answered his purpose quite so well. But this extract must be examined a little more in detail.

1. *Mr. Webster's slanderous pamphlet was the beginning of the whole troubles.* On this statement we remark—

1. That Mr. W.'s wonderful pamphlet was not *wholly slanderous*. He was led into *some* mistakes by misinformation derived from another. The offer to correct these was not accepted as satisfactory. The whole power, both of civil and ecclesiastical law, was then brought to bear on Mr. W. without resistance from him; neither was this accepted as satisfactory! But whoever has read that production, which acts so much like a galvanic battery upon the nerves of certain persons, will at once perceive that its main design was to show that the persons of whom he speaks were using improper means to overthrow the Discipline of the Associate Church. (See pages 18-24, inclusive.) If it was not then true, subsequent events have more than confirmed the views there given of the opposition to discipline with which the Associate Church has had to contend, and is still contending.

2. *Mr. W.'s pamphlet was the beginning of the whole troubles.* Page 158, only three pages ahead of this statement of D. B., the editor says—"It is indeed known, too well, in this section of the country at least, that Scotchmen were at the *very beginning*, and were in great part the *cause* of these troubles." This is true; and we leave D. B. to reconcile his statement with this of the editor. And as Dr. P. Bullions has exonerated Mr. W. from this charge, it is hoped the lash which has been so lavishly applied to his back, may find a brief season of quiet. The testimony of an enemy ought to be taken. For when the testimony of an *accuser* acquits the *accused*, it is the most satisfactory and triumphant refutation of the charge that can even be imagined.

II. *Had Messrs. Miller and Anderson not been called to give testimony, &c.* It appears that D. B. here proceeds on the assumption that men are not to give testimony when lawfully called upon to do so, lest some party concerned should take offence! "Yet it is a sin to refuse an oath touching any thing that is good and just, being imposed by lawful authority." (Con. Faith, chap. xxii. § 3. Heb. vi. 16.)

III. *Dr. A. Bullions was "deposed for words spoken in debate in the case of Mr. Stalker."* Dr. B. was suspended, not deposed, for words spoken *on the trial*, not *in the case* of Mr. Stalker; not in defence of Mr. S., but against some members of the court not on trial. And was finally deposed for having made himself responsible for an anonymous and highly slanderous letter, with a forged post-mark, in an unknown hand writing; a foot note in the Dr.'s hand, together with the address or direction to the Dr. also in his hand-writing!\* Has D. B. forgotten that this letter was laid on the table of Synod by the Presbytery of Cambridge, for the inspection of members? It can not be possible. How little, then, of truth is to be found in his statements?

Argument *seventh*. "Good order would have decided that members of the Presbytery, not of the aggrieved party, should have been his judges. Civilized nations are universally opposed to such barbarous customs, as making the aggrieved party the judges." This, like other arguments of D. B., is predicated on a false basis. The case was not one man against another, but one man against a Presbytery. Therefore, if this assumption prove any thing, it proves too much; for it supposes the community incompetent to try offences against itself, and all that is necessary for any violent man to carry his schemes, is to slander a whole Presbytery, or a whole Synod, and then deny their right to try him, because they are the aggrieved party! This assumption fairly denies the right of self-preservation, which is universally conceded by "barbarous" and "civilized" nations, to every organized and lawful community on earth, whether civil or ecclesiastic. The unfortunate but deluded Americans, recently executed at Prescott, by her Majesty's government, learned at the expense of life, that one civilized nation was not opposed to making the aggrieved party the judges; aye, and the executioners too. And yet this absurdity has been rung in all its changes against our church courts for seven years, through all Mr. Stark's pamphlets, which amount to five or six in number, and through almost every number of this Magazine! For let it be remembered, that it is against the Synod, *as such*, and against Presbytery, *as such*, that their artillery is levelled, and individuals are now and then named in subordination to this uniform design, viz: *to destroy our church courts!* The courts are first assailed under the cover of secrecy. This not proving successful, open and ruffian-like assaults become the next resort; then follows a denial of their jurisdiction, because they are the aggrieved party; and the whole series winds up with the cry of PERSECUTION! And in like manner the church of Rome, though drunken with the blood of the saints, has always cried PERSECUTION!

Argument *eighth*, is an expression of surprise that the Synod rejected the *sixth* resolution, which provided that the bond of the covenant should be "read, and the obligations recognized by the members," &c. Without repeating any thing said in a preceding paper on this point, or

\* See Narrative of this case published by the Presbytery of Cambridge.

noticing the irregular manner of covenanting here proposed, which is by mere assent, without the solemnity of an oath; yet it may serve to show the real design of this proposition, if we refer to an event not very remote in the history of the Secession Church in the United States. In 1820, the Synod met at Pittsburgh, and engaged in the solemn work of renewing the covenants. As all the members were not in attendance, it was agreed to continue the work at the next meeting in Philadelphia, 1830. Those ministers who had not been present the preceding year, at this time swore to and subscribed the bond, as their brethren had done on the former occasion. However, Mr. Stark, Dr. A. Bullions, and some others, were *greatly in the dark* as to the path of duty on this occasion. Dr. P. Bullions, however, was not present, his Grammar school at Albany having detained him from the meetings of Synod for *ten or twelve* years in succession, till a favorite measure was, if possible, to be carried in 1838. And the Rev. David Blair, who, according to the minutes, was present on both occasions, neither swore nor subscribed the bond of the covenant,\* nor gave in his adherence to any former covenant engagement; which would imply that he never has covenanted, though *two opportunities at least* have been afforded him. How his case was disposed of, the minutes inform us not. A committee was appointed, consisting of Dr. Ramsey, Messrs. Carson and Miller, to converse with some members who had expressed doubts "respecting the call of duty in their own case," which led to the following *resolution*, viz: "That while those who formerly engaged in public covenanting, have liberty to unite with other members of Synod in that duty, others who do not feel at liberty to do so, shall be called on to signify their adherence to their former covenant engagements, and their approbation of the present deed of Synod." "From this decision, Messrs. Gordon, McNaughton, Adams, Carson and Webster, requested their dissent to be marked." (Rel. Mon. vol. 7, pp. 9, 11.) Drs. A. Bullions, Bruce, and Mr. Stark, adhered to their former deed.

The former covenanting here spoken of referred to Britain, and to the Secession in that country. But as a covenant of duty in America must, in the nature of things, vary from a covenant of duty in Britain, being pointed against evils that have no existence beyond seas, or if they have, it is under a different modification, it was thought, I suppose, by these dissentient brethren and some others, that all our ministers should enter into a covenant suited to our circumstances, and solemnly engage to support the doctrines and discipline of the *Associate Synod of North America*. It is probable they were right. For, as matters now stand, neither Drs. A. nor P. Bullions, nor Messrs. Stark and Blair, ever covenanted to support the American Synod. Had they and others been required to do this, is it not reasonable to suppose that we should now hear less about holding our principles in subserviency to foreign churches? With these facts before the reader, we are willing to let this *doleful lamentation* over the Synod, for refusing to neglect important business and enter into covenanting in a disorderly manner, pass for all that it is worth! Yet it must be confessed that it is trying, to any body of men who have actually covenanted, to maintain *present* truth and *present* duty in *present* circumstances, and who are suffering all manner of reproach for a faithful discharge of their covenant obligations, to be thus accused by men, some of whom never covenanted, to maintain our present profession, and others not at all!

\* This is a mistake. Mr. Blair did swear and subscribe the bond.—*Ed. Rel. Mon.*

But D. B. concludes the whole by expressing the hope that these resolutions will yet be adopted by the Synod. And we as sincerely hope and pray, that God in mercy will prevent the Synod from adopting any such debasing and destructive measure; a measure at war with every valuable principle of her profession; a measure confounding to the most obvious moral distinctions; and which could not fail to prove the signal for a general dismemberment of the Associate Synod of North America.

SIMPLEX.

---

ART. IV. *Another Letter from Mr. Webster in relation to the Forgeries and Other Matters.*

DEAR SIR—As I had anticipated, my call upon the Rev. Andrew Stark, and the Rev. P. Bullions, D. D., for the manuscripts of the *forgeries* which they have published in my name, has been met with “shuffling and quibbling” and evasion, which renders it necessary for me to trouble you with a few words in reply. So far as they have attempted the semblance of argument, I will try to answer them in a becoming manner; but their idle gossip and slanderous tales, foreign to the point, bear such a striking resemblance to the story of that strange gentleman who wrote the K. paper, that I shall disregard them. I intend not to be inveigled nor driven from the question.

In relation to forgery No. 1, the Dr. says—“We never pretended that we had the words in his hand-writing, or that he either affixed or authorized his name to be affixed to them.” Ah! Dr. and is it so? Do you indeed make this acknowledgment? What! publish a statement to the world with my name signed to it, and then tell us that you never pretended that I either wrote or signed such statement! After this confession, the Dr.’s rebuke of my *effrontery* for solemnly denying such forgeries, comes with a peculiar grace.

In relation to No. 2, he says—“That Mr. Stark did not say that he *then* had the manuscript in Mr. Webster’s hand-writing; he gave it as an ‘exact copy’ of a paper which was believed to be his hand-writing,” &c. In reply to this, it is sufficient to say that they have not now, and never had, an “exact copy” of their published forgery in my hand-writing! For the truth on this point, I refer the reader to my letter of January 31st, published in the Monitor for March. It is, however, necessary to notice a sentence quoted, or rather *misquoted*, from your Review of their Magazine. Contrary to the drift of your remarks, and to the other part of your sentence, which they are careful not to quote, you are made to say, “the truth however, is, that Mr. Webster never denied, nor affected to deny, nor wished to deny or even conceal, that the paper in question contained a full retraction.” (Mag. p. 244.) You doubtless here refer to the paper as altered with a pencil by Mr. Stark and the committee of Presbytery, to which alteration I *never* acceded. I had used the word *some*, as the witnesses truly swear; and had Mr. Stark accepted it in that shape, it would of course have ended the matter. He would then have been at liberty either to accept or return the paper. But the case was altered when he requested the paper for con-

sideration over night, as I supposed, to take into consideration the propriety of receiving it as *I had written it*. For neither he nor I assented to the amendments that night. He assented in the morning. I never did. But the result has demonstrated that I had good cause for the reluctance with which I entrusted a paper in negotiation in the hands of such a man over night. And it had been well had I disregarded his solemn pledge and the importunity of one of the committee. But Mr. Stark calls the testimony of Messrs. Smart and Campbell a *negative* testimony! Solemn oaths, it seems, are not good testimony with Mr. S.

One word more, and I have done with this subject. It appears from the numerous articles in the Magazine, that I yielded every thing that any man possibly could do to prevent the evil that I foresaw, and every reflecting man must have foreseen, would result to the cause of public morals, from a civil suit respecting such matters. But nothing would satisfy him. Even now, according to his own showing, he stands before the public as having *first* pledged himself to receive a retraction; *secondly*, as prosecuting because I refused to retract; and *thirdly*, contending that I actually did retract! Modest claims truly! But if I had gone into court and admitted the truth of his pretended retraction, the gentleman would have been compelled to pay his own costs, according to his previous pledge.

