

ANDOVER-HARVARD LIBRARY



AH 69VM 9

P. Colman

Harvard Divinity School



ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY

MDCCCX

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

BOUGHT FROM THE FUND
GIVEN IN MEMORY OF

RUSHTON DASHWOOD BURR
Divinity School, Class of 1852

The gift of Mrs. Burr

Solus

THE *Journal*

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.

EDITED BY C. WEBSTER,

Pastor of the First Associate Congregation, Philadelphia.

VOLUME XVI.

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.

PHILADELPHIA:
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY WILLIAM S. YOUNG,
173, RACE STREET.

1839-40.

ADVERTISEMENT.

For the information of such as may not have seen the Prospectus for the *sixteenth* volume of " *The Religious Monitor*," it is proper to remark, that our aim is to make the work conformable to the import of its title.

We disavow all sectarian views, all party spirit, and all unkind feelings towards any who may differ from us. The path of religious controversy is sufficiently thorny when strewn with the flowers of candour, gentleness, humility, and brotherly kindness; and in the absence of these graces of the Spirit, it becomes rugged and intolerable. We shall honestly labour to effect a closer union among the friends of truth, in the only way in which it is believed to be at all practicable, namely, *agreement in doctrine and discipline*.

Offensive personal allusions—matters of a merely personal character—comments respecting individual cases of discipline, beyond such as are authorized by the church courts—impeachment of motives, and remarks tending to foster party spirit, or the rivalry of men, must be excluded with sedulous care. But, on the other hand, we respectfully tender the use of our pages to the lovers of truth and good order. And all who may favour us with original articles, are invited to mark the insidious encroachments of error, in whatever quarter it may appear.

A monthly synopsis of religious intelligence, drawn from the most authentic sources, from all parts of the world, may be looked for without interruption.

It seems incumbent on us to embrace the present opportunity, for expressing our obligations to early correspondents and patrons; and it is hoped a renewed acquaintance may prove mutually profitable in a greater degree than formerly. To you, dear brethren, and others of a like mind, must we look for countenance and support, for the maintenance, in a dissolute age, of those vital principles, which involve the present and future happiness of ourselves, our children, and our fellow men. Through the many changes, revolutions, and apostacies of modern times, God, in sovereign mercy, has continued among us a pure dispensation of gospel ordinances, which renders it obligatory on us, not only to walk in his ways, but also to transmit the "unspeakable gift" to the succeeding generation.

C. WEBSTER.

Philadelphia, June, 1839.

Period: 1718.55

v. 16

MINUTES

1839-1840

Of the Associate Synod of North America, at their Meeting in Pittsburgh, May 22d, 1839, and continued by adjournment, being their Thirty-Sixth Annual Meeting.

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

MEMBERS PRESENT.

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

Of the Presbytery of Cambridge.

MINISTERS.

Abraham Anderson, James P. Miller, *David Gordon.

ELDERS.

James Reid, John Law,
John Bishop, *John Robertson.

Of the Presbytery of Albany.

MINISTERS.

Peter Campbell, James Martin.

ELDERS.

James Smilie, Elisha Putnam, *James Geery.

Of the Presbytery of Philadelphia.

MINISTERS.

John G. Smart, *F. W. McNaughton,
Chauncey Webster, *John S. Easton.

ELDERS.

Samuel Johnston, *William Cummings,
William S. Young, *Joseph R. Dickson.
*William Morris,

Of the Presbytery of Illinois.

MINISTER.

James C. Bruce.

ELDER.

Aniel Rodgers.

Of the Presbytery of Indiana.

MINISTERS.

J. M. Henderson, George M. Hall, *James Dickson.

ELDER.

William Patterson.

Of the Presbytery of Miami.

MINISTERS.

Samuel Wilson, Andrew Heron.

ELDERS.

David Brown,
Hugh Hamil,

William Scott,
Thomas Rough.

Of the Presbytery of Richland.

MINISTERS.

David Lindsay,
Joseph M'Kee,
Robert Forrester,

*Samuel Irvine,
*Samuel Hindman.

ELDERS.

John Wilson,

William Collier,

John M'Dowell.

Of the Presbytery of Muskingum.

MINISTERS.

John Walker,
Thomas Hanna,
Daniel M'Lane, Jr.
Joseph Clokey,
Andrew Isaac,

Thomas Wilson,
*James Patterson,
Samuel M'Arthur,
James M'Gill.

ELDERS.

John Cunningham,
John Auld,
Francis Grove,
David Harvey,

David R. Little,
Thomas Latta,
John Warnock,
*Samuel Connelly.

Of the Presbytery of Ohio.

MINISTERS.

David Imbrie,
Alexander Murray,
*Elijah N. Scroggs,
*David Goodwillie,

William Douthet,
Joseph Banks,
James P. Ramsay.

ELDERS.

Andrew Glenn,
Joseph Stewart,
Joseph Lewis,

*John Stewart,
*John Sharp.

Of the Presbytery of Chartiers.

MINISTERS.

William Wilson,
Thomas Allison,
James Ramsay, D. D.,
*Thomas Beveridge, D. D.,
David French,

Alexander Donnan,
William M. M'Elwee,
Bankhead Boyd,
*David Thompson.

ELDERS.

Benjamin Babbett,
Matthew Atcheson,
Samuel Neily,
Robert Leiper,

*William Pollock,
*Andrew Russell,
*Samuel Brownlee,
*Samuel M'Ewen.

Of the Presbytery of Shenango.

MINISTERS.

Daniel M'Lane, Sen.	Matthew Snodgrass,
John France,	William C. Pollock.

ELDER.

David White.

Of the Presbytery of Allegheny.

MINISTERS.

Robert Bruce, D. D.,	John Hindman,
Joseph Scroggs,	James Rodgers,
David Blair,	William Galbraith.

ELDERS.

Thomas Mitchell,	William Bell,
William Smith,	Robert Stewart,
Alexander Gilmore,	*Bernard Gilleland.
Robert Marshall,	

Of the Presbytery of Vermont.

None.

Of the Presbytery of Stamford.

None.

Of the Presbytery of the Carolinas.

None.

Ministers without charge.

Thomas Allison,	*Thomas Ferrier,
*James Templeton,	*Alexander Boyd.

Whole number of Members present, 109.

Mr. John Robertson, ruling elder, from the Congregation of Cambridge, being present, was assumed as a member of Synod.

On motion, it was agreed, to dispense with the reading of the Minutes of last year, as they had been read and approved, previous to publication.

On motion, it was resolved, that the standing hours of meeting and adjournment, be as follow: namely,

Meeting in the morning, 9 o'clock.

Adjournment, half-past 12 o'clock.

Meeting in the afternoon, 2 o'clock.

Adjourned till 9 o'clock, to-morrow morning. Closed with prayer.

Thursday, May 23.

The Moderator having preached, last evening, from Ps. 97. 1. (1st. clause.) "The Lord reigneth, let the earth rejoice,"—the Synod this day met, and was opened with prayer. Members present as above, together with Mr. D. Gordon, minister from the Presbytery of Cambridge; Messrs. M'Naughton and John S. Easton, ministers, and Messrs. William Morris and William Cummings,

ruling elders, from the Presbytery of Philadelphia; Mr. Dickson, minister, from the Presbytery of Indiana; Messrs. Irvine and S. Hindman, ministers, and Mr. John M'Dowell, ruling elder, from the Presbytery of Richland; Mr. Patterson, minister, and Mr. Samuel Connelly, ruling elder, from the Presbytery of Muskingum; Messrs. D. Goodwillie and E. N. Sargogs, ministers, and Messrs. John Stewart and John Sharp, ruling elders, from the Presbytery of Ohio; Dr. Beveridge and Mr. D. Thompson, ministers, and Messrs. William Pollock, Andrew Russell, Samuel Brownlee, and Samuel M'Ewen, ruling elders, from the Presbytery of Chartiers; and Messrs. Ferrier and Templeton, ministers without charge. Mr. Joseph R. Dickson, ruling elder, from the Second Congregation of Philadelphia, being present, was invited to a seat.

The Minutes of yesterday's sitting were read and approved.

Mr. M'Naughton was chosen Moderator.

The following standing committees were appointed, namely,
 Committee of Supplies—Messrs. Anderson, Martin, Smart, James Bruce, Dickson, S. Wilson, M'Kee, Hanna, Goodwillie, Dr. Ramsay, Messrs. Pollock, and J. Hindman.

Committee of Bills and Overtures—Messrs. Walker, Clokey, and Hanna.

Committee on the Funds—Messrs. Miller, Morris, and Webster.

Committee on the Theological Seminary—Dr. Ramsay, Dr. Beveridge, and Mr. Rodgers.

Committee on Appeals—Dr. Beveridge, and Messrs. Smart and Martin.

Committee on Missions—Dr. Bruce, and Messrs. John S. Easton and S. Wilson.

Committee to transcribe the Minutes—Messrs. D. Gordon and B. Boyd.

On motion, it was resolved, that a committee be appointed to draught an act for a fast. Messrs. S. Hindman and Miller, were appointed said committee.

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

No. 1. The Report of the Presbytery of Illinois, which was, on motion, referred to the committee of Supplies, the committee on the Funds, and also of Bills and Overtures.

Report of the Presbytery of Illinois.

The Presbytery of Illinois, according to the order of Synod, was constituted on the 8th day of August last, after sermon, by the Rev. James C. Bruce, from Acts 16. 4. Since the first occupation of our bounds as a missionary field, the cause of truth has been successful in proportion to the attention given to the vacancies. Secession principles have taken root, and we trust the labour of Synod has not been in vain in the Lord. But although much has been gained, yet within the last two years much has been lost; our vacancies, with a few exceptions, have been visibly on the decline. This is owing in a great measure to their having been almost entirely neglected, and left destitute of the usual portion of supply. Several members of these vacancies finding themselves neglected, and giving up all hope of obtaining a settled ministry, have connected themselves with other branches of the church, or removed to settlements still farther west. This has been truly discouraging to those who remained steadfast. But we trust that these solitary places will yet have reason to rejoice. The organization of a Presbytery in this western wilderness, appears already to have had its influence, in reviving the spirits of the Lord's people, and in giving a new impulse to their exertions.

As a Presbytery, our location is peculiar. We are situated in a region where the principles of the Associate Church meet with a formidable opposition, where the most

gross errors are promulgated, and received with avidity. Even those errors, many of which do not flourish in a more enlightened part of the community, here meet with but little restraint; for such is the scarcity of the word, and so seldom is it preached, that whoever comes in the character of a gospel minister, it matters not what are his principles, he is joyfully received, and encouraged in his administrations.

In many places within our bounds, members of almost all the variety of religious denominations are found mingled together, and entirely destitute of the word of life. Among such there are many, who profess to approve of secession principles, and manifest an earnest desire to unite with us in a scriptural profession as soon as an opportunity is afforded. From these we have received repeated calls for preaching. To these calls we have not been able to respond for the want of ministerial aid, for such a small portion of supply was received during the last year, that Presbytery could not without injury to the vacancies occupy any new station.

Our settled congregations are gradually increasing. The vacancies under our care have been much refreshed by the labours of Mr. John L. M'Lean, who with fidelity and acceptance fulfilled the appointments of Presbytery.

Mr. Samuel M'Lean has not appeared within our bounds, nor rendered any reason for the non-fulfilment of his appointment. By this failure our congregations have sustained a severe loss. The frequent complaints of Presbyteries on this subject surely call for the immediate action of synod, that more energetic measures may be taken, to put an end to this system of independency, and to secure to the destitute their promised portion.

The vacancies have this year been as liberal as usual, but the amount received has not been sufficient for the payment of the supply sent. Having no funds at their disposal, Presbytery have agreed that they will, and hereby do, respectfully solicit Synod to grant to Mr. John L. M'Lean the sum of fourteen dollars, the balance due to him for his services within our bounds.

There is, perhaps, no section of the church where the demand for a supply of preaching is more urgent. We hope, therefore, that Synod will grant us as much as is consistent with the welfare of other sections of the church, and it would be more advantageous, both to the congregations, and the persons appointed, if the supply were sent in the summer, rather than in the winter months.

The Synod's fast, as far as has been ascertained by us, was observed by our members.

A call for the Rev. John L. M'Lean, from the united congregations of Apple Creek, and Buffalo, has been sustained, and is herewith transmitted to Synod, with a request that it be presented as soon as practicable.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES C. BRUCE, *Moderator.*

ANDREW RODGERS, *Presbytery Clerk.*

No. 2. The Report of the Presbytery of Miami—referred as above.

Report of the Presbytery of Miami.

Since our last report to Synod, our ministerial aid has been greatly diminished. As is shown by the minutes of Synod's commission, the pastoral relation of Mr. James Adams to the congregation of Massie's Creek, was dissolved by his deposition from the holy office of the gospel ministry in July last.