But Mr. Stark thinks I have convicted you of what, in his usually modest and christian style, he calls a *most malicious falsehood*. You say in your Review, that "through want of pecuniary ability I failed to defend myself in the civil suit." I said in my letter of January 31st, that had I admitted his pretended retraction, "I might have saved \$700 or \$800 in money." Now both these statements are literally true, whatever may become of Mr. Stark's "most malicious falsehood." At the time the suit was tried, I made several unsuccessful efforts to raise a sufficient sum to make the defence. The only pecuniary means then in my power, consisted of an unavailable bond and stock in the Fireman's Insurance Company, to the amount of \$500. Owing to the commercial pressure that then existed, this stock had fallen below par, and I could neither sell the stock nor borrow money upon it. And this stock passed into the hands of Mr. Stark, through the agency of Messrs. Hoffman & White; the following is a copy of the receipt received from Mr. Stark's lawyer:

"*Supreme Court—Andrew Stark vs. Chauncey Webster.*—Received from Messrs. Hoffman & White, 50 shares of Fireman's Insurance Stock, at 3 per cent. below par, amounting to the sum of \$494 70," &c. "which is to be applied to the payment of the judgment in this case.

"P. CAGGER,  
"Plff's Att'y.

"Albany, Oct. 29, 1836."

The balance was borrowed from Messrs. Hoffman & White. Thus you see that your statement and mine correspond. Mr. Stark tries to represent me as complaining of his suit. But he tries in vain. He received his "pound of flesh." If he is satisfied, I am. But it appears to sit heavy on his conscience; it appears to be gall and wormwood to his stomach, and rottenness to his bones; or surely after three years he would let the matter rest. But the public can not fail soon to perceive the character of the men I have been compelled to contend

with. They talk of the loftiness of my bearing, because I have resisted their lies, and because I still presume to live and move in this breathing world. Had I opened the pages of the Monitor to Mr. Stark's filthy productions—had I connived at their *treachery* and secret working against their own communion, my bearing would probably not have been so lofty. Their face has never been set against the workers of iniquity; but they have hunted with a steady and tiger-like aim all who have dared to speak against the things done of them in secret. And having, finally, to cap the climax of their guilt, published forgeries in my name, it is not wonderful that they regard my call for the manuscript a piece of unpardonable impudence.

In relation to *forgery* No. 3, the Dr. calls it "a garbled quotation from p. 151 of the Magazine." But it still stands on page 151 of the Magazine precisely as I quoted it; only I took the liberty to place it in capital letters, that its enormity might be the better seen. He, however, admits that the pamphlet was my "own *composition*, from materials furnished by others." He still persists in his slanders, though pinned to the wall. I will try to be a little more explicit. Let my disclaimer be worded thus—"No living man, minister or elder, either of the Presbytery of Albany or Cambridge, or of any other Presbytery, either dictated, contributed, or wrote, or *furnished materials* for a single line of my pamphlet, except the exception made in the advertisement. Is this explicit enough for the Dr.? If not, let him name the man that furnished materials, if he dare do so. But he dare not. They are very careful to avoid the use of individual names in their wholesale slanders; they dare not do this. It is always the *Presbytery*, or some such general terms. They have evidently become desperate, and are now writing for *ignorance* and *credulity*, as their last resort.

In regard to the *nameless* insinuation of Mr. Stark (p. 237) respecting the private interview with me, I have only to say, that he is in a fair way to render the step spoken of as *possible*, in my letter of Jan. 31st, absolutely necessary. And if it shall be found at the ensuing meeting of Synod, that their slanders have not ceased to operate upon intelligent minds, I will (providence permitting) submit these forgeries and atrocious insinuations to a jury.

Mr. Stark says, he has "heard it asked, whether the Presbytery would have licensed me to preach the gospel, if I had not torn up the paper,"\* meaning the paper of retraction. It is not for me to say what the Presbytery would or would not have done. But I suppose no Presbytery would license any man to preach the gospel who had deliberately and knowingly put his hand to a falsehood; until they had good evidence of repentance. And such would have been the case, had I given a *full* retraction. Indeed, the most important charge, as I think, which was brought against him in my pamphlet, was the authorship of his pamphlets, which *he has never yet denied!*

But Mr. Stark says, that the \$700 or \$800 which I expended about his law suit "might not be a dead loss." The term *dead* can here be used in no other than the sense of *total*; by which he evidently intends to insinuate, what he dare not assert, that others contributed a part of the money. An insinuation perfectly in keeping with many others, by which he makes out a case of wickedness against innocent men. But

---

\* The paper torn up was not *then* as I had written it.

it is sufficient for me simply to declare, that every farthing of the money in question was paid out of the product of my own labor, and I defy Andrew Stark, or any other man, to disprove this statement. But like other things equally destitute of truth, it must be used to make out his case. His statements and insinuations have become so reckless, so evidently intended to deceive the simple, that it would be folly even to contradict, or any further to notice, in any manner, any thing he may choose to say, unless it should be in the way above intimated.

But in the meantime, Mr. Editor, I will not trouble you with these matters. Your pages ought to be filled with other things more important to the welfare of mankind. And as they have virtually admitted their forgeries, nothing further need be said respecting them. Before closing, however, I may notice the Dr.'s insinuation that I compared myself to the apostle Paul. He does not indeed assert it, this would have been too barefaced even for him. He only *insinuates* after his usual manner. And the only foundation he had for his insinuation, was a reference by me to 2 Cor. xii. 11, without even quoting the passage! Are we not to be permitted even to make a reference to the scriptures, without being accused of making ourselves equal to the inspired writers? In some circles in the fashionable world it is impolite to quote the Book of God, in a serious manner. And infidels have called the practice *cant*. But so far as my reading extends, the Dr. has acquired the sole honor of making it *impious*. I say *impious*; for if to quote from Paul is equivalent to a claim of equality with Paul, then by parity of reasoning, the same thing must be true of quotations from the words of the Saviour. Does the Dr. intend this as an evidence of my lofty bearing? It was in bad taste for the Dr. to refer to the Presbytery of Cambridge to convict me of irreverent language. He has told us frequently that church courts are fallible—that the Presbytery of Cambridge are persecutors, and that some of its members are chargeable with *nefarious wickedness*. Bad authority.

But the Dr. tells us, page 246, that "Mr. Stark is able to prove in the clearest and most satisfactory manner, that Mr. Webster declared in Presbytery, on the morning of the 10th of September, 1835, that he gave that retraction to Mr. Stark on the evening before; *that he had in the night sought counsel and changed his mind.*" Had he left out the words placed in italics, and inserted *as he had written it*, this statement would then be correct. But it appears that these men can now prove any thing in this superlatively clear manner. It is a pity they had not done this when they had the opportunity. It is also wonderful that they declined the authority of the church courts, rather than stand a trial, when they could prove so much. It is not usual for men to act thus, when they are armed, not only with a righteous cause, but also with proof of superlative quantity and clearness. But I suppose Mr. Stark will answer, that "it is impossible to account for the taste of some persons."

However, it is impossible to tell what they can bring men blinded by prejudice and rage to swear. If men can secretly stab in the dark those whom they openly profess to honor—If they can contribute their money to publish anonymous slanderous pamphlets—If they can circulate anonymous letters with forged post-marks—If they can stab horses to the heart in the field, under cover of the night, through malice towards their owner—If they can deny the testimony of unimpeachable

witnesses under oath, yea, their own oath—If they can *import* a strange gentleman from beyond the Atlantic to serve a purpose, and then *export* him back in the twinkling of an eye, we can not tell what they may not do. If they can do these things, they will not stick at perjury; nay, they will seek the precious life, if it can be done with impunity. And all these things have been done, by whom we add not.

Yours truly,

C. WEBSTER.

Philadelphia, March 25, 1839.

ART. V. *A new series of Falsehoods detected and exposed.*

The more the conductors of the A. P. Magazine are checked in their career of iniquity, the more reckless and desperate they become. The number for March even surpasses its predecessors, in destitution of moral principle. It is indeed a *non-such* for profligacy and insolence. In that No. the editor, with increased virulence, spits his venom at the Associate Synod. And if it be asked, Why all this disgusting display of hate and spite against that judicatory? The answer is at hand, Because it has cast him and his associates out of its communion. Hence, the culprit, instead of confessing his crimes, abuses the court that convicted him, and would have it believed, that it is not himself, but the court, that has violated the laws of God and man!

The Synod of 1836 receives a new attack and is treated with unmeasured rancor and abuse, because it did not sustain a certain appeal, taken by Mr. Stark, from a decision of the Presbytery of Albany. As the Magazine, in remarking on this case, presents to its readers a somewhat new series of falsehoods, the old ones having become stale by repetition, it may be proper to take a brief notice of the matter.

At a meeting of Presbytery, September 10th, 1835, Messrs. Bullions and Stark carried a motion to have Mr. Webster libelled for certain statements contained in his pamphlet. Mr. B. drew up the libel; and the Presbytery again met, October 28th, to try Mr. W. on said libel. In the mean time Messrs. Bullions and Stark, in one sense "the libelling party," took the alarm, as they saw they had put it in Mr. Webster's power to claim the privilege of exculpating himself by proof, which exculpatory proof they feared would work the ruin of their character. Accordingly, they resolved to change their mode of warfare, viz: to have the libel set aside and Mr. W. deprived of the privilege of giving the truth in evidence for self-exculpation, but on the contrary, censured without any trial at all, on a mere *assumpsit* of guilt—on a taking of it *for granted* that he was guilty. Hence, even *before* the relevancy of the libel was tried, Mr. Stark presented the following resolution: "*Resolved*, that it is contrary to the discipline of the Associate Church to allow a person to prove what he had already declared to be unfounded." The editor of the Magazine, is, indeed, made to say that this resolution was submitted to the Presbytery *after* the relevancy of the libel had been found; and on this anachronism many false conclusions are built. Besides, this resolution appears in the

Magazine with an *interpolation*. The words "to attempt" are foisted in before the words "to prove." But such interpolations are common with the conductors of the Magazine. Mr. Stark knew that Mr. Webster could prove many of his statements, and he unwittingly admitted this in his resolution; but he has always since taken care to publish the resolution with the interpolation just noticed.

The object of Mr. S. in presenting the above resolution, was obvious to all present; it was to have the libel quashed, the truth concealed and Mr. Webster punished without a trial. Accordingly, after a long discussion, the resolution was rejected. And against this decision of Presbytery Mr. Stark protested and appealed to Synod. The Magazine admits, that Mr. Stark's object in presenting this resolution was as here stated, only, with characteristic effrontery, it expresses it as a *pious* attempt to prevent the Presbytery from wickedly allowing Mr. Webster "to justify his sin," or, in more honest phrase, to *exculpate himself*. The Popish doctrine, that a person charged with slander ought not to be allowed to defend himself, is still reiterated in this strange Magazine; and the editor has even the assurance to attempt an argument in favor of its correctness; but as well might he argue in defence of the Popish Inquisition.