At a meeting of Presbytery in the same month, our brother, Rev. James Templeton, tendered to Presbytery his resignation of the pastoral charge of the congregation of Sugar Creek, which was reluctantly accepted.

In consequence of the greatly increased demand on Presbytery for supply of gospel ordinances, especially through these two congregations being thrown destitute upon our care, the injury sustained through the entire failure of Mr. W. H. Walker to fulfil his Synodical appointment in our bounds was the more sensibly felt; and here we feel constrained to complain of this growing evil, and would urge Synod to adopt such measures as will secure the more certain fulfilment of your appointments. While we feel constrained thus to complain of the delinquency of this young brother, we are bound, also, to acknowledge the liberality of the Presbytery of Albany and Philadelphia, in remitting to this Presbytery, upon application made by us to that effect, the portion of Mr. I. N. Laughhead's labours allowed them by Synod.

Agreeably to the direction of Synod, Presbytery took Mr. I. N. Laughhead on trial for licensure. After delivering the usual pieces of trial, he was on the 10th of July licensed to preach the everlasting gospel, and has since that time, with the exception of several weeks, during which time he was prevented by sickness, been actively and very acceptably engaged in the service of the church.

A call from the congregation of Massie's Creek on Mr. James P. Smart, has been sustained by Presbytery, and was, on the 10th April presented, and by him accepted: his ordination and installation have not yet taken place.

Two calls on Mr. I. N. Laughead,—one of them from Poplar Ridge, Planefield, and Renton, and the other from Pistol Creek, Big Spring, and Salem, have been received and sustained; we, therefore, earnestly request Synod to send Mr. Laughead into our bounds immediately, that we may have a speedy opportunity of presenting these calls.

Application has been made by Presbytery, to the settled congregations under their care, for contributions to meet the necessary expenses of Synod's commission: we regret that we are under the necessity of reporting that our application, owing to several causes, was not entirely successful; a balance of \$16,40, is yet due to members of that commission, and, as we apprehend another application for contribution from those congregations would be unavailing, we are under the necessity of applying to Synod for the means of liquidating this balance.

The case of Rev. James Lyle having been by Synod referred to this Presbytery, we tabled against him a libel embodying the charges informally preferred against him by Synod, and took every other step legally requisite to a fair investigation of his case; but when the time appointed for trial arrived, Mr. Lyle neither appeared, nor sent us any manner of communication; we were informed, however, by letter, by a brother, that Mr. Lyle had left Jacksonville, Ala., his former residence, and again removed—our corresponding informant could not tell us whither: we have some difficulty to know what farther step to take in his case, and, therefore, request Synod to take his case into their own hands, or give us farther instructions.

A liberal portion of the supply at Synod's disposal is earnestly requested. The necessity of this request will appear the more manifest from a statement of the fact, that a new vacancy in Adams County, Ohio, has lately been taken under our care, the necessities and prospects of which are such that we have considered it our duty at our present meeting to pledge ourselves to give them supply, if practicable, for one-fourth of the ensuing year.

SAMUEL WILSON, *Presbytery Clerk.*

Respectfully submitted,

ANDREW HERON, *Mod.*

Xenia, May 8th, 1839.

No. 3. The Report of the Presbytery of Muskingum, which was, on motion, referred to the committee of Supplies.

Report of the Presbytery of Muskingum.

In presenting this, our annual report, to the Synod, we have reason to acknowledge the good hand of God upon us, during the past year. Our harmony and external prosperity have met with no particular interruption, and our hands have been greatly strengthened by the addition of acceptable ministerial aid.

Messrs. Samuel M'Arthur and James M'Gill, having given the usual probationary exercises, much to our satisfaction, were each ordained and installed as Pastors in the congregations respectively whose calls they accepted at last meeting of Synod.

Messrs. J. W. Harsha, William H. Walker, and John L. M'Lean, were also duly licensed to preach the everlasting gospel. Although we have but one organized vacancy within our bounds, yet there are several calls made on us, by a few families in different places for supply of preaching. In some instances these openings are very promising. The Presbytery have taken measures to raise funds to aid in sending supply to those who are desirous of obtaining it, but are as yet unable to meet the necessary expenses. We therefore ask a full proportion of the supply that may be at the disposal of Synod.

On inquiry, it was ascertained that all the members of Presbytery had observed the Synodical fast.

By order of Presbytery,

THOMAS HANNA, *Presbytery Clerk.*

No. 4. The Report of the Presbytery of Shenango, which was, on motion, referred back to said Presbytery for correction.

No. 5. A call from Apple Creek and Buffalo, for Mr. JOHN L. M'Lean, which was, on motion, laid on the table.

No. 6. A petition from Randolph County, Illinois, praying for a speedy issue of the case of the Rev. Isaac Beggs, and the enjoyment of his labours among them, as their stated pastor. This petition was, on motion, laid on the table, until the report of the Presbytery of Indiana shall be received.

No. 7. A memorial from certain members of the Associate Con-

gregation of Cadiz, respecting the duty of public covenanting. This memorial was, on motion, referred to a select committee, with instructions to report at the present meeting. Dr. Beveridge and Mr. Martin were appointed said committee.

No. 8. A Report of the Presbytery of Miami, on the printed draught of a book of discipline. This report was, on motion, laid on the table.

No. 9. A call from Tuscaloosa for Mr. Joseph T. Cooper. This call was, on motion, referred to the Presbytery of Miami.

No. 10. The Report of the Presbytery of Stamford. As there is no member present from said Presbytery, and as a standing rule of Synod prohibits the receiving of a report from any Presbytery which has no representative present in the Synod, it was, on motion, resolved, that the aforesaid rule be rescinded. The Report was then read, and on motion, referred to the committee of supplies, and on the funds.

Report of the Presbytery of Stamford.

No material change has taken place in our settled congregations since last meeting of Synod. The supply allotted to us was received, which, we trust, has proved refreshing to our vacancies.

We regret to observe that the small balance due to Mr. McGill, for missionary services in our bounds last year, was not paid. This, we believe, was an oversight, owing to the press of business. To prevent such an occurrence, Presbytery have paid whatever arrears were due to Messrs. Small and Walker, (namely, \$16,25 to the former, and \$12 to the latter,) and wish to do so in future to those who may be appointed to us, if we be allowed by Synod, to retain, and apply, to this purpose the collections that have been, or may be raised in our congregations for Synod's funds, so far as this may go. In hope of being allowed to do so, we retain for the present, a collection from the Associate congregation of Dumfries, amounting to \$15,37½.

Presbytery have sustained a call from London Congregation, for Mr. Edward Small, preacher, which we transmit to Synod for presentation.

We trust, that Synod will grant us as liberal a supply of preachers as circumstances will permit. Supply equal to a preacher the whole year, would be desirable, as we have the prospect of soon organizing another congregation in Chinguaconse, and would wish to be able to meet other applications.

As Synod's former intention of making to our Presbytery a donation of Testimonies has never been carried into effect, we hope that it may be done now, as the want is great and increasing.

A day of fasting has been generally observed by our congregations, but it has been found that that appointed by Synod is often at a season when it is very difficult for many of our people to attend. We would therefore suggest the propriety of a later period in the winter being fixed, if a simultaneous and universal observance is expected.

DAVID COUTTS, *Moderator.*

Messrs. Miller, D. Gordon, John Robertson, and John Bishop, asked and obtained leave of absence.

No. 11. A memorial from James Mitchell on slavery, and

No. 12. A memorial from certain brethren of the Congregation of Massie's Creek, in relation to the Ferguson case, now in the hands of Synod. Both these memorials were, on motion, referred to the committee of Bills and Overtures.

No. 13. A communication from the Rev. Dr. Pressly, as a member of a committee appointed by the Convention of the Reformed Churches lately held in this city, containing a copy of the proceedings of said Convention, and requesting the appointment of delegates, by this Synod, to attend another meeting of the Convention, to be held at Philadelphia, on the third Thursday of September next. This communication was, on motion, referred to a select

committee, consisting of Dr. Ramsay, Dr. Beveridge, and Mr. Anderson.

The commission appointed to meet at Massie's Creek, last July, laid their Minutes on the Synod's table, and on motion, the commissioners were ordered to prepare a condensed report of their proceedings, to be published with the Minutes of Synod.

During the progress of the discussion, in relation to the above Minutes, the members of the Presbytery of Chartiers, had asked and obtained leave of absence during the remainder of the present sitting.

Adjourned till 2 o'clock. Closed with prayer.

2 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 and read, namely,

No 14. The Report of the Presbytery of Cambridge, which was, on motion, referred to a select committee, consisting of Dr. Ramsay and Mr. J. Scroggs.

Report of the Associate Presbytery of Cambridge.

The Associate Presbytery of Cambridge report, that though they have cause to bless God, that he is still maintaining his cause among us, and has been "*lifting up a standard when the enemy was coming in as a flood*," yet there is occasion for *great searchings of heart for the divisions of Reuben*. This Presbytery have suffered the loss of one member, the Rev. A. Whyte, since the last meeting of Synod, by withdrawal; but, with this exception, they have, through the mercy of God, enjoyed peace among themselves, and harmony of sentiment and action. Yet they have with grief seen the congregations under their care tempted and disturbed by separatists, and some of the people drawn away from their profession. *Christ's fan is in his hand, and he is purging his floor*, and though the Presbytery feel it as a chastisement, they believe that it is a work of mercy for the support of truth and godliness. But as Christ's work, whether of mercy or of judgment, requires action of his followers, so the attention, not only of Presbytery, but of Synod, is necessary to this section of the church. (The attention of Synod is especially requested to the conduct of those whose sentence of deposition, they last year confirmed, and of others who have taken part and encouraged them in their disobedience and disorder.) Dr. A. Bullions and Mr. Stalker have continued the exercise of the ministry in ordinances both teaching and sealing; they have disregarded and trampled on the decisions of Synod as well as of Presbytery, and contemned the authority and order of Christ's house. They have set an example of insubordination which some of the people have followed, and become fugitives from discipline. Their doctrines virtually denying church government and discipline, have been embraced by the latitudinarian, the ignorant and unstable. They have entered other congregations than their own under the care of this Presbytery, dispensed ordinances among them, and led some of the unstable from the communion of the Associate Church in devotion to persons and to a party. The Associate Presbytery of Vermont, have encouraged them and assisted in these disorders and schisms, by one of the grossest outrages on Presbyterial order and government, respecting which, a special report will be laid before Synod. Those deposed ministers have held out the idea to their people and to others, that the decisions of Synod in their cases were not final—that their protests were admitted, and that they have a right to preach under them, contrary to the express decisions of Synod in these cases, and many profess to follow them through the influence of these representations. It is hoped that Synod will not allow these measures and representations to pass unreprieved, nor suffer the people to be farther ensnared without taking such measures as may be calculated to undeceive the ignorant, to correct mistaken apprehensions, and to maintain the order of the Presbyterial church government. The Presbytery have endeavoured to deal with Messrs. Stalker and Bullions, according to the order of Synod, but have received little in answer to their citations but refusals and expressions of contempt. Presbytery would ask the advice of Synod what farther measures they

should take in the cases of these men respectively. A special report on the case of the Rev. A. Whyte, will be laid before Synod.

Presbytery acknowledge the diligence and faithfulness of the Synod's commissioners, Messrs. M'Kee and M'Gill, although their labours did not produce the desired results.

The vacancies attached to this Presbytery in Canada have had but little supply during the past year. The necessities of the congregations in the immediate vicinity of the members of Presbytery, have required special attention on account of their peculiar circumstances; and much of the supply allotted to this portion of the church by Synod was appointed at such a season, that the Presbytery could not avail themselves of it for the assistance of the vacancies in Canada. The Presbytery would renew their request that Synod would allow some special supply to those vacancies, and furnish the necessary expenses of it. Presbytery acknowledge the commendable punctuality of the probationers sent to them in the fulfilment of their appointments. The Rev. George M. Hall, by an arrangement with a member of this Presbytery, has been in our bounds for some months; and though we regret the privation which his congregation in Indiana have suffered by his absence and by the Providential failure of the arrangement for supply in his place, yet we feel grateful for the acceptable assistance thus providentially rendered to us and the congregations under our care. Presbytery still request such a share of supply as Synod can afford. There is due to Mr. James Law, the sum of \$15, for missionary services in Lower Canada, which Presbytery request Synod to furnish from their funds.

D. GORDON, *Moderator.*

A. ANDERSON, *Presbytery Clerk.*

No. 15. A memorial from the session of Cæsar's Creek, on the subject of occasional hearing, which was, on motion, referred to the committee of Bills and Overtures.

On motion, it was resolved, that the Report of the committee of last year on the Ferguson case, lying on the Synod's table, be referred, together with all the papers relating to said case, to the committee of Bills and Overtures.

No. 16. A memorial from certain brethren under the inspection of the Presbytery of Stamford, complaining of the procedure and decisions of said Presbytery, in refusing to receive and sustain a charge laid against the Associate Session of Dumfries. This memorial was, on motion, referred to a select committee, consisting of Messrs. S. Hindman, Donnan, and Miller.

No. 17. The Report of the Presbytery of Ohio, which was, on motion, recommitted to said Presbytery.

No. 18. A communication from the Associate Synod of original Seceders in Scotland, which was, on motion, referred to a select committee, consisting of Dr. Ramsay, and Messrs. Anderson and Imbrie.

No. 19. The Report of the Presbytery of Albany, which was, on motion, referred to the committee of Supplies.

Report of the Associate Presbytery of Albany.

For some time past the Head of the church has been subjecting to a severe trial the fidelity of this Presbytery, in the matter of "holding fast his name." It is hoped, however, that through the good hand of our God upon us, we shall be enabled to "abide the trial," and "endure to the end," and that our "steadfastness in the faith," will be made manifest to all. It is known to the Synod, that some, who were formerly associated with us in the public maintenance of a witnessing profession, and associated, too, by pledges of the most sacred character, have abandoned our standard—"have gone out from us." This schism, whatever may be pretended to the contrary, originated doubtless in a want of cordial attachment to the principles of our public profession. Hence, though the Presbytery has by this defection been reduced in number, there has been no reduction in point of *real* strength. The cause, in which the Associate Church has displayed her banner, is *really* in as good condition within our bounds as ever it was. However much, therefore, the conduct of our schismatical brethren, and their adherents is to be lamented on their own account, it rather furnishes matter of gratulation than otherwise, when the true

interests of our Zion are taken into consideration. It is truly a dangerous case when "a man's foes are they of his own household." Although, therefore, the Presbytery has been called during the past year, to contend against the most unprincipled opposition, yet that opposition has been from *without*; and hence, the danger arising to our holy cause has not been really so great as in former years, when the same opposition was waged against us, but from *within*.

As the Synod must be aware of the existence of the schism to which we have referred, it will not be necessary that we should, at present, particularize any thing more concerning it. It may be stated, however, that the congregations adhering to the Presbytery appear to be generally in a settled state, and manifest a becoming degree of attachment to the cause of truth as exhibited in our public profession.

The second congregation in the city of New York has been called in the Providence of God to encounter a succession of trials, which have greatly enfeebled it; but we nevertheless hope, that it will prove instrumental in keeping alive the secession cause in that city.

In September last the Presbytery found it necessary to deprive Mr. James Williamson of the authority formerly given him to preach in the Associate Church, and to suspend him from the fellowship thereof, on account of his insubordination and schismatical conduct.

The Presbytery, also, in obedience to the order of Synod undertook "to deal" with the suspended brethren, namely, Messrs. P. Bullions, Stark, and Blair; and having cited them three several times to appear and answer for their misconduct, but without receiving from them the least notice whatever, the Presbytery found itself shut up to the infliction of a higher degree of censure upon them. Accordingly, on the 17th of April last, the aforesaid suspended brethren were in the name and by the authority of Zion's King, deposed from the office of the holy ministry.

The Synodical fast was duly observed by our congregations, though, in some instances, not on the day appointed by the Synod.

Owing to bodily indisposition, our brother Mr. De Freest was unable to fulfil his Synodical appointments at the south.

The Synod is respectfully requested to grant us an adequate portion of supplies for our vacancies during the ensuing year.

Respectfully submitted,
PETER CAMPBELL, *Moderator*.

Pittsburgh, May 23d, 1839.

No. 20. The Report of the Presbytery of Chartiers, which was, on motion, referred to the committee of Supplies.

Report of the Associate Presbytery of Chartiers.

Since the last meeting of Synod the calls reported for Mr. David Thompson, have been presented, and the call to the united congregations of Mount Hope and Cross Creek accepted. He has been accordingly ordained as their pastor. Calls have also been moderated for Mr. John W. Harsha, in the congregations of Noblestown, and also of Ohio, which have been sustained, and are hereby forwarded to the Synod to be presented. The Rev. Alexander Wilson, without any notice given to the Presbytery, has relinquished the congregation of Peter's Creek, and the communion of the Associate Church. His late congregation is to be added to the list of our vacancies, and the Synod will perceive from their statements, that a greater portion of supply than usual will be necessary to meet the wants of this and other vacancies.

Mr. Sawyer was admitted to attend the Theological Seminary, but not having completed the usual preparatory studies, he will give attention to these during the summer in order to his full admission as a student. The members of the Presbytery have all observed the Synodical fast. We have nothing farther to report, unless it be that through the divine goodness, nothing has occurred for several years past to interrupt the harmony of our members, or materially to affect the prosperity of our congregations.

WILLIAM WILSON, *Moderator, pro tem.*
JAMES RAMSAY, *Clerk.*

The Report of the Presbytery of Shenango, as corrected, was given in, and on motion, referred to the committee of Supplies.

To the Associate Synod of North America, to meet in Pittsburgh, 4th Wednesday of May, 1839,

The Presbytery of Shenango report,

That peace and prosperity seem again to be restored, in this portion of Zion, and have reason to be thankful, that we have not such evidences, now, of the Lord's con-

trovery; as we had some time past, in the reduction of our number, and are encouraged, to hope, that his chastenings, in this respect, will ultimately be overruled for profit. The persons allotted by Synod, to supply our vacancies, promptly fulfilled their appointments.

The pastoral relation between Rev. A. Boyd, and his congregation was dissolved, in October last; since that time he has been supplying in some of our vacancies. A call from the united congregations of Springfield, and Rocky Spring, for Mr. Edward Small, was sustained in January last, and on presentation, was by him accepted.

A call has been sustained from the congregation of Mercer, for Mr. James P. Smart, likewise a call from Cherry Run congregation, for half the ministerial labours of the Rev. Thomas Ferrier, which has been sustained by Presbytery, and which we hope will be accepted. No other material changes have taken place; and we again crave of Synod a just proportion of supply.

Respectfully submitted, by order of Presbytery.

WILLIAM C. POLLOCK, *Clerk.*

On motion, it was resolved to inquire how far the Synod's order of last year, in relation to absentees from the Synod's meeting, had been complied with by Presbyteries. After some conversation, it was agreed to suspend the inquiry, and appoint a committee to ascertain to what Presbyteries, respectively, the absentees from last meeting of Synod belong, and report before the Synod rise. Messrs. D. Gordon and Rodgers were appointed said committee.

The records of Presbyteries being called for, the following records were declared to be forward, and referred to their respective committees, as follow: namely,

Those of the Presbytery of Allegheny, referred to Messrs. Dickson and Lindsay.

Those of the Presbytery of Shenango, referred to Messrs. Clokey and Hanna.

Those of the Presbytery of Ohio, referred to Messrs. S. Hindman and Donnan.

Those of the Presbytery of Chartiers, referred to Messrs. J. Scroggs and Imbrie.

Those of the Presbytery of Muskingum, referred to Messrs. Hall and M'Kee.

Those of the Presbytery of Miami, referred to Messrs. Isaac and Irvine.

Those of the Presbytery of Indiana, referred to Messrs. Lindsay and Patterson.

Information was given that the records of the Presbyteries of Richland and Illinois were not in readiness—the excuses offered were sustained.

On motion, Mr. Dickson was added to the committee to transcribe the Minutes.

No. 21. A petition from Sumpter County, Alabama, for supply, which was, on motion, referred to the committee of Supplies.

No. 22. A petition from persons claiming to be the Associate Congregation of Cambridge, complaining of certain grievances in their situation. The Moderator having decided that this paper could not be received, an appeal was taken from the decision, but not sustained. From this decision, Mr. Heron entered his dissent.

On motion, it was agreed to take up the appeals from the decision of the Presbytery of Miami, in relation to the violation of the Synod's rule, on the publication of the purpose of marriage, by Thomas White and Mr. Heron. The report of the committee of

appeals laid on the table last year, was read, together with all the papers connected with the case. The parties were heard and removed, and a motion was made to sustain the appeals. While this motion was under consideration, the Synod adjourned till the usual hour to-morrow morning. Closed with prayer.

Friday, May 24.

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

Mr. Blair gave notice that he protested against the decision of yesterday afternoon, in relation to the petition from the Congregation of Cambridge. In this protest he was joined by Mr. Brown.

On motion, Dr. Ramsay and Mr. Miller were appointed a committee to complete the minute in the above case.

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

No. 22. A memorial from certain brethren in the bounds of the Presbytery of Miami, complaining of certain decisions of Synod last year, in the case of the Presbytery of Albany, Dr. A. Bullions, and Mr. Stalker, and praying for a reconsideration and reversal of said decisions. This memorial was, on motion, referred to a select committee, consisting of Dr. Beveridge, and Messrs. Walker, and J. Scroggs, with power to send for persons and papers.

No. 23. The Report of the Presbytery of Indiana, which was, on motion, referred to the committees of Appeals and Supplies.

Report of the Presbytery of Indiana.

In presenting this our first report to Synod, we have only to state, that agreeably to a previous order of Synod, the Presbytery of Indiana was organized at Bloomington on the eighth of August, 1838. A number of petitions were presented at that meeting, for supply of gospel ordinances, and they have since increased. Judging from the solicitude expressed in these petitions, we are led to believe that there is among the many destitute people within our bounds a hungering and thirsting after righteousness, and to trust that the Lord will in his own good time fill them according to his promise. There appears, also, to be a commendable attention to ordinances where they are enjoyed. During the few months that we have existed in a presbyterial capacity, we have neither witnessed nor felt any thing but peace and tranquillity, and our hope and prayer is that these rare blessings may be long continued with us. But whilst we have cause to rejoice and take courage on the one hand, we have experienced something of divine chastisement on the other. Our brother Mr. Ingles, in consequence of ill health, has preached but three Sabbaths since August, and as there is but little hope entertained of his recovery soon, it would seem but just that some provision be made for supplying his destitute congregations. A liberal portion of Synod's aid is earnestly solicited on another account. Mr. Hall having been disappointed in his expectation of one to fill his pulpit during his absence the last winter, his people have been destitute the principal part of the time, and as it is probable that he will feel it necessary, for providential reasons, to resign his charge soon, they may be vacant a considerable part of the ensuing year. A call from the Associate Congregation of Bloomington for the ministerial labours of Mr. Isaac N. Laughead, has been sustained by Presbytery, which, together with the accompanying papers, is herewith transmitted to Synod, to be presented to the candidate with other competing calls. Also, a call from the united congregations of Princeton and Midway for Mr. John L. McLean has been sustained by Presbytery, which, together with other accompanying papers, is herewith handed over to Synod for presentation. We have farther to state that Mr. James A. Brown having requested the privilege of prosecuting his studies under the care of Presbytery during the last winter, and the professors of the Theological Seminary having signified their willingness that he should do so, his request was granted, and, accordingly, he continued under our direction through the winter, during which time he manifested commendable diligence and improvement. As it respects the difficulty about occasional hearing,

which stood in his way of obtaining license last year, we are happy to state that it is now entirely removed, and we feel the utmost freedom in recommending him as a candidate for licensure as soon as convenient. Respecting the case of Mr. Beggs, referred to us at last meeting of Synod, we have only to state that the papers in the case not being forwarded in time, nothing could be done at our first meeting, and when they were afterwards obtained were found so utterly defective, there being no libel or charge formal, nor informal nor any properly authenticated minute in the case, Presbytery, thinking it impracticable to come to any proper decision under the circumstances, resolved after due consideration to refer the whole matter back to your Rev. body, and transmit the papers; and in doing so we would humbly and earnestly entreat Synod to take up and issue the case at the present meeting, if possible, since the cause of truth and good order has already suffered much by unnecessary delay. We are, also, sorry to inform Synod that Mr. Beggs has been preaching, notwithstanding his suspension by the proper authority. This he acknowledged at our first meeting, and we entreated him to desist, though the time might seem to be long, which he declared to be the reason of his doing so. He accordingly did cease for a few months, but after the Presbytery referred his case back to Synod he resumed preaching, and continued, according to his own acknowledgment, to do so through the winter, giving as his reason that he thought our deed equivalent to an acquittal; but how he could arrive at such a conclusion we cannot say. Having thus endeavoured to discharge the duty assigned us, but failed through a want of the requisite papers, and having given Synod such information as we possessed on the subject, we leave the whole matter to your disposal, trusting that it will be speedily and righteously terminated.

By order of Presbytery,

J. M. HENDERSON, *Moderator.*
JAMES DICKSON, *Clerk.*

No. 24. The Report of the Presbytery of Richland, which was, on motion, referred to the committees of Bills and Overtures, and also of Supplies.

Report of the Presbytery of Richland.