The appeal taken by Mr. Stark, as above stated, was tried before the Synod, and was "not sustained." For this decision, the Magazine makes the Synod a mark at which it shoots its poisonous arrows. It says: "the Synod attempted to disguise the real character of their decision by making an effort to show that there was no ground for the appeal. This was done by calling witnesses to prove that Mr. Webster had never admitted that his statements were unfounded." And this the Magazine calls "one of the worst things about the whole business." It says, the Synod had no business with the question, Whether Mr. Webster had admitted his statements to be unfounded, but only with the abstract question, "*Is it agreeable to the discipline of the Associate Church to allow a person to attempt to prove what he had already admitted to be unfounded.*"

But this is an outrageous perversion of the true state of the case. Mr. Stark's resolution was discussed in the *concrete* before the Presbytery; that is, Mr. Webster's name was really used, as the matter was discussed, instead of the word "person" in the resolution. Mr. Webster was indeed the "person" intended by the resolution. And accordingly, in the discussion, Mr. Stark contended that the libel against Mr. Webster ought not to be tried, because he had retracted his statements as unfounded, and consequently ought not to be allowed to prove them. On the other hand Mr. Webster, who was permitted to speak for himself, denied this; and he was sustained in so doing by the committee, Messrs. Campbell and Smart, who declared before Presbytery that Mr. Stark's version of what took place in the committee was entirely fallacious. For the correctness of this statement of the case, as it was argued in the Presbytery, we refer to Messrs. Anderson, Miller, A. and D. Gordon, who were present on the occasion.

The editor of the Magazine attempts, indeed, to ridicule the Presbytery for stating in their Narrative, that they had assurance from the solemn declarations of Messrs. Campbell and Smart, that the acknowledgment which Mr. Stark imputed to Mr. Webster was groundless. The editor charges the Presbytery with referring, in this statement, to the *testimony* of Messrs. Campbell and Smart six months before it was

given! But every honest mind that reads the Narrative will at once perceive that the Presbytery do not refer to the *testimony* of the committee as taken before the Synod at all, but to their declarations made on the floor of the Presbytery, when Mr. Stark's resolution was under discussion.

But further, Mr. Stark himself presented the case to the Synod not in an *abstract* but in a *concrete* form. This is evident from his Reasons of Protest. At the previous meeting of Synod the following resolution had come up for consideration, viz: "*Resolved*, that it is censurable according to the word of God and the discipline of this church, for a minister of the gospel to enter a civil suit against a member of his own communion for a supposed injury to his moral character, without having first submitted the matter to the adjudication of the appropriate church court." This resolution had been adopted by the Presbytery of Albany, and was brought before the Synod by an appeal taken by Mr. Stark. But the Synod refused to decide on the abstract principle it contained, and dismissed the matter by saying, that "there was no particular case before the Synod." Mr. Stark's Reasons of Protest begin with a reference to this affair, and that, too, in a way of gross flattery, as follows:

"In appearing a second time before Synod with Reasons of Protest against a decision of the Associate Presbytery of Albany, the subscriber embraces the occasion to express his gratitude for the candor with which his Reasons were considered, and for the constitutional manner in which his cause was issued by that Reverend court at its last meeting. It was indeed a most appropriate resolution to which the court came, viz: that 'no particular case is before Synod;' for it must have been very evident to all who are acquainted with the peculiar principles of the Associate Church, that the resolution of the Presbytery of Albany never ought to have been made a case."

This *exordium* strongly reminds us of the sycophantic beginning of the speech of Tertullus the orator against the Apostle Paul, (Acts xxiv. 2-4.) "Seeing that by thee we enjoy great quietness, and that very worthy deeds are done unto this nation by thy providence, we accept it always, and in all places, most noble Felix, with all thankfulness. Notwithstanding, that I be not further tedious unto thee, I pray thee that thou wouldst hear us of thy clemency a few words."

In direct opposition to the ground *now* taken by the Magazine, Mr. Stark, in his Reasons of Protest, acknowledged that an abstract question was not a *constitutional* and legitimate object of Synodical action; and hence he proceeded to submit a "particular case" to the Synod for adjudication. "Before, however, proceeding with the Reasons of Protest," says he, "it is necessary to give a brief detail of the facts and circumstances which led to the decision," against which he protested. Accordingly, he proceeds to give a history of Mr. Webster's pamphlet, with the accompanying circumstances, down to the time of his appeal; all which is done in his usual "clear manner" and with the *accuracy* and regard to *facts* which distinguish all his anonymous and other historical productions. Among other things he makes the following statement, which gave occasion to the Synod to take the testimony of which the Magazine so bitterly complains, viz: "Mr. Webster gave to the subscriber a paper drawn up by himself and in his own hand-writing, of which the following is an exact copy;" which paper he presents

to the Synod as proof that Mr. Webster had admitted as unfounded the things for which he was libelled.

Thus, having introduced for the consideration of Synod, not an abstract proposition, but a "particular case," he next proceeds to give his *Reasons of Protest*; all of which present and argue a *concrete* question. Though he adduces many reasons, there is not one among them that can be called an *abstract* reason: they are all identified with *the case of Mr. Webster*. It may amuse the reader, however, to inform him that many of the reasons which Mr. Stark gives for protesting had no existence at the time he protested, but are drawn from the subsequent proceedings of the Presbytery!

Again, the Presbytery in their Answers argued the case as Mr. Stark had presented it, viz: as connected with Mr. Webster and his alleged retraction; and they unequivocally charged Mr. Stark's statements as put forth on this subject, with being unfair, deceptive and false. Hence, as the main controversy between Mr. Stark and the Presbytery turned on the fact, whether Mr. Webster *wrote* and gave to Mr. Stark, *as his retraction*, the paper, a copy of which the appellant laid before Synod, the court determined to ascertain the truth in the case by calling witnesses. And what else could the Synod do? Was not this the precise point submitted to the court by the appellant and allowed by the respondent, the Presbytery? And must the Synod now be abused for this procedure, which all honest men will applaud? Observe, also, how the inspiring genius of the Magazine "blows hot and cold with the same mouth:" He *praises* the Synod of 1835, for not acting on an abstract question; and he *condemns* the Synod of 1836, for not acting on an abstract question! He blackguards the Synod for their consistency!

But what seems particularly to gall the Magazine is the fact, that the witnesses, called by the Synod, proved the statements put forth by Mr. Stark in his *Reasons of Protest*, to be entirely false. The Synod, therefore, must be reproached for this, in the most arrogant and insulting manner. This proceeding of the Synod is said to be "wholly unprecedented, and pre-eminently calculated to awaken the most painful suspicion, that their object was not to discover the truth, but to mislead the public." Indeed! And why? Because, says Dr. P. B.—

"1. They attempted an impossibility—they resolved to prove a negative." But they resolved no such thing: they simply went to work to ascertain whether Mr. Stark had falsified, as the Presbytery affirmed that he had, in stating that a certain paper was wholly in Mr. Webster's hand-writing, and that Mr. Webster had given it to him, in presence of Messrs. Campbell and Smart, as an unqualified retraction. And the witnesses testified, that a part of that paper was in Mr. Stark's own hand-writing, and a part of it in the hand-writing of one of the witnesses; and moreover, that the paper was given to Mr. Stark with much reluctance, and that not as a "retraction," but as a paper still under "negotiation"—*Mr. Stark having pledged his sacred honor that he would make no use of it whatever*. Was this, then, attempting an impossibility? Was this a resolving to prove a negative?—As the editor betrays gross ignorance on the subject of negative testimony, although he would have his readers believe that he is deeply versed in law, both civil and ecclesiastical, we will quote for his benefit a single sentence from our Book of Discipline: "Though he [the person libelled] can not prove a negative, yet it may be possible to prove some fact or facts, plainly inconsistent with those set forth in the libel." (p. 47.)

"2. The Synod allowed one of the parties in the cause to be a witness." Messrs. Campbell and Smart were *not* "one of the parties in the cause," any further than they were members of the court appealed from. But in cases of appeal, the superior judicatory is *to gain all the information from the members of the inferior judicatory, which may be deemed requisite*; (See Presbyterian Book of Discipline, chap. vii. sec. 3;) and if such information be obtained under the solemnity of an oath, we should suppose it were all the better for the appellants. Here, again, the editor of the Magazine is made to betray great ignorance of the forms of judicial procedure.

"3. The Synod took their testimony without having notified Mr. Stark—they had no right to do this—no testimony could be lawfully taken that was to affect the case, till Mr. Stark had been duly notified." Here, also, the editor betrays his ignorance. Was the Synod bound to notify Mr. Stark to come and attend to the issuing of his own appeal? He had sent up his appeal to them for their judgment, and had urged them, in an accompanying letter, to decide upon it in his absence. But this they found they could not intelligently do, without taking testimony on some matters of fact which were controverted between the parties. Whose fault was it that Mr. Stark was not present? The Synod's, to be sure, says the editor of the Magazine! But we apprehend that sensible men will think differently, and will also praise rather than censure the Synod for doing in a just and intelligent manner what Mr. Stark would have had them do *blind-folded*.

But these complaints against the Synod are all *after-thoughts*. It is but lately that they have sprung into existence. Even Mr. Stark's friends in Synod made no objections to the taking of the testimony of Messrs. Campbell and Smart: And the Synod's decision "not to sustain the appeal," was made *unanimously*. But now, after three years' hard thinking, two individuals, who have been cut off from the fellowship of the church, have discovered that the Synod ought to have decided the case without testimony, simply on Mr. Stark's allegations.

The editor of the Magazine next tries hard to convict the Synod of giving a wrong judgment, when it decided that "From the testimony of the Moderator [Mr. Smart] and Mr. Campbell, it has been proved to the satisfaction of Synod, that the paper which Mr. Stark alleges to have been a retraction of the charges made by Mr. Webster against him in a certain pamphlet, was never subscribed or assented to by Mr. Webster, in the form in which it is given in Mr. Stark's reasons of appeal," &c.

If the editor's *assertions* are to be taken as proof, then the Synod decided wrong. But those who know him will be very loath to place any reliance on his unsupported assertions, however strongly made. And much less will they be likely to put any faith in the statements of Mr. Stark in opposition to the testimony of respectable witnesses. We do not so much wonder, indeed, to find Mr. Stark, on the one hand trying to make the public believe that Mr. Webster wrote and assented to a paper which he has published with Mr. Webster's signature, and on the other hand, endeavoring to wipe off the odium of violating his solemn pledge given on the reception of said paper, though it will be for ever out of his power to effect this, as the only disinterested persons present on the occasion have recorded their testimony against him: But we do wonder that Dr. P. Bullions' subserviency to Mr. Stark should carry

him so far as to endorse all the interested statements of one, who, in times past, was wont to caution his friends "to beware of the Bullionesses,"\* and that too in contradiction of the solemn oaths of men whose honesty and integrity he never had cause to suspect. Yet he says he is able to prove that the Synod's decision founded on those oaths was wrong! And this he can prove by Mr. Stark! Or if he can not prove it by Mr. Stark, Mr. Stark can prove it by him!