In presenting our first report we have to state, that—in obedience to the order of Synod, the ministers with their elders respectively, included in that part of the Presbytery of Muskingum lying west and north of the Tuscarawas, and Muskingum rivers, met at Wooster, on the 1st Wednesday of August last, and were constituted into a Presbytery by Mr. Samuel Irvine, who previously preached from Psalm 133rd, 1st.

The calls for Mr. Robert Forrester mentioned in the last annual report of the Presbytery of Muskingum, with one for the same person from the congregation of Ohio, transmitted by the Presbytery of Chartiers, being presented; and that from Truro accepted; Mr. Robert Forrester, on the 7th of November last, was ordained to the office of the holy ministry, and installed pastor of the congregation of Truro.

Recently a change has been effected in Mr. Hindman's charge. Formerly it consisted of three branches; now it consists of four. In consequence of the southern part of Washington congregation having been by Presbytery struck off into a regular vacancy, the northern part felt unable to retain the time previously enjoyed by the whole of the original congregation, namely, one third, and accordingly petitioned to be released from their pastor one-half of said time. The congregation of Mansfield, which, also, had enjoyed a third of the time, avowedly on account of inability to support, presented a similar petition. Both these petitions were granted by Presbytery, and in consequence Mr. Hindman was left unsettled one-third of his time. Soon after, a call from the conjoined congregations of Killbuck and Mohican, for two-thirds of the time, with one from South Washington for one-fourth, were presented to Mr. Hindman, the latter of which was accepted, still, however, one-twelfth of his time is not occupied in a settled way.

The supply allotted to us by Synod was not all received. Mr. Samuel M'Lean neither came into our bounds, nor sent any excuse for not doing so. Mr. Small, we suppose, was prevented from fulfilling his appointment with us, by his accepting a call in a different Presbytery. Mr. I. N. Laughhead, by bodily indisposition, was prevented from fulfilling his regular appointment, but came and supplied in our vacancies during the month of April. Messrs. Harsha and Smart fulfilled their appointments. Besides three organized vacancies, we have application from four different places for preaching, and, therefore, would solicit as liberal a proportion of supply as the general demand will warrant.

To the book of church government and discipline submitted to the several Presbyteries two years ago, we have given some attention, and would say, that, while we

think it in some respects preferable to the one now in use, we cannot consent to its adoption as a substitute without some amendments. In a new book of the kind, not to mention the grounds of censure enumerated in the old, would have, we apprehend, an injurious effect—at least it should contain a distinct and explicit reference to the Testimony and Confession on the subject, with a statement of those offences now judged censurable, though not expressly mentioned in the above standards; for example, the practices of occasional hearing and slave-holding. The forms appended to the old should be retained in the new, and others, namely, of censure, and the obligations in baptism, added. It would, we think, also be for edification and peace, to define a protest as taken against a decision of the highest court; showing what privileges a protestor may claim in such a case.

As the subject of slavery is now deeply agitating the community—and as some in our own communion are unwilling to admit the immorality of holding human beings as goods and chattels; and others, while they admit slavery to be a sin, maintain that the people of the non-slaveholding states have nothing to do with the evil, we would suggest the propriety of Synod's addressing a letter to the churches under their care on this subject. A call from the conjoined congregations of Killbuck, Molican, and Clear Creek, for Mr. I. N. Laughead has been sustained, and is herewith transmitted, to be presented as soon as convenient. In conclusion, we have to express our acknowledgement of the divine favour manifested to us in our infant state.

By order of Presbytery,

S. IRVINE, *Moderator.*

J. M'KEE, *Presbytery Clerk.*

No. 25. A call from the Congregations of Princeton and Midway, for Mr. John L. M'Lean, referred to in the Report of the Presbytery of Indiana, and

No. 26. A call from Bloomington for Mr. I. N. Laughead, referred to, in the above report. These calls were, on motion, laid on the table.

No. 27. The Report of the Board of Managers of the Theological Seminary, which was, on motion, laid on the table.

Report of the Board of Managers of the Theological Seminary.

The annual meeting of the board took place on the 27th of March, at the Theological Seminary.

The number of students in attendance during the last session was twenty-one. Their names and grades respectively are as follow, namely: Messrs. Thomas Gilkerson, James Hawthorn, William Smith, and David R. Imbrie of the 4th year.

Messrs. John Bryan, John M. French, Isaac Law, Daniel H. A. M'Lean, Archibald Reid, and George C. Vincent, of the 3rd year.

Messrs. Ambrose Barcroft, David Bullions, William J. Cleland, James R. Doig, James W. Logue, John Patrick, John Tod, and Thomas B. Walker of the 2nd year, and Messrs. Titus Bassfield, Robert J. Hammond, and Benjamin F. Sawyer of the 1st year.

Discourses were delivered by all the students excepting one of the 3rd year, (who was prevented by indisposition,) and those of the 1st year, which were generally considered as respectable specimens of theological attainments. Those of the 4th year were examined on the distinguishing principles of the Secession Church, and their answers were satisfactory.

The board take the liberty of expressing their opinion, that it would be improper for Mr. John Patrick to continue his theological studies, as he has stated doubts concerning the immorality of slavery, in opposition to the act of Synod, and as he has withdrawn for some time from the communion of the church.

A contribution has been received from a friend of the Associate Church, amounting to one hundred dollars, which has been distributed by the board equally, to the aid of five students of theology.

By order of the Board,

THOMAS HANNA, *Secretary.*

P. S. According to the organization of the board, the term of service of Messrs. Donnan and Walker will expire at this meeting.

No. 28. A memorial from certain brethren, in the bounds of the Presbytery of Miami, in opposition to the one voted above, and marked No. 22. This Memorial was, on motion, referred to the same select committee as the former.

No. 29. A paper containing reasons of protest by Mr. Stalker, against the Synod's decision of last year in his case, and a petition for a reconsideration of the case. The first part of this paper was, on motion, laid on the table. The petition was rejected as inadmissible.

No. 30. A memorial and petition from the Congregation of N. Argyle, in relation to the case of their pastor, Mr. Stalker. The Moderator having decided that this paper is not admissible, till it come through the Presbytery of Cambridge, an appeal was taken from the decision, but not sustained. From this decision Messrs. Heron, Ferrier, Blair, Brown, and Rough, entered their dissent. Mr. Clokey also dissented, for reasons to be given in.

No. 31. A petition from the Second Congregation of New York, praying for pecuniary aid from the Synod in maintaining a stated dispensation of gospel ordinances among them. This petition was, on motion, referred to the committee of Missions. Dr. Bruce was, at his own request, released from serving on said committee, and Mr. Isaac, appointed in his stead.

No. 32. The Report of the Presbytery of Allegheny, which was, on motion, referred to the committee of Supplies.

Report of the Presbytery of Allegheny.

Presbytery, in presenting this, our report, to Synod, cannot refrain from expressing our thankfulness to the Author of all our mercies, that two ministers have been added to our number since the last meeting of Synod, and that peace and harmony prevail among the members and people. Mr. John M'Auley was ordained to the office of the holy ministry, in the Congregations of Upper Piney, Jefferson, and Cherry Run, in the month of July; and Mr. Rodgers has been installed in the Congregation of Allegheny.

Presbytery have failed in getting any supply from Synod during the last year, for our vacancies, excepting three or four Sabbaths from Mr. Ferrier: we think it will be obvious to any one who will look over the statistical table of the various Presbyteries, that there is not an equal distribution of the labours of our travelling preachers in the different Presbyteries. We hope Synod will attend more particularly to the claims of our Presbytery: Mr. Dickey has resigned his charge in the town of Kittaning, and remains with the other branches of his congregation. Mr. Blair has tendered the resignation of the Conemaugh branch of his congregation, and there is little doubt but it will be accepted by Presbytery, at its first meeting, which will take place in a few weeks. These things will show that our demand for supply of preaching is on the increase.

We have called on all the members of our Presbytery who left Synod, last year, before its close; and their reasons have been sustained by Presbytery.

We are very desirous that Synod should, at this meeting, be enabled on scriptural grounds to take some measures, which would effectually remove the various difficulties presently existing in our church. We feel, as members of the body, deep affliction, on this subject, and our people are much grieved, on the subject. "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." That the Lord may direct you in this, as in all matters, is our earnest prayer.

DAVID BLAIR, *Moderator.*

JOHN HINDMAN, *Clerk.*

The Presbytery of Philadelphia requested permission to defer the presentation of their report till to-morrow morning. The request was granted.

No. 33. A call from Clear Creek, Killbuck, &c., for Mr. I. N. Laughead, referred to in the report of the Presbytery of Richland. This call was, on motion, laid on the table.

No. 34. A representation and petition from a body claiming to be the Associate Presbytery of Albany, signed James Williamson,

Moderator, and Andrew Stark, Presbytery Clerk. This paper was, by the Moderator, pronounced inadmissible.

No. 35. Reasons of dissent, from the decisions of last year, in reference to the Presbytery of Albany, by a body calling themselves elders in the Second Congregation of New York. This paper was, also, decided by the Moderator to be inadmissible.

No. 36. A Report of the Presbytery of Cambridge, respecting the Presbytery of Vermont, complaining of certain steps in the proceedings of said Presbytery. This report was, on motion, referred to the select committee, to whom the memorials from the brethren of Miami, had been referred.

No. 37. A call from the Second Associate Congregation of Philadelphia, for Mr. Joseph T. Cooper. This call was, on motion, laid on the table.

Extracts of Minutes, from the Presbytery of Miami, were read, respecting the call from Tuscaloosa, for Mr. Cooper, and referring said call to Synod, as sustained. These papers were, on motion, laid on the table.

No. 38. A remonstrance and petition from the Associate Congregation of Barnet, against the proceedings of Synod last year, in the case of the Presbytery of Albany, Dr. A. Bullions, and Mr. Stalker, and praying for a review and reversal of said decisions. This paper was, on motion, referred to the select committee, to whom the other memorials, on the same subject, were referred.

No. 39. The Report of the Presbytery of Vermont, which was, on motion, referred to the committee of Bills and Overtures.

Report of the Presbytery of Vermont.

The Associate Presbytery of Vermont was constituted at the time and in the manner appointed by Synod at its last meeting. Few things of sufficient importance to report to Synod, have occurred in our Presbytery within the last year. Notwithstanding the aspect of the times is unfavourable, in some respects, we have some evidences of the Lord's gracious presence and power among us. At our first meeting a resolution was passed to request the Presbytery of Cambridge to transmit to us an account of the receipts and disbursements of their funds, for a few years past. Long since we have been informed, by the clerk of that Presbytery, of the receipt of our request. But that court, through want of courtesy, or some other reason, has not returned us any direct answer; although the Synod ordered "that all documents in the hands of the Presbytery of Cambridge, affecting the Presbytery of Vermont or any of its members, shall be transmitted to them." An account of their funds was necessary, not only to an equitable division of the Presbytery, but to counteract the injurious reflection upon the congregations in this Presbytery, implied in the last report of the Presbytery of Cambridge to Synod. At the same meeting, Dr. A. Bullions applied to Presbytery to be received and restored to his former standing in our Church. After consideration of his case, his application was received, and, on submitting to censure, he was restored to the communion of the church, and, to the office of the gospel ministry. In the "Religious Monitor," falsehoods and calumnies have been published against Presbytery and individuals, who are members of it. On account of these things, and others of a similar nature, this Presbytery cannot concur with the Synod in patronising that publication. We lament the sad strife and contention which agitate the Associate Church. May the God of Zion, who turns away ungodliness from Jacob, and redeems Israel out of all his troubles," repair the breach and heal these unhappy divisions.

All which is respectfully submitted to the Rev. Synod,

CLAUD GILFILLAN, *Presbytery Clerk.*

May, 7th, 1839.

The Presbytery of Ohio asked permission to defer the presentation of their report till the afternoon. The request was granted.

No. 40. The Report of the Massie's Creek Female Missionary Society, which was, on motion, referred to the committee of Missions.

May 6th, 1839.

REV. SIRS,

The Massie's Creek Female Missionary Society respectfully beg leave to address you on a subject which is intimately connected with the glory of the church's Head, and the everlasting welfare of immortal souls, and one in which we feel a deep interest. The subject of missions to the heathen has, of late, engaged the attention of the females of this section of the country, and considering the advantages we enjoy from a ministration of gospel ordinances, we think it our duty to do something for the spread of the gospel among those who are destitute of the blessings we enjoy. It is a fact, well known to us all, that by far the greater portion of the human family have never heard of the Redeemer's name, and are in the depths of spiritual darkness; and in the expressive language of Scripture, they are "without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers to the covenants of promise, without God, and without hope in the world." Oh! how agonizing to think how many of those wretched beings are carried hourly to the gulf of endless perdition, without one solitary ray of hope of a happy resurrection beyond the grave. When the Redeemer was about to ascend to his mediatorial glory, he commanded his disciples,—“Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.” “Go, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.” Our sister denominations are actively engaged in fulfilling this command; they have carried the gospel even to farthest India, and that, too, mingled with error. And shall Seceders be the last to go and preach the gospel in its purity, in order to counteract the error and mischief that may be done by false teaching. Or will they ‘fold their arms in listlessness,’ and say, “The time is not yet come, the time when the Lord's house should be built.”—Believing as we do, that the church, in her distinctive capacity, is the only authorized organ of missionary operations, we propose becoming auxiliary to Synod, to furnish them with pecuniary aid in spreading the gospel in heathen lands. We earnestly entreat you, at your present session, to take the subject into consideration; and may the God of missions guide and direct you in your decisions.

Report.

The Massie's Creek Female Missionary Society was organized January 2d, 1837. The object of the society was to gain information on the subject, to excite a missionary spirit, and also to raise funds for the support of foreign missions. Society, at a late meeting, passed a resolution—

“That all funds on hand, and to be collected, be placed in the hands of the Presbytery of Miami, until said Presbytery, or the Associate Synod, shall take definitive order on the subject of foreign missions, and that society inform Synod of what it has done. In compliance with this resolution, society has placed in the hands of the Presbytery of Miami eighty-two dollars forty-one cents, which can be had at any time it is called for. Society, though small, is now in successful operation: it has, at no period, exceeded twenty, the majority of the congregation having been deterred from espousing the cause on account of Synod not acting on the subject. We feel confident that were Synod to take some decisive measures on the subject, the Congregation would, unanimously, “come up to the help of the Lord against the mighty.”

By order of Society,

JANE MOODIE, *President.*

MARY L. CASSIL, *Secretary.*

The committee of Bills and Overtures reported on the memorial from the Session of Cæsar's Creek, on the subject of occasional hearing, and the report was adopted, as follows: namely,

Report of the Committee of Bills and Overtures, on the Memorial of the Session of Cæsar's Creek on the Subject of Occasional Hearing.

Your committee beg leave to report, that as the apparent object of this petition is to have something more definite on the subject of occasional hearing, in a new book of discipline, than is in the present one, that said papers lie on the table until this book is before the Synod for consideration.

JOHN WALKER.
THOMAS HANNA.
JOSEPH CLOKEY.

The committee appointed, yesterday, on the subject of absentees from the last meeting of Synod, reported, and the report was re-committed.

Information was given to the Synod by Mr. Anderson, that Mrs. Smith, of Hebron, in the state of New York, lately deceased, has bequeathed a certain legacy to this Synod, payable after her husband's death; and that the husband proposes a compromise. In relation to this matter, it was, on motion, resolved, that the executor, Mr. Reid, be authorized to compromise the matter according to his discretion.

Resumed the consideration of the business left unfinished last evening; namely, the resolution to sustain the appeals from the decision of the Presbytery of Miami, in regard to the publication of the purpose of marriage. After some discussion, but before coming to a final vote, the Synod adjourned till the usual hour. Closed with prayer.

2 o'clock, P. M.

The Synod met, and was opened with prayer. Members present as above, together with Mr. James Geery, ruling elder, from the Second Associate Congregation of New York, who being present, was assumed as a member of Synod.

The Clerk of Synod not being present, Mr. Hanna was appointed Clerk, pro tem. Agreed to proceed with the business left unfinished in the forenoon; namely, the appeals from the decision of the Presbytery of Miami, in the case of the publication of the purpose of marriage. Soon after the commencement of the discussion, the Clerk appeared and took his seat. After a free discussion, the question was put, "Sustain the appeals, or not," and carried "Sustain."

The Minutes of the forenoon sitting were read and corrected.

The Presbytery of Miami gave notice that they had referred the cases, the appeals on which had not been decided, to the Synod for final issue. The reference was, on motion, accepted, and a committee appointed to prepare a resolution issuing the whole matter. Messrs. Martin, Hanna, and Clokey, were appointed said committee, and the committee, at their own request, had leave to retire.

Answers to reasons of protest by Dr. Bruce and others, against the decision of Synod last year, in the case of Dr. Bullions, were given in and read, and on motion, adopted.

We, the subscribers, protest against the decision of Synod, sustaining the Presbytery of Cambridge in its procedure in the case of Dr. B., for the following reasons,—reserving to ourselves, if we see cause, the right to assign others in due time.

1. Because of the great precipitancy of the Presbytery in the case, and the manifest want of Christian tenderness, manifested by Presbytery in their procedure. It is admitted, on all hands, there was uncertainty as to the words used by Dr. B., which gave offence. While he was insisting that what the Presbytery charged him with, was not his language, and did not convey his meaning, he was silenced by the Moderator; and during this imposed silence, even after he protested against the correctness of the minute professing to state his language, he was judged worthy of censure. The sentence was proposed to be executed, and because Dr. B., under all the irritation necessarily resulting from such treatment, did not immediately submit to the censure which appeared to him in the circumstances harsh and unjust, he is immediately suspended.

2. Because, in this case, the Presbytery violated a plain rule of church orders, in rejecting a protest against a final sentence, and proceeding to execute that sentence

when a protest had been entered against it. No principle is better settled in Presbyterian Church discipline, than that a protest and appeal sists [arrests] the final execution of the sentence. This rule was violated by Presbytery, and in so doing, the Synod sanction their deed.

3. Because, in our judgment, Dr. B. made ample acknowledgment of his offence, which ought to have satisfied the Presbytery, and should have been sufficient cause to sist all farther procedure in the matter.

4. Because, by this decision, the Synod have sanctioned the deed of Presbytery, in excluding three members of court at one time, and one at another from their seats in Presbytery on that case, against whom no charge is even alleged, which exclusion entirely changed the character of Presbytery, and vitiated its acts. To exclude any of them on the ground of relationship is sanctioned by no law or principle received by the Associate Church; nor approved precedent in that, or any other Presbyterian Church; and if alleged partiality in the Dr's. favour, was a good reason for the exclusion of any, surely partiality against the Dr., or, to speak more properly, prejudice against him, should have also properly excluded the others who did judge and condemn him.

5. Because the majority of those voting against Dr. B. were interested, and therefore could not be supposed to be impartial judges. But the decision of Synod says they were. The contempt of court was the alleged offence of slandering Messrs. Miller, Anderson, A. Gordon, and D. Gordon.

6. Because, by mixing up foreign and extraneous matter with the case, the decision of court is affected by that which constituted no part of the original offence, which ought to have been decided on its own merits. There was no allusion to any letters on the part of Dr. B., or of other members of Presbytery, till he was judged worthy of censure, and, therefore, they had no concern in procuring that decision unless secretly in the minds of members.

7. Because the Synod has sanctioned the principle that the Presbytery were right in proceeding in the case of Dr. B., when a declinature of their action and an appeal to Synod was lying before them.

8. Because, contrary to well-established constitutional law in this case, the Presbytery are sustained in deposing Dr. B. in his absence, which is not competent to a Presbytery, &c.

9. Because Synod have sustained the members of the Presbytery of Cambridge to sit and decide as judges in a case in which they were one of the parties, and consequently interested, and by the laws of all courts unfit to judge impartially.

10. Because of the fewness of the members present at these proceedings, and the hurry with which the whole matter was conducted, by meetings held at such times as rendered it impossible for the other members of Presbytery to be present.

ROBERT BRUCE,
THOMAS GOODWILLIE,
WM. GILKERSON,
WM. GALBRAITH,
WM. PRINGLE,
THOMAS FERRIER,
DAVID GOODWILLIE.

Answers to Reasons of Protest given in by Dr. Bruce and others, against a Decision of Synod made in the case of Dr. A. Bullions, and the Presbytery of Cambridge.

It should be observed, in general, respecting these reasons of protest, that the greater part of them are founded on misapprehension. The protestors had not learned the facts of the case, which may account for their votes and their protest, and, perhaps, for some reasons of a different nature which they have advanced.

1. The first reason complains of the *precipitancy* of the Presbytery in the case. This is a vague charge, a matter of opinion, and its proof almost always imaginary and uncertain. Speedy action is not always precipitancy. A fatal stroke for an irritating expression is precipitancy, but not so, if it be absolutely necessary in immediate defence of life. Dr. Bullions' expression, which *occasioned* his suspension, was itself suspending the entire action of the Presbytery, and holding the members disqualified for every part of ministerial duty. The Presbytery must suspend him, or suspend proceedings, and the members lie under the grave charge of *immorality* and *error*. The Presbytery too, gave him abundant time to explain, retract, confess his fault, or furnish the means of investigation. As he did none of these, and added open contempt, and as the sentence of suspension was not final, nor irreversible, the Presbytery were not precipitant. But even precipitancy is not necessarily a valid objection against a

decision of Presbytery, if that decision be correct, and much less is precipitancy in the inferior court a ground of condemning the decision of the superior court passed on the merits of the case. The charge of *manifest want of Christian tenderness*, is gratuitous, rash, and slanderous.

In this reason, it is asserted that, "It is admitted, on all hands, there was uncertainty as to the words used by Dr. B., which gave offence." This is a misapprehension of the facts of the case. Dr. Bullions had pleaded that there was uncertainty, but the Presbytery showed a record of the words, and abundant testimony besides, proving them.

2. The second reason complains that Presbytery violated a plain rule of discipline in rejecting a protest against a final sentence, and proceeding to execute that sentence. The protestors ought to have stated what final sentence they had in view. It is presumed they mean suspension. But this sentence was not final; it was a step necessary in the case, in order to the final issue of it. And, besides, there was no protest entered against this sentence till it was executed. This is another instance of a mistake of facts by the protestors. Though it is boldly asserted that a protest always sists the final execution of the sentence, the rules of discipline maintain the reverse. They expressly leave it to the judgment of the court whether to sist or proceed.

3. The third reason alleges that Dr. Bullions made ample acknowledgment of his offence, which should have satisfied Presbytery. It is supposed the protestors mean that he did this in his written disclaimer. But though he disclaimed the meaning attributed to him, he did not say what he did mean; he still left the expression unretracted, and his plea on it for the postponement of the business of Presbytery not withdrawn. And though he not only disclaimed the meaning attributed to him, but his words, yet he repeated his offensive words before he was suspended.

4. The fourth reason alleges that four members of Presbytery were excluded from their seats, without even a charge alleged against them. But it is not necessary to a just exclusion, that a charge should be made. Relationship is no charge nor ground of charge. It is strangely asserted that no law or principle received by the Associate Church sanctions the exclusion of any on account of relationship. Yet it has been a common practice, both in church and state, to exclude relations from acting as judges, and is expressly recognised in books of discipline. See Pardovan, book iv. tit. 5, Sect. 9.

Besides, prejudging the case was charged against one of the excluded members, and partiality also against the other three.

5. The fifth reason alleges that those who condemned Dr. Bullions in Presbytery were interested, and consequently partial judges. But even if this were true, it cannot prejudice the Synod's decision, which did not respect the Presbytery's partiality, but the merits of the case. The Synod's decision, therefore, was so far a proof that the Presbytery had acted above the influence of interest. This reason presents another evidence that the protestors did not understand the case. They suppose that the contempt of court with which Dr. Bullions was charged, consisted in his slandering four members. But Presbytery did not make the charge on this ground, but on the ground that he refused the means of investigation while they demanded these according to the acknowledged rules of discipline, and while he still held them under a charge; and, with this refusal, contemptuously saying, that they might censure him till they were tired. But farther, in answer to the allegation of interest, let it be remembered, that it is always admitted, that a court has the right of self-protection, and can justly punish contempt.

6. The sixth reason charges Presbytery with mixing up extraneous matter with the case, while they ought to have confined themselves to the original offence, and asserts that Dr. Bullions made no allusion to any letters till he was judged worthy of censure. This is another instance of a mistake of facts by the protestors. Dr. Bullions did, in his first offensive expressions, refer to the letters in question, as the ground of his charge, and this was presented to Synod on the trial. The contents of these letters had, indeed, no concern in the first decision of Presbytery, nor did they allow them any, although they had some concern in the latter decision, when it was proved that Dr. Bullions had made himself responsible for them. This was, therefore, no extraneous matter, and courts have always a right in their final sentence to accumulate all the offences proved against the member charged.

7. The seventh reason alleges that the Presbytery should have sisted procedure on account of Dr. Bullions' declinature, representing it as a declinature of the *action* of Presbytery. This is another instance of a mistake of facts of important bearing in the case. Dr. Bullions might lawfully have declined the *action* of Presbytery in the case as every lawful appeal does; but he declined the *authority* of Presbytery, which is unlawful, and warrants deposition as a high contempt of court. See Pardovan.

Dr. Bullions not only denied the authority of Presbytery, but even their existence, and, consequently, their authority. Synod, therefore, only maintained their acknowledged rules in this case, in sustaining Presbytery's procedure.