But after a great deal of blustering about what he can prove, when it comes to the pinch he abandons all his witnesses but one, whom he doubtless must consider as the principal one. And who is that one, does the reader imagine? Why, the editor of the Religious Monitor! Yes, we are made to testify as follows: "The truth however, is, that Mr. Webster never denied, nor 'affected to deny,' nor wished to deny, or even 'conceal,' that the paper in question contained a full retraction. This he has always admitted. (Rel. Monitor for February, p. 391.)" Is the mind of the reader prepared to be told, that this is only the *part* of a sentence; and which is essentially modified and explained by the unquoted part? We utterly deny the sentiment imputed to us. We have never given the testimony which has been thus fraudulently wrung from our words. The scope of our remarks and the unquoted part of the above sentence sufficiently show our meaning. We were speaking of the "paper of retraction" in its patched up state, as containing interlineations made both by Mr. Stark and the committee, and to which Mr. Webster had not assented. Now any person that has ever read that paper can not fail to see that it contains a full retraction. And to a silly remark of the Magazine in relation to Mr. Webster's tearing up that paper, we replied: "The truth, however, is, that Mr. Webster never denied, nor 'affected to deny,' nor wished to deny, or even 'conceal,' that the paper in question contained a full retraction, (this he has always admitted,) but he denies, and always has denied, that he gave the paper to Mr. Stark *as his retraction*, or in any other sense, than *as a paper still under negotiation*."

After quoting but a part of this sentence, and making us speak an entirely different language from what we intended, and thus perverting the truth and wronging the innocent, Dr. P. Bullions, with unparalleled effrontery and unblushing insolence, applies to us the following *maxim, proverb and poetry*:—"It has been said by an old philosopher, 'that a liar has need of a good memory, lest he should let out the truth to his own confusion.' 'The lip of truth,' says Solomon, 'shall be established for ever: but a lying tongue is but for a moment.' (Prov. xii. 19.) Truth is simple and consistent with itself. To use the words of the poet,

'Twixt truth and error, there is this difference known,  
Error is fruitful, truth is only one."

More shameless trickery, more gross hypocrisy, and more real wickedness can scarcely be imagined, than is to be found in this conduct of the editor. He mutilates our language, wilfully perverts our meaning, and then tells us that "a liar should have a good memory;" and what is worse still, he profanes a text of scripture in order to wound us and cover over his own iniquity. Many a poor wretch is doomed to drag out years of suffering and infamy in a penitentiary for a less crime

---

\* This appeared in evidence before Presbytery on the trial of Mr. Webster.

against the laws of God and man. But perhaps it may be said, that owing to inaccurate *punctuation* the Dr. may not have been aware of the modification contained in the unquoted part of the sentence. To this we reply, that afterwards in the same article, he twice quotes that identical part of the sentence, when he found that it would suit his turn. His misquotation, therefore, and perversion, could be nothing else than wilful.

Such, then, is the testimony, (a mutilated sentence from the *Rel. Monitor*!) which Dr. P. B. produces, after all his flourish of vain words, to convict the Synod of an error in judgment. He says this testimony "settles the question that the paper did contain a full retraction, and that it was given to Mr. Stark." Yes, he repeats it, that this testimony, (manufactured by misquotation and wilful perversion,) "entirely sweeps away" the Synod's declaration, that "not so much as a single vestige of it remains!"

But it is sickening to pursue the editor of the *Magazine* further in his attempts to cloud the decision, to misrepresent the motives and injure the character of a Synod, to which he had sworn subjection in the Lord.

We would say, however, to prevent mistakes, that the Synod did not entirely overlook the *abstract* question involved in Mr. Stark's resolution. The abstract question was discussed on the floor of Synod. A summary of the reasoning which was then presented by the Presbytery may be found in Vol. XIII. of the *Religious Monitor*, in a letter addressed to certain Memorialists, and in answer to their complaints respecting this same decision of the Synod; and which has never been attempted to be answered till this day. A portion of which may be profitably republished in this place:

"Now, any grievance arising from the Synod's refusal to sustain this appeal of Mr. Stark must seem remarkable enough. Had the Synod sustained the appeal, they would by that deed have sanctioned the correctness of an abstract, universal proposition, which certainly admits of many exceptions—they would have sanctioned a principle in judicial procedure, which is expressly repudiated both by civil and ecclesiastical law—they would have affirmed a thing to be contrary to the discipline of the Associate Church, which is contrary to the discipline of no community deserving the name of a Church. But, brethren, as you profess to differ from others in judgment on this point, laying assertion aside, let us reason the case.—Is it indeed 'contrary to the discipline of the Associate Church to allow a person to prove what he had already declared to be unfounded?' Or in other words, is a confession of guilt *in all cases* to result in conviction without any further investigation? The rule which governs the practice of our civil courts in relation to confessions of guilt, is founded in common sense and equity,—'Every species of confession, to be admissible must be free and voluntary. And in the case of a confession made before a magistrate or other person, if it appear that the defendant was induced to make it by any promise of favor, or by menaces, or under terror, it shall not be received in evidence against him.' (2 Hale, 285. Archbold's practice, 117.) 'However slight the inducement may have been, a confession so obtained can not be received in evidence, on account of the uncertainty and doubt whether it was not made rather from a motive of fear or interest, than from a sense of guilt.' (Chitty's pleadings, p. 118.) These quotations from standard works on Law are sufficient to show what is the practice

of civil courts relative to confessions of guilt. You surely could not have been ignorant of this; and yet because the Synod did not sanction a principle directly contradicted by such practice, you affect to be greatly aggrieved! Were any civil court to practice according to the rule you would have had the Synod to establish, it would subject itself to the scorn and contempt of all honest minds, and expose itself to an impeachment on the ground of imbecility or wilful disregard of the claims of right. You have doubtless read of the feelings of deep abhorrence and reprobation that were excited in the breasts of all the pious and intelligent in Scotland, when the Justiciary Court acted on the plan, on which you would have the 'discipline of the Associate Church' conducted. I refer to the case of James Mitchell, who was convicted and condemned to death by that unrighteous court, simply on the ground of a confession, he had formerly made, of an attempt to assassinate Sharp, the bishop of St. Andrews. When arraigned for trial, my author states, that 'Sir George Lockhart argued in behalf of the prisoner, with great judgment and learning, to the admiration of the audience, showing, that no extra-judicial confession could be allowed in court, and that his confession was extorted from him by hopes and promise of life.' (See Crookshank's History of the Church of Scotland.) But you may perhaps object to this appeal to the practice of civil courts respecting an ecclesiastical affair. I have indeed only appealed to such practice, because it is based on a common-sense principle; a principle, which I will now proceed to show you is also acted on in the matter of ecclesiastical discipline. In our Book of Discipline we have no express rule on the subject, but we have one laid down in Stewart's Collections, a book which has always been regarded as of authority in our church courts. The rule to which I refer is the following—"Probation by confession, *if judicial*, is the strongest of all probation; but if men confess a crime, rather from weariness of, or aversion to life, than from conscience of guilt; or, if there appear any signs of distraction or madness, then such confessions ought not to be rested upon," &c. (See Book iv. Tit. 3, sec. 5, also sec. 11.) What say you, brethren, to this rule? What now becomes of your grievance? Or is it a matter of grievance to you that the Synod did not repeal this long standing rule of the Church relative to confessions of guilt? Would you have had the Synod to establish in its place a rule admitting of no limitations or exceptions? for such was the nature of Mr. Stark's resolution, the rejection of which you lament as an awful grievance! But the rule prescribed to you in the above quotation, and which is embraced in the "discipline of the Associate Church," is carefully guarded, is strictly limited. It declares that a confession of guilt, in order to be received in evidence, must be *judicial*; that is, it must be made by the accused in the presence of the court, after his arraignment for trial; and not only so, it must also possess certain other attributes, as you will perceive by again turning your eye on the rule.

"Thus far I have been considering Mr. Stark's resolution in the *abstract*, and have clearly shown that the Synod would not have been justified in adopting it, which would have been the case had his appeal been sustained. Let us now consider it in the *concrete*, at least so far as it had a bearing on the case of Mr. Webster. And suppose for a moment, that Mr. W. did make the confession which you impute to him; was not that confession alleged to have been made before the Presbytery of Albany commenced their process against him? Consequently,

it was not a *judicial* confession. And besides, may it not have been extorted under a *promise of favor*, or under *menaces*, or under *terror*, or from a motive of *fear* or *interest*, rather than from a *sense of guilt*, and therefore, inadmissible by 'any well regulated court?' And would you have the Synod to say, that a confession made under such circumstances was a sufficient evidence of guilt, and that it would be a horrible outrage to investigate the case any further? But *let it be remembered* that Mr. Webster, when arraigned before the Presbytery for trial, *utterly denied* having made the *extra-judicial* confession imputed to him, the truth of which denial has since been established by unimpeachable testimony. Where then was the error of the Presbytery? And where was the error of the Synod in approving of the procedure of the Presbytery? Brethren, are you not too easily offended?

"I have clearly shown that Mr. Stark's resolution, when considered in respect of its *merits*, as an abstract proposition can by no means stand the test, and yet, let me remark, that it was not rejected by Presbytery and Synod simply on that ground, but chiefly on the ground of its *mis-application* to a particular case. Even though it had contained a true proposition, from the wrong application that was attempted to be made of it, it behooved to be rejected. *The thing had no business there.* It was evidently presented with the intention to impede the course of justice and to screen guilt; besides in the application that was made of it, it was based on the false assumption that Mr. Webster had confessed the truth of the charges, laid in the Presbytery's libel against him. Accordingly the Synod, as you will see from their proceedings in the case, without particularly affirming or denying the principle of the resolution, proceeded to satisfy itself from the examination of witnesses, whether the resolution did really apply to the case of Mr. Webster: and the judgment of the court was that it did not. And the reason why the Synod decided the matter rather in its *concrete* than its *abstract* form, was, because Mr. Stark's 'reasons of protest,' and the Presbytery's 'answers' presented the subject particularly in that point of view."

---

#### ART. VI. A Disclaimer.

It has been a favorite theme in the Associate Presbyterian Magazine to charge the members of the Associate Presbyteries of Albany and Cambridge with a partnership—"a conjunct concern"—in Mr. Webster's pamphlet. The charge has been often repeated without specifying the individuals intended, leaving the public to fix it on all the members of those Presbyteries, if they pleased. This was an ungenerous measure, and done for effect, and not an evidence of the fact supposed. At length, however, in the 8th No. of the Magazine, and after Mr. Webster had fully exonerated all the members of those Presbyteries, the charge is repeated with specification of individuals, among whom I find I am included: An occasion is, therefore, now given for denial, and I think, justice to myself requires me to embrace it. With the merits, or demerits of that pamphlet, I have nothing to do at present; but I repel the charge of secretly assisting in a work, and leaving an-

other to bear the whole responsibility, and the odium that may be attached to it, whether justly or unjustly. Though I believe all the members of these Presbyteries innocent of the charge, yet I speak only for myself.—I did not contribute to that pamphlet, directly or indirectly. This simple statement, I trust, is sufficient; and I hope the public will require stronger evidence than that which is advanced in the Magazine to prove me guilty, viz: *That because I was called by Mr. Webster to prove some of his statements, therefore I had assisted him in his pamphlet.* According to this logic, a witness must always be considered an accomplice, his citation a charge, and his testimony the proof against himself. This rule may be pleaded by culprits, for if once established, there is an end to testimony, and the transgressor may proceed with impunity. But Mr. Webster never learned from me the facts which he called on me to prove; he was himself an eye and ear witness to at least the principal part of them. And even had I communicated them to him, it would require something more to prove that I was a partner in the publication.

ABRAHAM ANDERSON,

---

ART. VII. *An injurious Report corrected by Rev. G. M. Hall.*

MR. EDITOR,

Permit me, through your periodical, to correct a report, which has been extensively circulated, tending to the injury of the cause of truth as well as my individual character. Report says, that while I am publicly upholding the decisions of the Presbytery of Cambridge and of the Associate Synod, in relation to Dr. A. Bullions, Mr. Stalker and others, I am privately and secretly encouraging them in their pernicious courses. The design of this report seems, not merely to set me up to the world as acting a double part, but also to promote a cause which is based upon falsehood and misrepresentation. If the report affected no one but myself, I should be silent, well knowing that it matters little what decision men may pass upon me; but when I reflect that it may injure the cause I have espoused, and influence the wavering, I conclude that it would be criminal to suffer it to pass unnoticed. It might be sufficient for me in this public manner, to declare that the report, as circulated here and in other parts of the church, is utterly false. The origin of the report may be traced to some private letters, written by me some five or six years since, to a near friend of Dr. Bullions, in answer to a one-sided and partial history of the trials of Dr. Bullions in the Presbytery of Cambridge. In these letters I censured the conduct of Presbytery very severely, which censure, a true history of the case showed me to be wholly gratuitous.

When I first came to the North, I was reminded of these letters, by the individual to whom they were addressed. I replied, that circumstances had changed—that my opinion had changed. Though I made this statement in the presence of several individuals, who still remember it, yet it was immediately reported, that I had said that my opinion was not changed in relation to the conduct of the Presbytery. When I heard the report, I went in company with a friend to its author, and en-

quired whether such a statement of our conversation had been given. I was informed that such a statement had been given. I then declared, that I had never uttered the statement imputed to me. The author not only refused to testify that I had made use of the expression, but admitted that she must have been mistaken. Since that time, the report has obtained little or no credit in this part of the country. The same report has, however, been industriously circulated in the West, with another untruth, calculated to influence the minds of those who may hear it. But that which surprised me most was, the information, that it was sent there by one so famed for honesty—honest enough, I suppose, to believe that he had sent it so far that I could not contradict it. I declare the report and the addition utterly false.

Yours,

GEORGE M. HALL.

ARGYLE, March 20, 1839.

ART. VIII. *Some Interrogatories put to A. R.*

MR. EDITOR,

In your March No. of the Religious Monitor, I see in the 2d Article, *another* effort to save slavery from the charge of being “essentially oppressive and tyrannical.” Such attempts are not strange, coming from the mouths of Clay and Calhoun, men, whose names are “written in the earth;” who walk by sight, and are quiet or alarmed, as the things of this world may go well or ill; and are strangers to that faith that views the *union* between God and the soul of such superior importance, that compared with it all social and political “unions” are as nothing, and even to be disregarded, when they would interpose between the believer and his God. But it is to me passing strange, to see a man battling for the right and *duty* in some cases to “enslave,” apparently under the banner of that MAN who said, “that he that is *greatest* among you *shall* be your *servant*.” That he may be preserved “from sinking,” I offer for his consideration the following interrogatories:—Were not some of the Jewish laws exceptions to the general rules of the law of nature? If aye—Were not the rules regulating the servitude obtained from *the heathen*, like the law of usury, and the extermination of the nations of Canaan, founded on such exceptions? If aye—Did not these exceptions cease with that nation? If aye—Why refer to them to show that “tyranny and oppression” are not essential to slavery? Without special authority, would it not have been “essentially tyrannical and oppressive” for Joshua to have drenched his sword with the blood of the men, women and children of Canaan? Could we reason now from the case of Joshua, that it would not be “essentially tyrannical and oppressive,” if we were to enter Canada and commence an indiscriminate destruction of human life? What more authority have we for enslaving the Africans, under the judicial laws, than we would have from the same laws to exterminate the Canadians?

What does the writer mean in saying that slavery is not of God, and yet puts a case in which he says, that it would be an act of mercy, &c.

to "enslave" a person? Can we "enslave" *without slavery*? If slavery be not of God, then it *must* be sin. If sin, is there *any other correct remedy* than *immediately* ceasing to commit it? Wherein does such *immediateism* differ from abolition? Can we conceive of as great an evil as to be "*let alone*" in sin? Is not the right of personal liberty an absolute and inalienable right given us by our Creator, prescribed in the law of nature? Can slavery exist in any sense, without infringing on that right? Are not the violations of the law of nature "essentially tyrannical and oppressive?" But how hard is it to reason *self-evident* truths, the violation of which is *self-evidently* wrong? It requires the meekness of Moses to keep in temper arguing with those who are *still* willing to "enslave" a human being. If Jesus were on earth, would you in any case "enslave" him? If not, how dare you "enslave" his "image," and perhaps a *member* of his mystical body? "He that toucheth you toucheth me." Slavery, in all its "phases," should be regarded as *sin*; sin, in its conception and its growth; sin, in the relation which necessarily deprives the slave of his personal liberty, and without which it can not exist, therefore, necessarily wrong.

I. LOGAN.

---

ART. IX. *Family Government*—By DR. HUMPHREY.

(Concluded from page 368.)

HOW SHOULD IT BE ADMINISTERED?

This is one of the most important inquiries in the whole range of domestic education. Children must early be brought under absolute parental authority, and must submit to all the rules and regulations of the family during the whole period of their minority, and even longer, if they choose to remain at home. The master of a family who, from any cause, fails to rule his own house, fails in one of the essential duties which he owes to God, and to the children whom God hath given him. Want of patience, want of wisdom, want of what is called a *faculty*, does not excuse him. "If any man lack wisdom, let him ask it of God, who giveth unto all men liberally, and upbraideth not."

But *how* is the great duty to be discharged? What are the means to be used—what the measures to be adopted and steadily pursued, for the attainment of the end? This is a branch of the subject, which I have merely glanced at. I have insisted, some will think too strenuously, perhaps, that the thing must be done—that children must be governed; but I have not yet told how. Perhaps I shall fail to answer the question wisely, in the remarks which I am about to offer. They are my own thoughts, however, and they are not put forth hastily, however far short I may fall in doing justice to the subject.

My first remark is, *that in the government of children, regard should always be had to their age, constitutional temperament, and such other diversities, as often exist in the same family.* At first, you can not reason with the restive little creature in your arms at all. It is too young to understand any of your appeals to its conscience, or its heart; but not too young to show a bad temper; and therefore not too young

to be a subject of incipient discipline. Of course, it must be adapted to the infantile state and capacities of the child, or it will do no good, and may be positively injurious. There seems to be a kind of exquisite instinct imparted both to the mother and the child, for this very purpose. By this instinct, she conveys her meaning in tones, and looks, and smiles, and frowns, to her darling boy, long before it is capable of understanding a single word that she utters. "As in water face answereth to face," so the heart of a mother to her babe; and in this way she begins to mould its temper and habits to her wishes. It is needless to say, that as soon as reason dawns, you should appeal to it in the government of your children, and avail yourself more and more of its aid, up to the full maturity of its development. Milk for babes, and strong meat for those who are old enough to digest it.

It will be strange, if, in studying the physical temperament and mental constitution of your children, you do not find some striking diversities, which it will require all your wisdom to guide into safe channels, and keep under proper control. One child needs a great deal more curbing than another. One must be managed in this way and another in that. *George* yields at once; but *Stephen* holds out to the last. *Julia* is all docility and affection, while *Anne* is as wild as a young roe, and loves dearly to have her own way. *David* is constitutionally sedate, and early learns to govern his temper, and to submit cheerfully to parental authority; but *William* is all mercury—his feelings are like a box of percussion caps, and though he may be neither sullen nor obstinate, it is extremely difficult to keep him under proper subjection. Hence the necessity of discrimination, promptitude and steadiness, on the part of the parent. Many fail here. They will not take the trouble to study the characters of their children, and note down such differences as exist in almost every family; but manage them all very much alike, and then marvel exceedingly, that what works like a charm upon one, has no effect at all upon another.

My next remark is, that *affectionate persuasion, addressed to the understanding, the conscience and the heart, is the grand instrument to be employed in family government.* Nobody has less confidence than I have, in the power of mere 'moral suasion,' to convert the soul to God. I should as soon expect it to raise the body of a dead man, as to change the heart of a living one. *Instrumentally*, it is of the highest importance, because God has appointed it; but *efficiently*, it is nothing. The excellency of the power is not of it, but of *Him*. But in the administration of domestic government, I lay great stress upon the use of arguments, to show the reasonableness of filial obedience, and of high moral suasion, to enforce the duty. A child of four years old is capable of being reasoned with to much more effect, than is generally imagined. To be sure, it is the intellect of a child, and not of an adult, that you have to enlighten, and as a matter of course, you must come down to its level, both in thought and language. Were you to address it as you would a son of fifteen, your labor would all be lost; but there is a way to approach it—there is language which it can understand—there are reasons which it can begin to see and feel.

The minds of our children were made to be instructed in regard to their duty, and to be influenced by proper motives when clearly and properly presented. Our being clothed with patriarchal authority, does not authorize us to over-look this all-important susceptibility, and govern by mere will and force. So far from it, that I hold it to be the duty of

every parent to explain the reasons of his requirements, as far and as fast as his children become capable of comprehending them. This should be his invariable rule from the early dawn of reason, up to its brightest youthful maturity. I know that where there is a large family, it requires a great deal of time and patience, much more than we know how to afford, to give a reason for every thing; but though it may be very inconvenient, at first, there will be a clear saving of time in the end. With few exceptions, children soon learn cheerfully to acquiesce in the better judgment of their parents, when the grounds of that judgment are briefly or more fully stated, as occasion may require. A child that has been sick, calls for a particular kind of food, and thinks it very hard to be denied. Let him be told the reason why it can not be given him. He has set his heart upon going out in a damp day, to see his little playmates. His mother is sure it would not be safe, and let her convince him if she can. He is unwilling to go to school, or to church. Reason the matter with him, and in this way try to overcome his reluctance, before you resort to more cogent arguments. Your son wants to go to play with certain other boys in the evening, and feels as if he could not be denied. You can not give your consent, because you are perfectly satisfied, that it would not be safe, either for his health, or his morals, and you might settle the question with a simple and decided negative. But this would not be wise. He wants to know the reason, and how can you spend a few moments to better advantage than trying to satisfy him?