8. The eighth reason assumes that by well established law it is not competent to a Presbytery to depose a minister in his absence. This rule has been latterly often spoken of, but not pointed out. It might suit the wishes of some to have such a law, but it has, as yet, no existence in our books of discipline, and it would be fatuity in a church to adopt it. Deposition is competent to a Presbytery, a contemptuous absence is made a just ground of inflicting it. Pardovan, form of process, paragraph 6:

9. The ninth reason is much the same with the fifth. It alleges that the Presbytery were a party, even interested, and ought not to have judged in the case. If this were correct, no court could protect itself; it must submit to every contempt, because by the contempt of a member it has become a party; and thus a guilty member may arrest all procedure by adding contempt to his other crimes. But not even were the individual members of Presbytery parties in the case. The trial was not held on the slanders uttered by Dr. Bullions in his first offence, nor on the contents of the letters afterwards; on none of these did he give an opportunity for trial; but it was held on his contempt of court, violation of law, and on his responsibility for the letters.

10. The tenth reason alleges the fewness of the members of Presbytery, who decided in the case, and the hurried procedure, as reasons why Synod were faulty in their decision. But as the Synod decided on the merits of the case and sustained the decision of Presbytery, justice, it appears, was not wounded by the fewness of Presbytery, nor by their celerity. It is strange that such a reason of protest should be advanced. If Synod are bound by their rules to sustain a quorum of three in a Presbytery as a lawful court, why should they not acknowledge it when eight or nine members acted; and must six or seven months of laborious attention to the case be accounted a hurried procedure? The members of Presbytery that had a right to sit on the case, and who chose to attend, had always not only legal time, but abundance of time given between meetings.

A. ANDERSON,
JAMES MARTIN.

Mr. Blair craved the privilege of joining in the protest against the decision of Synod last year in the case of Dr. Bullions. The Moderator decided that the claim was not in order.

Answers to reasons of protest by Dr. A. Bullions, against the decision of Synod last year, sustaining the decisions of the Presbytery of Cambridge in his case, were given in and read. These answers were, on motion, adopted.

The subscriber protests against the decision of the Associate Synod, passed this day, sustaining the Presbytery of Cambridge in suspending and deposing him, and that for the following reasons, which he now submits, reserving to himself the right to assign additional reasons in due time.

1. Because this decision of Synod sustains the Presbytery of Cambridge in suspending the subscriber on the ground of an alleged insinuation insufficient to warrant it, and which he disowned. The Presbytery charges him not with asserting, but insinuating that a member or members present were unfit to sit in any court, and for this alleged offence, the court suspends him, and continues this suspension, and even followed it up with deposition, although he solemnly asserted, that he had no recollection of having uttered the imputed offensive words, and declared that they did not convey the meaning he intended, that he regarded them as improper, and disowned them. Granting that the offence charged was actually committed, the above declarations given in to Presbytery, and recorded in their minutes, ought to have been accepted as an ample reparation.

2. Because of the conduct of the Presbytery, in proceeding to suspend the undersigned, when he had protested against the correctness of their minutes, and also against a previous decision to inflict upon him the censure of rebuke, and appealed to Synod, which conduct of the Presbytery was illegal, and contrary to the usages of the Associate Church, and ought not to have been done till this appeal was issued.

3. Because this decision of Synod sustains the Presbytery in excluding four of the ministers, who were members of that Presbytery, from their seats and votes, without any just reason, which entirely changed the character of the Presbytery, and rendered its decisions null and void, because they were not the decisions of the Presbytery, but the decisions of a part of the Presbytery, and the very reverse of what they would have been had the excluded members retained their seats, and been permitted to vote.

4. Because the decision of Presbytery, sustained by Synod, respecting an anonymous letter, was made by those members of Presbytery who were themselves interested in the matter, and could not have any right to vote in the case, and the trial was held after the subscriber had declined their authority, and could not consistently be present to defend his own interests.

5. Because this decision sustains the Presbytery in deposing the subscriber before he was thrice cited to appear before them, and was passed in his absence; both of which were altogether illegal, according to the long established rule, that no Presbytery can depose a minister without citing him thrice to appear before them, nor in his absence, unless it be the supreme court. But so far were the Presbytery from observing these rules, that they cited him only twice on the trial of the anonymous letters, and only one day intervened between the second citation and his deposition.

For these and other reasons, which may be given in due time, the subscriber protests against the above named decisions of Synod; holding that nothing is bound on earth, which is not bound in heaven, and will hold it to be null and void till reviewed and reversed, and claims all his rights as a minister of the gospel to discharge all the functions of the gospel ministry, as though no such act had passed.

ALEXANDER BULLIONS.

Philadelphia, June 2d, 1838.

Answers to Reasons of Protest by Dr. Bullions against a Decision of Synod in 1838.

1. The first reason holds the decision of Synod faulty in sustaining the Presbytery of Cambridge, in their suspending him for an alleged insinuation, when he had denied recollection of the words imputed to him and had disowned them. The allegation that Presbytery suspended Dr. Bullions for an *insinuation* is a mere quibble on words which were sufficiently explained in Synod. Dr. Bullions did utter words which were specified and recorded, and which carried an insinuation. He openly acknowledged and repeated these words before suspension. Nor was he suspended merely for the words, but for contempt of court by his refusing the means of investigating this charge, while Presbytery demanded them under acknowledged and necessary rules of discipline, by his persisting in his slander and contempt, and by his express mockery of Presbytery's action and authority. And though Dr. Bullions solemnly denied recollection of the words imputed to him, he himself again repeated them as the words that he had at first used, varying in no material point from the words charged against him by Presbytery, and he afterwards several times recognised them. And though he disclaimed a meaning, he did not explain his meaning, and thus he still kept up the charge.

2. The second reason alleges that the Conduct of Presbytery was illegal in suspending him when he had protested against the correctness of the minute, and against a decision to inflict the censure of rebuke. But books of discipline and common sense give to Presbytery the power of proceeding in trials and censures, notwithstanding protests entered, when the case requires it, and does not admit of delay, as in suspension and deposition instant for some crimes. Dr. Bullions' case was of such a class, because his charge as he made and maintained it by disobedience and contempt, necessarily suspended all business of Presbytery then and ever after, unless they resisted it by suspending him. He ought not to have a seat with them while he held them disqualified for a seat in Presbytery. Besides, in reference to his protest against the correctness of the minute, it must be remembered that the court were the only legal judges of what passed before them.

3. The third reason complains of the decision of Synod for sustaining the Presbytery in excluding four members from their seats and votes, without any just reason, which rendered their acts null and void. The exclusion of those members *without just reason* is here assumed, but not supported. No argument is offered to show that those members were excluded without just reason, and, therefore, no farther answer is called for. Yet it may be stated that Presbytery showed just reason for their exclusion, which was not disproved in Synod. Therefore, the part of the Presbytery remaining, being many more than merely a legal quorum, did lawfully act in the case; and the Synod justly sustained the Presbytery in their decisions.

4. The fourth reason alleges, that the members of Presbytery who acted in the case of the anonymous letters were interested, and thereby disqualified to act as judges. But all kinds of interest in a cause do not disqualify for acting as judges in it. We are all interested in the matters of our profession; but not, therefore, disqualified to act as judges respecting it. In the case in question, the matter of the anonymous letters was not in trial. And as the Synod decided on the merits of the case,

and sustained the Presbytery, the impartiality of the latter was proved, whatever temptations they were under to the contrary.

This reason farther adds, that Presbytery's decision respecting the anonymous letters was made after, Dr. Bullions had declined their authority, and that, therefore, he could not be consistently present to defend his interests. This, by the way, shows the necessity of the rule of discipline, which does not allow a member of Presbytery to decline their authority, nor even to stay all process by an appeal; for otherwise, fugitives from discipline would have the plea of legal order for their worst conduct, and crime, however great or manifest, must pass unpunished. But Dr. Bullions cannot complain that he had not opportunity of defence in Synod on the trial; and the decision of Presbytery had no effect in preventing such opportunity. It gave an additional opportunity.

5. The fifth reason complains that the decision of Synod sustains the Presbytery in deposing Dr. Bullions before he had received three citations. But, notwithstanding the pretence here, books of discipline do not require imperiously and universally three citations; they allow three citations, and they also allow deposition without this number, when refusals to attend, and contempt of court are offered. And such was this very case. Dr. Bullions not only refused to attend on the first citation, but he expressly declined, not only the action, but the authority of Presbytery. The rule here so confidently referred to, as prohibiting the deposition of a minister by a Presbytery in his absence, has no existence in our books of discipline; but the contrary does exist, expressly allowing deposition in his absence. If such a rule prevailed as Dr. Bullions pretends, it is not probable that any minister would be deposed by a Presbytery, however guilty he might be.

A. ANDERSON.

JAS. MARTIN.

The Report of the Presbytery of Ohio, as corrected, was given in and read, and, on motion, referred to the committee of Supplies.

[By some over-sight this report was not received by the editor. If forwarded, it will be inserted in a subsequent number.]

The committee appointed last year, to report some alleged errors in the minutes of the former year, were called upon for their report; but not being prepared, were instructed to report as early as practicable during the present meeting, and Mr. Miller was, on motion, added to the committee.

Agreeably to the standing rule of Synod, it was agreed to go into a nomination of members of the Board of managers of the Theological Seminary, in the room of Messrs. Walker and Donnan, whose term of service has expired. Messrs. Walker, Donnan, D. Thompson, and Thomas Wilson were put in nomination.

The Presbytery of Cambridge requested leave to retire a short time, for business. The request was granted.

On motion, it was resolved, that the calls now on the Synod's table, be presented to such of the candidates as are present.

In pursuance of this resolution, the calls for Mr. Joseph T. Cooper, from the Second congregation of Philadelphia, and from Tuscaloosa, were presented, and that from Philadelphia accepted.

The calls for Mr. John L. McLean, from the united congregations of Apple Creek and Buffalo, and from the congregations of Princeton and Midway, were presented, and that from Princeton and Midway accepted.

On motion, resolved, that the calls reported for Mr. I. N. Laughhead, be referred to the Presbytery of Miami, for presentation.

Paper No. 41, was given in and read; namely, a report from the Presbytery of Cambridge, on the case of the Rev. A. Whyte. This report was, on motion, referred to the select committee to whom

the several memorials on the proceedings of Synod last year had been referred.

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

Saturday, May 25.

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

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

No. 42, the Report of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, which was, on motion, referred to the committee of Supplies.

The Associate Presbytery of Philadelphia, in compliance with the requisitions of Synod, report,

That none of our vacancies within the past year have been settled. The Rev. James Templeton has laboured with much acceptance, within our bounds, several months during the past year. By order of Presbytery, a new congregation was organized by Mr. Templeton, in Union County, Pennsylvania, under the name of Rehoboth, and the sacrament of the Lord's supper dispensed amongst them in the month of May.

This adds another to our list of vacancies, and encourages us to hope that a banner for the truth will yet be displayed in other places, where it has hitherto been comparatively unknown. Our vacancies have had a limited supply of the preaching of the gospel. To the last, we allude not from any disposition to complain, as if it were altogether in your power to remedy it, for it is not to be denied that the labourers for the harvest are few; but, that your attention may be called to the subject, in order that some measure may be devised, if possible, tending to thrust more labourers into the harvest. We are aware that one step was taken towards this at your last meeting, but we are not aware that the funds disposable for such a purpose are of such an amount as to be of any material aid in effecting the desired object. Let, then, some plan be adopted to raise what is practicable. The settled congregations continue much as usual: no great increase or diminution has taken place; and, however it may be hereafter with respect to the latter, we have no reason to calculate much on the former, when causes local, as well as natural and moral, are operating against it. Those ministers that have pastoral relations, continue the same in number as when last reported, are in good standing, and remain in the active discharge of their pastoral duties. There are no ordained preachers without charge in Presbyterial connexion with us. The Rev. A. T. McGill, who was formerly placed in Carlisle and branches, and who was upon the plea of ill health released from them, but who afterwards received and accepted a call from the same places, and was, in consequence, continued by you under our inspection, has been by us suspended from the exercise of the office of the ministry, and the communion of the church. Since which time he has been received into the Presbyterian church under the General Assembly. As a fact, we are bound to make this announcement of it, and we would content ourselves with this bare announcement alone, were it not for some considerations which induce us to take a farther notice of it. There has appeared in a newspaper called "The Presbyterian," what purports to be a history of the proceedings of the Associate Presbytery of Philadelphia, that suspended, and of the Carlisle Presbytery that received him. This seems to have been done for two objects. The one to attract sympathy and notoriety. And this will doubtless be effected; for in these times there appears no surer way to attain it than for a person to be brought under the discipline of the church for erroneous conduct. But of this we do not complain, at least in this particular case; for some men deserve pity, and moreover, ought to be known. The other object, to cast odium upon the Presbytery. But here let it be remarked, in passing, that, if the individual felt himself aggrieved, he had only himself to blame: the improper manner in which he forced himself upon our notice, left us no alternative; for it was asking rather too much of us to withhold discipline and pervert judgment even for one who might have maintained a much more unequivocal course of conduct. But, to resume: in the publication referred to, and in a letter to the Carlisle Presbytery, asking admission, Mr. McGill says, in relation to the Associate Presbytery, "Upon my expressing doubts, &c., they immediately suspended me." Now, it is readily admitted that there may be an expression of doubts that is not censurable; but again, there may be in the manner of expression, or in the matter connected with the expression, things highly censurable. Therefore, in the case under consideration the Presbytery suspended Mr. McGill, for the following things. An advancement of sen-