'Father,' said a young man once, to a patriarch of the mountains, who is still living, (after being told that he must not go with half a dozen idle fellows, who had come to invite him,) 'Father,' why is it that you deny me those privileges which other parents grant so readily to their sons of my own age?' 'David,' said the father, after lifting up his head and leaning upon the top of his hoe handle, 'I have lived much longer in the world than you have, and I see dangers, which you little suspect. These young men are in a bad way. Such habits of idleness, and this going about to frolics and horse races will ruin them. You will see, if you live, that some of them will get into the State's Prison by and by, and it is well if they do not come to the gallows. These are my reasons for wishing you to have nothing to do with them.' David was satisfied. Years rolled away. Those young men soon spent their patrimony and fell into dissipated habits. From step to step, they went on, till the prediction of the patriarch was literally fulfilled. Two or three of them were sent to the State's Prison, and one, at least, was hanged.

While I strenuously insist on the duty of giving *reasons* in the administration of family government, I am aware there may be cases, in which from prudential motives they should be withheld, at least for a time. Your little son may wish to associate with the vicious children of his own age, in the next house; and while you can not allow it, it may not be expedient to tell him why. So it is more than possible that when the hearts of our children are greatly set upon any indulgence, they will not be convinced by any arguments which we can use, to dissuade them. In such cases, if our reasons are good, the fault is with them; and at any rate, we are to be the judges in the last resort, and not they. If I can not convince my child, that the gratification of his desires would be injurious, or wrong, when I am sure it would, I must interpose my authority to restrain him. This I take to be the true

ground, and the true distinction. But if parents were universally to make it a fixed principle, to 'show cause,' where it can be done, in the exercise of the authority with which God has clothed them, it would be communicating a vast amount of instruction to their children, on a thousand practical questions of the greatest moment, and would go very far towards securing the most prompt and cheerful obedience.

Before dismissing this topic, let me add, that there is a great advantage in administering family government, by the expression of our wishes, rather than by *positive commands*. The most obedient and affectionate children are those that have been accustomed from their cradle, to regard every wish of their mother, as a law of love, and rather to anticipate her desires, than to wait for any less gentle demonstration of her authority. Those who commonly talk low, and say, 'I hope you will not do this,' or 'I shall be very happy in seeing you do that,' are the most likely to rule their household well, provided they contrive to make it distinctly understood, that every wish they express has all the force of law, and must be so regarded.

Equally important is it, that their parents should enlist the *consciences* of their children, to secure a ready and cheerful obedience. Indeed, till you reach the conscience, you have done but little to bind your child to his duty. He must be made not only to see *reasons*, but to feel the force of moral obligation. 'You must do this because it is *right*, and you must not do that, because it is *wrong*.' Such appeals, when solemnly and affectionately presented, are calculated to make a deep impression on the young mind. Conscience responds to them, and when properly enlightened, soon establishes her empire in the bosom of the child, so that he can not be obedient without a feeling of self-condemnation, which will act as a more powerful restraint, than the most positive requirements and prohibitions. *Command* your child, and if he sees you are in earnest, he will probably obey you. Show him the reasons of the command, and he will yield more cheerfully. Appeal to his conscience, get that enlisted on your side, and you have a hold upon him which you never had before. You have gained an auxiliary, that will sometimes help you even when you are asleep yourself, and will often be more efficient when you are absent, than when you are present.

Having once gained the conscience of your child, his heart will yield almost as a matter of course; and this is incomparably the sweetest control, that a parent can ever establish in his family. Let him reign in the hearts of his children, that is, let their obedience be prompted by filial affection, and what can he wish for more? This is the law of love, which is paramount to every other law, and without which, family government must be essentially defective. With it, the fire-side is the dearest spot on earth. There is no constraint like that of love. It is the great law by which the holy family of heaven is sweetly governed.

#### PUNISHMENT.

There is a great deal of fine, hot-press poetry to be found 'now-a-days,' in booksellers' windows and ladies' parlors, about the angelic sweetness of infancy; the bewitching prattle and innocence of childhood; the ever-gushing purity of maternal love, and the lamb-like gam-

bols of cherubic and sylph-like forms, dearer to every parent's heart, than life itself. All this is exceedingly charming, and very well too, if we understand it right, and make proper distinctions. We have seen it and felt it all, a thousand times, in the nursery. A father, once, speaking to his friend of the remarkable forwardness of his first child, and expressing a strong presentiment that it would soon be taken away on that account—'Cheer up, brother,' was the prompt and comforting reply, 'I have had *eight* just such children, and they are all living still.' So when the poet has selected his favorite little cherub, and sung his sweetest lullaby over its cradle, or his tenderest requiem over its grave, every mother can say, 'I have seen one at least, quite as lovely as this.' And in sober prose, there certainly are a thousand bewitching smiles and innocent endearments, in the nursery, and in the dimpled and lipping fire-side circle, to which none of all the Nine can ever do justice. A parent of the humblest pretensions can both see and feel more than any poet, however gifted, can express.

But let us always, when we speak or write on this theme, carefully distinguish between the *social affections*, and the *state of the heart* in the sight of a holy God; so as not to leave the impression, that there is any thing in all this infantile and juvenile loveliness, to set aside the teachings of Scripture in regard to native depravity. When we read of the spotless innocence of childhood, we ought to understand it, as simply expressing those sweet and endearing qualities, which may co-exist with a little heart, that at the same time inherits the *corruption* of our fallen nature. There is a great deal of the finest poetry in the Bible; but not one word, as far as I remember, about the spotlessness of our children's hearts. 'Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me. The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand and seek God. They are all gone aside, they are altogether become filthy, there is none that doeth good; no, not one. The wicked are estranged from the womb. They go astray as soon as they are born, speaking lies.' This is Bible poetry; and the reason of my introducing the subject of early depravity here is, that I conceive the great laxness of family government, which characterizes the present age, may be traced very often to erroneous views on this very point. How can a parent who believes that his children are as innocent as lambs; that they have no bad passions, and are naturally no more inclined to do wrong than right; how can such a parent find it in his heart, or his conscience, to punish them, even when all other measures fail to secure their obedience, and when every body else sees the ruinous effects of his mistaken lenity? The natural consequence of such feelings is, that if the dear little creatures can neither be coaxed nor persuaded to honor and obey their parents, they have their own heads, till they become too big and too wilful to be controlled, either by father or mother.

But whether it be from this, or from some other cause, the opinion seems to be gaining ground, in some respectable and influential quarters, that *punishments* are rarely if ever necessary, in family government. It is said, that if parents would begin early, and cultivate the social affections of their children, and enlighten their understandings, and bring the whole force of moral influence to bear upon their consciences and their hearts, there would be no need of resorting to punishments of any kind, to establish and maintain domestic authority. Some may tell us, perhaps, that they speak from their own happy experience on this sub-

ject, and that they are ready to submit the result to the candid judgment of those who are best acquainted with them and their children.

Now I have admitted in my last paper, nay, I have insisted earnestly, that parents ought, in the government of their families, to put and keep in requisition, all the moral influence they can command: to rule, as far as possible, by argument, by love, and by the most solemn appeals to the conscience. Some, no doubt, and I am afraid the majority of heads of families, are exceedingly deficient in all these particulars, and are consequently obliged to resort to punishments, in a great many cases, where they might have saved themselves from the painful necessity. I am willing to admit, also, that in here and there an instance, the spirit of the child may be so gentle, or the tact and skill of the parent so admirable, as to preclude the need of any thing more severe than a word, or even a look of disapprobation. Such cases, however, are extremely rare. This gentle natural temperament pervades but very few families; and but few parents are so highly gifted. What we want and must have is, a system for the mass of the people; and the true question is, not whether one family in a hundred can be brought up without penalties of any sort, but whether, as a general rule, they are or are not necessary. If punishments are not necessary for the maintenance of domestic authority, then here is a remarkable exception to every government in the world, whether human or divine.

Disloyalty is, to use the mildest phrase, the common infirmity of our fallen nature; and to meet the case, every other government is administered by rewards and penalties. It is found by experience, that whatever may be the case with children, older people can not be governed without laws; and where there are laws, there must be penalties annexed; and when the laws are broken, the penalties must be inflicted. Indeed, a law, without penal sanctions, is a misnomer. It is no law at all, but mere advice; and if, when a law is violated, the penalties are not inflicted, it soon falls into contempt. On this point, I need only request the reader to open the first statute book that happens to fall in his way, and glance his eye over the first half a dozen pages. Nay, he need not give himself that trouble. Let him only consider what would be the state of the community in which he lives, or of any other civil community which he ever heard of, if there were no laws against theft, fraud, assault and battery, and the like; or if no penalties were annexed to the violation of those laws; or if such penalties, when annexed, were not to be executed. Could you restrain the bad and protect the good, by argument and moral suasion merely? I leave every one to answer the question for himself.

And how is it in the administration of the Divine government? It is impossible to look into the Scriptures, without perceiving that it is pre-eminently a government of rewards and punishments. Every law of God has its sanctions; and throughout the Bible, the strongest appeals are made to the fears of mankind, as well as to their hopes, their understandings and their consciences. 'The soul that sinneth, it shall die.' 'And it shall come to pass,' said Moses to the nation of Israel, 'if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe and to do all his commandments and his statutes, which I command thee this day, that all these curses shall come upon thee and overtake thee. *Cursed* shalt thou be in the city, and *cursed* shalt thou be in the field. *Cursed* shall be thy basket and thy store;' and so on,

waxing more and more terrible, through the whole 28th chapter of Deuteronomy. It is true, that 'punishment is God's strange work;' but is equally true that he has never governed the world a day, since the fall of Adam, without it. The historical books of the Bible are almost one unbroken record of man's disloyalty and of God's threatenings and punishments. 'And it is worthy of special remark, that he chastises his friends as well as his enemies, when they forget their proper allegiance.' 'If his children forsake my law, and walk not in my commandments, then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes. Nevertheless, my loving kindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail.'

I say again, therefore, that if family government can be maintained without penal sanctions, it is an anomaly in human legislation; and in *divine* legislation, too, so far, at least, as *this* world is concerned. But is there any such delightful anomaly, save in theory and imagination? Aside from the experience of thousands of years, who could soberly believe that the very same fallen and depraved beings, who require so many volumes of penal statutes to govern them after they come of age, can be controlled by a mere reason and moral suasion, during the first third part of their lives? And then, when we come to consult the great arbiter, experience, in regard to this matter, I venture to say, that no hundred, or even ten families, taken at random, in any community, were ever kept in proper subjection, without the aid of rewards and punishments. Let the very few favored parents, (if there are such,) who can govern their household without penalties, or who can make their penalties effectual without ever inflicting them, be thankful to God, who has given them so rare a faculty and such docile children; and let every parent do all he can, by patient instruction, by familiar and affectionate reasoning, by serious expostulation and by solemn appeals to the hearts and consciences of his children; but let no one say, when all those fail, 'I can do more. I have exhausted my abilities and used up my influence. If the overflowings of parental love and solicitude; if line upon line and precept upon precept; if the pleadings of natural affection, and if the sanctions of religion—if all these prove ineffectual, I stand acquitted to my own conscience and to God. I can not resort to stripes. Every feeling of my heart revolts at it, and it would do no good, if I should?' Let no parent take ground like this, and 'lay the flattering unction to his soul,' that he is prepared to meet a ruined and reprobate son at the judgment, till he can prove from the Bible that when all other means fail, there is nothing more for him to do.

---

#### ART. X. *Slavery and Literature.*

The London Eclectic Review of February, 1830, contains a long article upon *American Periodical Literature*. That part of it which adverts to the discussions on slavery, I have transcribed as a specimen of the transatlantic criticisms upon that important topic.—*Emancipator*.

"Slavery in America involves one characteristic which inconceivably augments its hideous enormity, and renders its criminality most

heinous. *The foundation and strong-hold of man-stealing are in the churches!* Whatever may have been its unutterable wickedness in the the West-Indian islands, there it *never* was baptized with the Redeemer's hallowed name, and its corruptions were not concealed in the garb of religion. That acme of the piratical turpitude was reserved for the professed disciples of Jesus in America, who aver that all men are born free and equal, and possessed of certain inalienable rights, of which by no compact can they divest themselves or their posterity.

"Now it was naturally supposed, that Christian Spectators and Reviews; Biblical Repositories and Repertories, and Theological Reviews and Magazines, as soon as a question of vital importance to 'practical piety and christian morals' had become the startling topic of discussion, would have girded on the evangelical armour, and under the standard which has been lifted up by the spirit of the Lord, would have encountered that ruthless foe of human rights and human weal, as well as of the kingdom of God, and would have maintained the holy war until victory had been attained by the death of the monster. We should have argued that the descendants of the Puritan pilgrims, as soon as an opportunity was presented to assert 'the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free,' as responsible creatures at the tribunal of Jehovah, would have rushed to the van of Freedom's embattled hosts, and there have withstood the 'wiles of the devil,' with a moral courage undaunted, and a perseverance steadfast and enduring.

"Alas! some men endeavor to serve both God and Mammon. This has been the case with several of those periodicals; and the friends of the oppressed, with the enemies of slavery, have been in consequence, reviled with a coarseness and virulence as contrary to decorum as it is inimical to the gospel of Christ.

"No characteristic of modern times is more melancholy to the Christian Spectator, than that pusillanimous abandonment of the holy principles and supremacy of revelation, of which many of the American periodicals have on this point, been guilty. There are two circumstances characterizing the traffic of America in the bodies and souls of men, which render *their system even more odious than the infamous African slave trade.*

"The kidnapping in Guinea and Congo was directed against strangers, whom color, language and conformation, excited not the smallest human sympathy in the pirates who infested those shores. Reckless of all consequences, and without the fear of God, their avowed object was wealth, by any means through which it could be obtained. But *American citizens make a regular business of rearing slaves!* They violate the laws of God and man, to increase human beings with whom to traffic; and sell their own children and grand-children with no more solicitude, and often with greater satisfaction, than any other of their '**FREE BORN AMERICAN SLAVES!**'

"*Ministers of the gospel, church officers, and professing Christians of all the principal denominations, buy, sell, nurture, scourge, and drive slaves, their fellow disciples in name, members of the same church, without remorse and with impunity;* and as has been proved in numberless instances, they literally fulfil the prophet's declaration: Their possessors do feed, but slay the flock, and 'hold themselves not guilty, and they who sell them say—blessed be the Lord for I am rich, and their own shepherds pity them not.' (Zec. xi. 4, 5.)

In addition to the great iniquity, the American slave-holding profes-

sors of religion are now sedulously and constantly employed in distorting the holy scriptures into a justification of slavery; and they aver that 'the relations of slavery in any form are not legitimate subjects of inquiry and discipline for the church.' Now when we consider that slavery abrogates the marriage covenant, and with it all domestic relationships; that it prohibits instruction to the colored people, bond and free, excluding them from the Sabbath School, and shutting them out from all practical purposes, from the illumination, and sanctity, and heavenly sympathies of 'the gospel of the grace of God;' it might have been anticipated that the recognized expounders of scriptural truth in those states where slavery is unknown, would have put forth their energies in one omnipotent struggle against a system whose impiety towards God is only equalled by its cruelty to man.

"Instead, however, of this, the *Christian Spectator* palliates the wickedness, extenuates the crime, justifies the slave-holders, and denounces the opponents of slave-holding christianity. The *Biblical Repertory* devotes all the erudition and talent which the Princeton College and Theological Seminary embody, to demonstrate that American slavery is not anti-evangelical in theory, or practically inconsistent with religion, or incompatible with an avowed submission to the laws of Christ—and of course, that slavery is conformable to the Lord's rule of reciprocal equity.

"The *Literary and Theological Review* unites with the others, and superadds unmeasured invective and vituperation—proceeding even to menace the anti-slavery ministers and churches with public displeasure.

"The *Biblical Repository and Christian Review* has not exactly participated in these obnoxious measures, but they have sung the lullaby of neutrality, which has been equally pernicious as open war. Their silence has been disgraceful to their conductors, and a curse to their country. If there be any one case in which that divine aphorism, 'He that is not for me is against me,' holds true, it is surely that of slavery, as it exists and is commended on the republican soil of America.

"The *Methodist Magazine* has gone far beyond most of its contemporaries, and has developed a spirit of censure and denunciation in references to the advocates of abolition, which has completely propitiated the merchants in 'slaves and the souls of men.'

"The wretched subserviency of the religious press, as is proved by the last number of these miscellanies which we have seen, and especially by the *Baltimore Magazine*, edited by Mr. Breckinridge, who two years ago edified the British churches with his *exemplary courteousness and modesty!* is not amended, but has recently developed characteristics more objectionable than in anterior years."

#### ART. XI. *The Reformed Presbyterian.*

A friend has just put into our hands the February No. of the above periodical. From an article in it headed, "Charge of Slander Refuted," it appears, that the editor in his No. for August had taken some notice of a charge which we had formerly brought against him, of reiterating an "oft-repeated slander" against the Associate Church. Although we

have sent the Monitor regularly to the editor, we have not received a single number of his periodical for a whole year. We spoke to his agent here, respecting this, a few weeks since, but still no "Reformed Presbyterian" has come to us according to engagement. Hence the proposal which the editor says he made last August might as well not have been made, so far as we are concerned: And perhaps not a half dozen of persons connected with the Associate Church ever heard of such a proposal.

The proposal was this, that if we or any of our Secession brethren would furnish a statement of what we believed on the subject of Christ's Mediatorial dominion, it should be published in the Reformed Presbyterian. This was very kind in Mr. Roney. But would it not have answered as well, to publish what we declare on this subject in our Subordinate Standards; e. g. the Answers to the Question, How doth Christ execute the office of a king, in both the Larger and Shorter Catechisms? or even to publish the brief and distinct statement of the Associate Synod on this subject in a Letter addressed to the Reformed Presbyterian Synod, June, 1830? In this Letter our Synod says:

"We assert, in the plainest terms, that the mediatorial kingdom of Christ extends to all persons and things. But we distinguish between his essential and mediatorial kingdom. As God over all and blessed for ever, the right to govern the world essentially, belongs to him, and he can no more cease to be the Supreme Ruler than cease to be the Most High God. And to deny this, is, we think, to detract from the glory of his divinity. But while we maintain for the honor of his Godhead, that his essential administration can neither be transferred nor laid aside for a single moment, we also assert that our Lord Jesus Christ has a dominion over all things as Mediator. Eph. i. 17-22."

But notwithstanding of this plain and explicit declaration, the editor of the Reformed Presbyterian makes an attempt to prove, that we confine the Mediator's authority to the church, according to what is stated in Reformation Principles Exhibited, and which we have pronounced a slander. However, his proofs, which he has adduced in refutation of this charge of slander, do most unequivocally substantiate it, as they expressly show that Seceders do not, and never did maintain that Christ's mediatorial authority was confined to the church. But we have not time nor room at present for any lengthened discussion of this matter. Only we would say, that although Seceders believe in Christ's mediatorial headship over the nations, yea, over all things, yet it is very probable, that none of them believe in it, in the same sense in which Mr. Roney does. For if we understand him, he makes the Mediator to be head of the Chinese Empire, in the same sense in which he is head of the Church, "which is his body."

In this connection we may also state, that a communication has just been handed to us, subscribed, *Veritas et Pax*, whose object it is to convict us of a mistake in having said in our April No., that the Reformed Presbyterian Synod had refused to correct certain misstatements of which the Associate Synod had made complaint, and also, that the disclaimer of the latter Synod had not been deemed sufficient.

Our Synod first made this disclaimer in a letter addressed to the Reformed Synod, June 1826, giving at the same time a brief statement of our principles on the several points of our profession, which had been misrepresented. In reply to that letter the Reformed Synod did indeed say, as quoted by *Veritas et Pax*, that they would "gladly correct any misapprehensions into which they had fallen," &c. This, however, was not done. Our Synod again sent them another letter containing a further statement and illustration of our views on the points in dispute.

Still the correction was not made. After this another letter was sent repeating in brief and distinct statements what we believed, and what we did not believe, in relation to the matters in controversy. But still the correction was not made. At length, after six years from the receipt of our first disclaimer, and in reply to a long letter, the Reformed Synod sent us the following Resolution, which is also cited by *Veritas et Pax*:

"Resolved, that the committee of foreign correspondence be directed to inform the Associate Synod, that if furnished with a brief and distinct statement of the views entertained by Seceders, on the points in question, such statement shall be embodied in the next edition of our Narrative."

It now seems that Reformed Presbyterians consider themselves justifiable in continuing to embody in their Narrative misrepresentations of the principles of Seceders, at least until the misrepresented party, notwithstanding all the disclaimers and assertory statements they have already made, shall give to their *accusers* another "brief and distinct statement of their views on the points in question." Whether justice, then, will ever be done us by our Reformed brethren, is made to depend on several contingencies;—will our Synod ever make the proposed statement? if so, will the Reformed brethren consider it sufficiently *brief and distinct*? and if so, will there ever be another edition of their Narrative, in which to embody it? But enough at present. We may afterwards canvass these matters more fully.

Let our readers judge then how much we were mistaken in saying, "such correction, however, was refused to be made. The *disclaimer* of the Associate Synod was not deemed *sufficient*." Nothing but want of room prevents us from giving *Veritas et Pax* entire.

---

#### ART. XII. *Transfer of the Religious Monitor.*

With the present number our connection with the Religious Monitor ceases. When Mr. Webster transferred to us his interest in the Monitor, Nov. 1835, he reserved to himself the privilege of resuming it at the end of the present volume, if he should see proper so to do. This privilege he chooses to exercise. We accordingly re-assign to him the Monitor with all its dues. The next No. will be published at Philadelphia. For further particulars we refer the reader to the Advertisement on the cover. There are two or three communications on hand, which will be transmitted to Mr. Webster. In parting with our patrons, we trust we shall not cease to commend them to God and the word of his grace. We thank them kindly for the patronage they have bestowed on us, and for their evident disposition to overlook the defects of the Monitor while under our control. And in now parting with them, it is matter of consolation to us, to think that they may have received some spiritual benefit from our labors.