timents, judged by them to be deistical. Statements, which known facts proved to be untrue, impeaching articles of faith solemnly engaged to be maintained, and an avowed intention of apostacy. And now need it be asked, were we not justified in doing as we did? But yet, in the face of these things, Mr. McGill comes before the Carlisle Presbytery, and seems to be understood as saying, "Dear brethren, I just simply expressed my doubts," no, nothing more, and, lo, they suspended me!" Some might call such conduct disingenuous, others an attempt to cover sin. Nay, it might perhaps be called by even a more characteristic name. Again; in said letter, Mr. McGill says, "My standing was unblemished." In reference to this declaration, we have only to say, that public rumour had for a length of time made several charges against him, which, in our opinion, seriously impeached his standing, and that this rumour had become so clamorous, that we felt ourselves bound in duty to notice it. Accordingly, a paper containing some of these charges was laid upon our table, in order that the truth or falsehood of them might be investigated. Upon our table this paper still remains. With this statement, to correct erroneous impressions that may have gone abroad about these matters, we dismiss the subject.—Mr. Joseph T. Cooper, who was sent into our bounds, and whom we were directed to take on trial for license, was, according to the usual order, on the fourth of July last, licensed to preach the everlasting gospel. A call for him from the Second congregation of Philadelphia is herewith transmitted for presentation. We ask a liberal portion of the supply at your disposal.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN S. EASTON, *Moderator.*

JOHN G. SMART, *Clerk pro tem.*

The committee of Bills and Overtures reported on the representation and complaint of the Presbytery of Cambridge, against the Presbytery of Vermont, in the case of Dr. A. Bullions.

To the Associate Synod of North America, to meet in the City of Pittsburgh, May 22d, 1839.

The following representation and complaint of the Presbytery of Cambridge, respectfully sheweth to your Rev. body, that however painful it is to appear before you, in the attitude of complaining of the conduct of any of their brethren, a sense of duty to the cause of truth and order compels this Presbytery to call the attention of the Synod to some conduct of their brethren of the Presbytery of Vermont, which requires the judicial notice of the Synod.

Soon after the time had elapsed when, by the appointment of Synod, the Presbytery of Vermont was to constitute and hold its first meeting, a rumour prevailed in the bounds of this Presbytery, that Alexander Bullions, who was under sentence of *deposition* from the office of the ministry and the lesser excommunication from the fellowship of the church, and who had, by Synod, been remitted to the care of this Presbytery for farther dealing, had been received as a regular member of the Presbytery of Vermont. This Presbytery addressed a friendly communication to their brethren of the Presbytery of Vermont, requesting information respecting the truth of said rumour, to which communication the following is a copy of the only answer which has been received by this Presbytery from them.

"Barnet, September 28th, 1838.—To the Associate Presbytery of Cambridge.—By a resolution of the Presbytery of Vermont, which met at Ryegate on the 24th ult., it is made my duty to inform you that your paper concerning Rev. Archibald Whyte, and Rev. Alexander Bullions, D. D., was received and laid on the table.

CLAUD GILFILLAN, *Presbytery Clerk.*

Recently, however, this Presbytery has been certified of the fact, in a manner which leaves no room to doubt of its truth—particularly by a communication from the said deposed brother himself, and by an affidavit sworn to by the Rev. Archibald Whyte, a copy of which will be laid before Synod—and a report of a committee, appointed by this Presbytery to converse with Mr. Whyte on this subject, and, also, respecting the part which he himself took in the matter.

This Presbytery is of the opinion, that the conduct of the brethren complained of in this instance has given a deep wound to the cause of Christ in our bounds, and has done an injury to the cause of truth, which they may never see healed nor repaired. Their conduct has been certainly unparalleled in the history of the Associate Church, or indeed, it is believed, in any regularly conducted branch of the Presbyterian Church. It manifests,

1. Contempt of the authority of Synod.
2. It presents an instance of solemn mockery and perversion of the divine institution of church government.

3. The conduct of the Presbytery of Vermont was not only illegal and unconstitutional, but disreputable to the ministerial and Christian character of the brethren themselves of that Presbytery, and consequently calculated directly to injure religion, and more especially from the relation in which the only two ministerial members of that Presbytery stood to Dr. Bullions, the one being his brother-in-law, the other his son-in-law.

4. It is a most disorderly and irregular attempt to usurp the prerogative of a co-ordinate Presbytery, and to destroy all order and government in the church.

5. It was trifling with, and in direct violation of their ordination vows.

6. It was unbrotherly towards the Presbytery of Cambridge—and directly calculated to disrupt all fraternal feeling. This Presbytery would, therefore, request Synod to take judicial cognizance of the conduct of the Presbytery of Vermont, and give such judgment on the same as truth and duty may require.

Agreed to at Argyle, }
May 1st, 1839. }

Signed, D. GORDON, *Moderator.*
A. ANDERSON, *Presbytery Clerk.*

The committee of Bills and Overtures, on the representation and complaint of the presbytery of Cambridge respecting the official conduct of the Presbytery of Vermont in the case of Dr. Alexander Bullions, beg leave to report, that the history of this transaction in the Report of the Presbytery of Vermont is not materially different from the statements made in said complaint, and as that Report is also referred to your committee, both these papers shall be comprehended in this our Report.

The history of this extraordinary transaction is, that at last meeting of Synod Dr. Alexander Bullions, who had been deposed by the Presbytery of Cambridge, and this sentence being confirmed by Synod, was remanded to that Presbytery for farther dealing—instead, however, of submitting to Synod and Presbytery, he went and appeared at the bar of the Presbytery of Vermont—this Presbytery, without regard either to the Synod or a co-ordinate Presbytery, administered some kind of censure, and restored him to full standing in the Secession Church. Upon the conduct of the Presbytery of Vermont, your committee would therefore submit the following resolutions:

I. That the Synod concur with the following sentiments expressed in the complaint of the Presbytery of Cambridge respecting the conduct of the Presbytery of Vermont, in the restoration of Dr. Bullions, namely, that their conduct manifests,

1. "Contempt of the authority of Synod."

2. "It presents an instance of solemn mockery and perversion of the divine institution of church government."

3. "The conduct of the Presbytery of Vermont was not only illegal and unconstitutional, but disreputable to the ministerial and Christian character of the brethren themselves of that Presbytery, and consequently calculated directly to injure religion."

4. "It is a most disorderly and irregular attempt to usurp the prerogative of a co-ordinate Presbytery, and to destroy all order and government in the church."

5. "It was trifling with, and in direct violation of their ordination vows."

6. "It was unbrotherly towards the Presbytery of Cambridge, and directly calculated to disrupt all fraternal feeling."

II. That the conduct of the Presbytery of Vermont, during the first year of their Presbyterial existence, renders it evident to Synod that it is, for the present, unsafe to commit to them the Presbyterial oversight of that section of the church, by the Synod committed to their care.

III. That the Presbytery of Vermont be suspended from the exercise of Presbyterial authority until the next meeting of Synod, and that these brethren and all the congregations settled and vacant under their oversight, be committed to the care of the Presbytery of Cambridge, until next meeting of Synod.

IV. That the Synod order the clerk to cite the members of this Presbytery to appear at the bar of the Synod at its next meeting, to answer for their conduct as charged above.

JOHN WALKER,
THOMAS HANNA,
JOSEPH CLOKEY.

The Report, after amendment and a free discussion, was adopted by the following vote.

Ayes.—Dr. Beveridge, Messrs. Imbrie, Walker, French, Anderson, Miller, Hanna, Campbell, Martin, Clokey, McElwee, S. Wilson, Templeton, Smart, J. Bruce, Hall, Lindsay, D. Gordon, Web-

ster, Thomas Wilson, M'Kee, M'Arthur, John S. Easton, S. Hindman, Dickson, Patterson, E. N. Scroggs, D. Thompson, Ministers.—Messrs. John Robertson, James Reid, John Bishop, John Law, James Smiley, Elisha Putnam, Samuel Johnson, William S. Young, Aniel Rodgers, William Patterson, Hugh Hamil, William Scott, John Wilson, William Collier, John Carnahan, John Auld, Francis Grove, David Harvey, David R. Little, Thomas Latta, John Warnock, Andrew Glenn, Samuel Neily, William Smith, William Morris, William Cummings, Samuel Connelly, John Stewart, Joseph R. Dickson, John M'Dowell, Andrew Russell, John Sharp, James Geery, Ruling Elders.—61.

Nocs.—Drs. Ramsay and Bruce, Messrs. William Wilson, D. M'Lean, sen., Donnan, France, Murray, Heron, D. Blair, Isaac, D. M'Lean, Jr., Henderson, Rodgers, Snodgrass, Douthet, B. Boyd, Galbraith, Pollock, Forrester, M'Gill, Irvine, D. Goodwillie, Ferrier, Ministers.—Messrs. David Brown, Thomas Rough, Joseph Stewart, Benjamin Babbett, Matthew R. Atcheson, David White, Thomas Mitchell, Alexander Gilmore, Robert Marshall, William Bell, William Pollock, Samuel Brownlee, Samuel M'Ewen, Ruling Elders.—36.

*Non liquet,** Messrs. J Scroggs, and J. Hindman.

From the adoption of the 2nd and 3rd resolutions in the Report Dr. Ramsay dissented. Mr. Donnan also dissented for reasons to be assigned, and was joined by Messrs. Heron, Isaac, W. Wilson, Douthet, France, Ferrier, Pollock, Rodgers, Brown, Rough, D. M'Lean, sen., Snodgrass, Babbett, D. Blair, Galbraith, Goodwillie, and M'Ewen.

Mr. Henderson craved to have it marked that he voted in the negative, not because he was opposed to the spirit of the Report, but because the resolutions do not sufficiently define the relations and privileges of individuals and sessions in that Presbytery, as under the care of the Cambridge Presbytery. Messrs. Irvine and B. Boyd wished the same explanation of their vote recorded.

The following resolution was then offered, and after some discussion adopted.

“On motion, resolved that the deeds of the Associate Presbytery of Vermont, restoring Dr. A. Bullions to the office of the ministry and the communion of the church, and admitting him as a member of that Presbytery, are null and void from the beginning.”

The state of the vote is as follows:

Ayes.—Drs. Ramsay and Beveridge, Messrs. Imbrie, Walker, Murray, J. Scroggs, Isaac, Anderson, Miller, Hanna, Campbell, Martin, Clokey, M'Elwee, J. Hindman, D. M'Lean, Jr., Templeton, Smart, Henderson, J. Bruce, Hall, Douthet, B. Boyd, Lindsay, D. Gordon, Webster, T. Wilson, Pollock, M'Kee, John S. Easton, Forrester, M'Arthur, S. Hindman, Dickson, Patterson, E. N. Scroggs, D. Thompson, Ministers.—Messrs. John Robertson, James Reid, John Bishop, John Law, James Smiley, E. Putnam, S. Johnson, William S. Young, Aniel Rodgers, William Patterson, H. Hamil, William Scott, Thomas Rough, John Wilson, William

* *Not clear.* A technical phrase in ecclesiastical proceedings, applied to such as decline voting on the question at issue.—EDIT. M.O.N.

Collier, John Carnahan, John Auld, Francis Grove, David Harvey, David R. Little, Thomas Latta, John Warnock, Andrew Glenn, Benjamin Babbet, Matthew R. Atcheson, Thomas Mitchell, William Smith, Robert Marshall, William Bell, William Morris, William Cummings, Samuel Connelly, John Stewart, William Pollock, Samuel M'Ewen, Joseph R. Dickson, John M'Dowell, Andrew Russell, John Sharp, James Geery, Ruling Elders.—77.

Noes.—Dr. Bruce, Messrs. Heron, D. Blair, Snodgrass, Galbraith, Ferrier, Ministers.—Messrs. David Brown, David White, Ruling Elders.—8.

Non liquet.—Messrs. D. M'Lean, sen., Donnan, Ministers.—Messrs. Joseph Stewart, Alexander Gilmore, Ruling Elders.