## CONTENTS OF VOL. XV.

### No. 1.

Page.	Page.
<i>Art. I.</i> Minutes of the Associate Synod for 1832 . . . . .	3-45
<i>Art. II.</i> The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church . . . . .	45-48

### No. 2.

<i>Art. I.</i> Historical Sketch of the United Brethren or Moravians, (continued from vol. xiv. p. 541) . . . . .	49	<i>Art. V.</i> Precious Remedies against Satan's Devices, (continued from vol. xiv. p. 582) . . . . .	80
<i>Art. II.</i> Address to the Students of the Theological Seminary . . . . .	55	<i>Art. VI.</i> The General Synod of the Reformed Dutch Church . . . . .	86
<i>Art. III.</i> Future Retribution . . . . .	63	<i>Art. VII.</i> Missionary Intelligence . . . . .	91
<i>Art. IV.</i> Extracts from a Clergyman's Diary . . . . .	76	<i>Art. VIII.</i> American Bible Society . . . . .	94
		<i>Art. IX.</i> Comparative Strength of Parties . . . . .	98

### No. 3.

<i>Art. I.</i> Address to the Students of the Theological Seminary (concluded) . . . . .	97	<i>Art. VII.</i> General Assembly of the Church of Scotland . . . . .	133
<i>Art. II.</i> On Changing a Religious Profession . . . . .	107	<i>Art. VIII.</i> The Abolition of Slavery in the West Indies . . . . .	137
<i>Art. III.</i> Precious Remedies against Satan's Devices, (continued from page 86,) . . . . .	116	<i>Art. IX.</i> A Schism attempted in the Associate Church . . . . .	139
<i>Art. IV.</i> Abbreviated Creeds . . . . .	121	<i>Art. X.</i> Notices . . . . .	142
<i>Art. V.</i> Act of the General Assembly, &c. . . . .	123	<i>Art. XI.</i> Ecclesiastical Record . . . . .	142
<i>Art. VI.</i> Reformed Presbyterian Synod in Ireland . . . . .	125	Advertisement . . . . .	143

### No. 4.

<i>Art. I.</i> Charges delivered at the Installation of the Rev. John G. Smart, to the pastoral inspection of the Associate Presbyterian Congregation in the City of Baltimore, Md. May 2, 1838 . . . . .	145	<i>Art. VI.</i> Peculiar Fastidiousness of the Age in respect to Ministers . . . . .	174
<i>Art. II.</i> Reflections on the Treatment of our Colored Population . . . . .	151	<i>Art. VII.</i> Remarks before the Jefferson County Anti-Slavery Society . . . . .	177
<i>Art. III.</i> A Memorial to the Committee of the Edinburgh Bible Society . . . . .	158	<i>Art. VIII.</i> Correspondence, &c. . . . .	182
<i>Art. IV.</i> Ministerial Flattery . . . . .	165	<i>Art. IX.</i> Precious Remedies against Satan's Devices, (continued from page 121.) . . . . .	184
<i>Art. V.</i> Abiding in Christ . . . . .	167	<i>Art. X.</i> Insufficient Causes of Secession . . . . .	187
		<i>Art. XI.</i> Psalmody . . . . .	189
		<i>Art. XII.</i> On the Causes of Irreligion in Children . . . . .	191
		<i>Art. XIII.</i> Notices . . . . .	191

### No. 5.

<i>Art. I.</i> Historical Sketch of the United Brethren or Moravians, (continued from page 53,) . . . . .	193	<i>Art. VI.</i> Liberality without Principle . . . . .	210
<i>Art. II.</i> Charges delivered at the Installation of the Rev. John G. Smart, to the pastoral inspection of the Associate Presbyterian Congregation in the city of Baltimore, Md., May 2, 1832, (concluded from page 150,) . . . . .	201	<i>Art. VII.</i> The Sandwich Islands . . . . .	224
<i>Art. III.</i> Some Strictures on the Associate Presbyterian Magazine . . . . .	205	<i>Art. VIII.</i> "Forsake not the assembling of yourselves together," . . . . .	226
<i>Art. IV.</i> Observations on the Divine Glory of Christ, as the Son of God . . . . .	210	<i>Art. IX.</i> Ministers' and Deacons' Children . . . . .	228
<i>Art. V.</i> General Thoughts on Psalm lxxxix. 15 . . . . .	216	<i>Art. X.</i> Precious Remedies against Satan's Devices, (continued from page 184,) . . . . .	229
		<i>Art. XI.</i> Brief Memoir of Andries Stoffes . . . . .	232
		<i>Art. XII.</i> Prayer in Affliction . . . . .	235
		<i>Art. XIII.</i> Memoirs of Ezekiel Cheever . . . . .	236
		<i>Art. XIV.</i> Miscellany . . . . .	238
		<i>Art. XV.</i> Notices . . . . .	239

### No. 6.

<i>Art. I.</i> Exposition of Romans viii. 18-23 . . . . .	241	<i>Art. VII.</i> A Short Sermon . . . . .	270
<i>Art. II.</i> Historical Sketch of the United Brethren or Moravians, (continued from page 201,) . . . . .	251	<i>Art. VIII.</i> Respect to Age . . . . .	281
<i>Art. III.</i> The Asso. Presbyterian Magazine . . . . .	256	<i>Art. IX.</i> State of Religion in Prussia . . . . .	282
<i>Art. IV.</i> Letter from the Asso. Synod of Original Seceders to the Asso. Synod of N. America . . . . .	260	<i>Art. X.</i> Ecclesiastical Proceedings relative to the General Assemblies . . . . .	284
<i>Art. V.</i> Proceedings of the Associate Reformed Synod of New-York . . . . .	268	<i>Art. XI.</i> Miscellany . . . . .	287
<i>Art. VI.</i> Precious Remedies against Satan's Devices, (continued from page 232,) . . . . .	274	Choice Sayings of Richard Cecil . . . . .	287
		Better Days . . . . .	288
		Hindoo Absurdity . . . . .	288
		<i>Art. XII.</i> Notices . . . . .	288

## No. 7.

<i>Art. I.</i> Historical Sketch of the United Brethren or Moravians, (continued from page 304.)	289	<i>Art. VIII.</i> Proceedings of the Convention	331
<i>Art. II.</i> The Gospel hid to them that are lost	291	<i>Art. IX.</i> Miscellaneous Items	331
<i>Art. III.</i> Recollections of a Sermon	305	Synod of Cincinnati	334
<i>Art. IV.</i> Obituary of the Rev. Samuel Douthat	311	A "Lamb."	334
<i>Art. V.</i> Slavery Essentially Immoral	319	Betting on Elections	334
<i>Art. VI.</i> Personal existence of God denied	325	Important Concession	335
<i>Art. VII.</i> Family Government	325	I, and I, and I, and I, and I	335
		<i>Art. X.</i> Notices	336

## No. 8.

<i>Art. I.</i> Historical Sketch of the United Brethren or Moravians, (concluded from page 294.)	337	<i>Art. VII.</i> Poetry—Adrian	375
<i>Art. II.</i> Slavery essentially immoral, (concluded from page 325.)	343	<i>Art. VIII.</i> Excommunication of the Burghers—A mistake corrected	377
<i>Art. III.</i> An examination of the decision of the Associate Synod of 1-32, respecting the two parties claiming to be the Presbytery of Albany	350	<i>Art. IX.</i> A Pro-Slavery Argument considered	378
<i>Art. IV.</i> Family Government, (continued from page 330.)	361	Miscellaneous Items	379
<i>Art. V.</i> Precious Remedies against Satan's Devices, (continued from page 279.)	368	The Law Suit—Hiring a Minister	379
<i>Art. VI.</i> Eight Reasons against Universalism	372	Thanksgiving	380
		Betting on Elections—American Missionary Society	381
		On Private Prayer—Malta	382
		The Infidel's Death Bed	383
		Religion of the Heart essential to success	384

## No. 9.

<i>Art. I.</i> A Review of the Associate Presbyterian Magazine	385	<i>Art. III.</i> Missionary Intelligence—Madagascar	421
<i>Art. II.</i> Partiality	430	<i>Art. IV.</i> Notices	432

## No. 10.

<i>Art. I.</i> A Word of Admonition and Warning to Congregations	433	<i>Art. VII.</i> Precious Remedies, &c. (concluded)	463
<i>Art. II.</i> Further Reflections on the Treatment of our Colored Population	438	<i>Art. VIII.</i> A Reply to an Article in the Associate Presbyterian Magazine, entitled "The Examination examined"	467
<i>Art. III.</i> Inceptum occultare proditores	442	<i>Art. IX.</i> A Letter from the Rev. Joseph McCarell, D. D. S. T. P. to the Editor of the Rel. Monitor—with accompanying Remarks	477
<i>Art. IV.</i> Free Communion, &c.	449	<i>Art. X.</i> Notices	480
<i>Art. V.</i> Misrepresentations Corrected	454		
<i>Art. VI.</i> Letter to the Editor of the Rel. Mon.	459		

## No. 11.

<i>Art. I.</i> Extracts from a Clergyman's Diary	481	<i>Art. VI.</i> Inceptum occultare proditores—No. 2	502
<i>Art. II.</i> Further Reflections on the Treatment of our Colored Population, (concluded from page 442.)	484	<i>Art. VII.</i> The Pittsburgh Convention	513
<i>Art. III.</i> The Case of the Rev. A. T. McGill	490	<i>Art. VIII.</i> Mr. Stark and his Credentials	518
<i>Art. IV.</i> The Man born blind	495	<i>Art. IX.</i> Mr. Stark and his Protest	523
<i>Art. V.</i> More Misrepresentations Corrected	500	<i>Art. X.</i> A Letter from Mr. Webster relative to one of the Forgeries	525
		<i>Art. XI.</i> Notice—A New Book	529

## No. 12.

<i>Art. I.</i> The Case of the Rev. A. T. McGill, (concluded from page 485.)	529	<i>Art. VI.</i> A Disclaimer	561
<i>Art. II.</i> Obituary of Mr. Alexander Bachop	537	<i>Art. VII.</i> An injurious Report corrected	568
<i>Art. III.</i> Inceptum occultare proditores—No. 3	540	<i>Art. VIII.</i> Some Interrogatories put to A. R.	563
<i>Art. IV.</i> Another Letter from Mr. Webster in relation to the Forgeries and Other Matters	549	<i>Art. IX.</i> Family Government, (concluded from page 386.)	564
<i>Art. V.</i> A new series of Falsehoods detected and exposed	553	<i>Art. X.</i> Slavery and Literature	570
		<i>Art. XI.</i> The Reformed Presbyterian	572
		<i>Art. XII.</i> Transfer of the Religious Monitor	574