From the decision adopting the above resolution, Dr. Bruce dissented, for reasons to be given in.

Messrs. S. Hindman, Templeton, William Pollock, and D. R. Little asked and obtained leave of absence for the remainder of this sitting.

Adjourned till 10 o'clock on Monday morning. Closed with prayer.

Monday, May 27.

The Synod met, and was opened with prayer. Members present as above, with the exception of Messrs. D. Harvey and John Warnock, whose excuses for absence were sustained, and that Robert M'Neil attended in the room of Samuel Neily, and William Robb in the room of Robert Leiper.—Mr. James M'Cormick, Ruling Elder, from the congregation of Peter's Creek, being present, was invited to a seat.

On motion, it was resolved that a portion of the present sitting be spent in the exercises of prayer and praise, and Messrs. Campbell and M'Kee were appointed to lead in these exercises.

After the religious exercises were closed, the minutes of Saturday's sitting were read and approved.

The committee appointed to bring in a Report, issuing the matter respecting the publication of the purpose of marriage, presented a report, which, being amended, was adopted as follows.

The committee appointed to draft resolutions for the issuing of the appeals from the Presbytery of Miami, report the following:

1. *Resolved*, That the Synod highly approve of the conduct of the session of Sugar Creek, in judging Thomas White to be worthy of censure, on account of his violation of the Synod's rule, relative to the publication of the purpose of marriage; but the Synod would, at the same time, recommend to that session to use as much lenity as they may deem consistent with duty in their farther dealing with the said Thomas White, or dismiss the case with an expression of disapprobation.

2. *Resolved*, That the conduct of the Rev. Andrew Heron, in marrying a couple in the bounds of another congregation, not merely in contravention of the Synod's rule, referred to in the preceding resolution, but in opposition to the known efforts of the minister and session of that congregation to enforce the observance of said rule, is viewed by this Synod as both disorganizing and unbrotherly, and, as such, highly to be disapproved of, and that Mr. Heron be warned against the commission of the same offence in future.

J. MARTIN,
THOMAS HANNA,
JOSEPH CLOKEY.

Papers being called for, the following were given in and read; namely, No. 43,—the Report of Daniel Murphy, assistant treasurer, which was, on motion, referred to the committee on the funds.

Associate Synod in account with Daniel Murphy, Assistant Treasurer.

1838.	Dr.	Ca.
June 28,	To cash paid James Graham, for services as sexton, 20.00	By Balance in cash, as per report of June 2nd, 1838, 571.09½
	To cash paid Rev. Wm. Y. Hamilton for missionary Services, 59.00	July 12, By cash for missionary fund from Mr. Alexander Bachop, Argyle, Washington County, N. York, 100.00
	To cash paid Rev Joseph M'Kee and Rev. A. T. M'Gill, expenses to N. York and Cambridge, 63.00	1839.
July 24,	To cash paid Wm. S. Young, as per order of D. Houston, 50.00	May 7, By Cash, for student's fund from one year's interest on Commercial Bank Stock 99.00
Aug. 9,	To cash paid John M. Scroggs 100.00	
	\$292.00	\$770.09½ 292.00
		Balance 478.09½

The above report, showing the state of Synod's fund at Philadelphia, with the accompanying vouchers, is respectfully submitted.

DANIEL MURPHY, *Assistant Treasurer.*

Philadelphia, May 16th, 1839.

No. 44, A Petition from certain subscribers in and about Cansburgh, praying for liberty to hold meetings of the anti-slavery society in the buildings of the seminary, during the recess. Said petition was, on motion, referred to the board of trustees, with a recommendation that the use of the building be granted during the recess, both to the anti-slavery and colonization societies, if requested.

Adjourned till the usual hour. Closed with prayer.

2 o'clock P. M.

The Synod met, and was opened with prayer: members present as above, except that Mr. Alexander Reid attended in the room of Andrew Russell.—John Kayton in the room of Thomas Mitchell, and James Thom in the room of William Pollock.

The minutes of the forenoon sitting were read and approved. Messrs. Walker and Thomas Wilson were elected members of the board of managers of the Theological Seminary.

Papers being called for, there was given in and read, No. 45. A Report from Rev. A. Whyte, respecting the fulfilment of appointments by probationers in the Presbytery of the Carolinas.—This Report was, on motion, referred to the committee of Supplies.

The committee on Bills and Overtures reported respecting the delinquencies of certain probationers complained of in the Reports of Presbyteries. The Report was adopted.

The Committee on Bills and Overtures report,

Your committee find in the Reports of the Presbyteries of Miami and Illinois complaints against Messrs. S. M'Lean and William H. Walker, two of your itinerant preachers, for delinquency with respect to their Synodical appointments. As it would be evidently unjust to condemn without a hearing, your committee recommend, that as Mr. M'Lean is not present, his case be referred to the Presbytery of Philadelphia for such procedure as the nature of his delinquency will warrant. With respect to Mr. W. H. Walker, who is present, your committee recommend that he should now be called to the bar of Synod, to answer for his conduct.

JOHN WALKER,
THOMAS HANNA,
JOSEPH CLOKEY.

The same committee reported on the matters in the Report of the Presbytery of Richland, which had been referred to their consideration, and the report was adopted.

The Committee of Bills and Overtures, on that part of the Report of the Presbytery of Richland referred to them, beg leave to report,

That so much of said Report, as recommends certain amendments to the draught of a book of discipline now under the consideration of this Synod, lie on the table until said draught come before Synod for discussion.

And farther, that so much of said Report as requests Synod to address the people under their care on the *sinfulness* of slavery, and the participation of the non-slaveholding States in that sin, be granted, by the Synod's appointing a committee to prepare a letter accordingly.

JOHN WALKER,
JOSEPH CLOKEY,
THOMAS HANNA.

Messrs. Patterson and Walker were appointed the committee contemplated in the above Report.

The committee of Appeals reported on the case of Mr. Beggs, as referred in the Report of the Presbytery of Indiana. The Report was adopted, as follows; namely,

The committee of Appeals on the case of Mr. Beggs, as referred to Synod in the Report of the Presbytery of Indiana, would recommend to Synod the acceptance of this reference, in order to the final issuing of his case.

T. BEVERIDGE,
J. MARTIN,
J. G. SMART.

In pursuance of the above Report, Messrs. Rodgers, D. McLean, sen., and Clokey were appointed a committee to consider and report upon the case, with power to send for persons and papers.

The select committee on the various memorials respecting the proceedings of Synod last year, reported, and their Report was adopted.

The committee to whom were referred certain memorials relating to the proceedings of the last meeting of Synod, see no reason to enter particularly upon the statements and reasonings contained in these papers; but would recommend to Synod the adoption of the following address to such of these memorialists as have expressed dissatisfaction with the aforesaid proceedings.

T. BEVERIDGE,
JOHN WALKER,
J. SCROGGS.

Dear Brethren,

The Associate Synod having given such attention as their time and circumstances would admit, to the complaints contained in your memorials, would respectfully reply, that they can see no sufficient reason for reconsidering and reversing their former deeds. It is evident to the Synod, that the complaints against their proceedings are chiefly founded on misapprehensions. We do not attribute this to the want of attention to published documents relating to their affairs, but to the difficulty of understanding cases so involved, without being personally present, and more conversant with the history of them than could be expected of those who are not members of the Synod. Our proceedings, also, have been industriously misrepresented in certain publications, and with so much confidence, that we are not surprised that some have been misled. We hope that the publication of the reasons of protest in the cases to which we refer, and the answers to these reasons, adopted, almost unanimously, at the present meeting, will do much to remove any unfavourable impressions. Our brethren will find in these answers such statements as supersede the necessity of any farther remarks on their grounds of complaint. However desirous of gratifying their wishes, and promoting a greater degree of harmony in a few of our churches, which have been disturbed by the agitation of questions about our procedure, we hope they would be far from wishing us to employ means inconsistent with that faithful exercise of discipline which is so essential, both to the purity and peace of the church. The door is still open for the readmission of those who have been cut off for their offences, and we trust that no other feeling would be entertained but that of gratification at their return; yet this return must be in the way of repentance and submission. We

have acted from a sense of duty, and have not felt ourselves convinced of injustice in our proceedings; and, however much we are grieved that charges of this kind should be brought against us, until convinced in our own minds, we cannot recede from what we have done. If the plea used in behalf of the brethren under censure, be good in their case, it must, at least, be equally good in ours, not to yield until we are made sensible that we have done wrong. If you judge that these persons are innocent of the charges brought against them, yet surely you cannot acquit them of pursuing a course of conduct exceedingly vexatious and contemptuous to their brethren. If, as appears more probable, you view them as guilty and worthy of being condemned, but regard some of the proceedings of the church courts in arriving at their condemnation as not regular, then why should you desire the restoration of the guilty, without confession of repentance, as a means of correcting such errors of procedure? Would it not be the most disorderly step of all, "to justify the wicked" in his sin? We do not, as a court of Christ, claim infallibility, and if any steps in our procedure be wrong, we trust, when convinced of this, we shall cheerfully correct them; but it is not a just reason for abolishing discipline that there have been mistakes attending its exercise. Even supposing our acts to have been wrong, both in the process and in the issue, as they relate to the administration of discipline, and not to the principles of our profession, they form no sufficient ground to justify these brethren in withdrawing from the communion of the church, and treating her discipline and courts with contempt; nor can others be justified in countenancing these men in conduct manifestly divisive and contrary to their solemn ordination vows.

We hope that our brethren who have complained will remember the duty of obeying those who are over them in the Lord; that while adhering to the doctrines and ordinances of the word of God in opposition to all who would infringe upon their liberty in these things, they will be careful to distinguish this liberty from that licentious spirit which is prevailing to such an alarming extent, and which fears not to speak evil of dignities, and to set at naught the authority both of civil and ecclesiastical rulers. This authority is the ordinance of God, and is correctly employed in enacting and enforcing such rules as may promote the good of society, and especially of the kingdom of Jesus Christ. Whoever, therefore, resists the lawful exercise of this authority, is resisting an ordinance of God, and is guilty of a most aggravated sin.

Brethren, we beseech you to beware of those who would artfully beguile you, and alienate your affections from the courts of Christ, and your holy profession. Beware of attending on the ministry of those who have been righteously deposed from their office, and have now no authority to act in Christ's name. We beseech you, "by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you, but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment." "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 that is unprofitable for you." Brethren, "the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit. Amen."

The same committee reported on the case of the Rev. A. Whyte, sen., and the Report was, on motion, adopted, and referred to the Presbytery of Cambridge.

Paper No. 46 was given in and read, namely, a Petition and Memorial from the Associate Congregation of Troy, praying for a review and reversal of the Synod's decisions of last year, in relation to the Presbytery of Albany. The Moderator having pronounced this paper inadmissible, an appeal from the chair was taken and sustained. The paper was then, on motion, referred to the committee on memorials.

On motion, the report of the board of managers of the Theological Seminary was taken into consideration, and the following students were ordered to be taken on trial for licensure, namely,

Mr. Thomas Gilkerson, by the Presbytery of Chartiers.

Mr. William Smith, by the Presbytery of Philadelphia.

Mr. David R. Imbrie, by the Presbytery of Ohio.

Mr. James A. Brown, being recommended by the Presbytery of Indiana, was, on motion, referred to said Presbytery to be taken on trial for licensure.

On motion, resolved, that Synod do not appoint Mr. James Hawthorn to be taken on trial for licensure.

On motion, resolved, that a committee be appointed to converse with Mr. John Patrick, and report on his case as presented in the Report of the board. Messrs. Martin and Anderson were appointed said committee.

Reasons of protest by Mr. Heron against the Synod's decisions of last year, in relation to the Presbytery of Albany, and the Rev. D. Stalker, were read, and on motion, referred to Messrs. Martin, Anderson, and Miller, to prepare answers; and the committee were instructed to report during this meeting, if practicable.

Adjourned till the usual hour to-morrow morning.

Closed with prayer.

Tuesday, May 28.

The Synod met, and was opened with prayer: members present as above, with the exception, that Mr. Joseph M'Nary attended in the room of Matthew R. Atcheson.

The minutes of the last sitting were read and adopted.

Mr. William Wilson craved to have his dissent marked from the decision of yesterday, adopting the report of the committee on the case of the Rev. A. Whyte.

Answers to reasons of dissent by Dr. Bruce and Mr. Walker, from a deed of Synod passed in 1829, in relation to the right of infants to baptism, were read; and the following resolution, after discussion, was adopted.

That as it is impracticable for want of time for Synod at present to examine the answers of the committee, with that deliberation and care that the importance of the subject demands, and in order that the members of the Synod may have an opportunity to examine the subject, therefore, resolved, that the reasons of dissent, together with the answers by the committee, be published in the minutes.

The subscribers, having dissented from a deed of the Associate Synod at their last meeting in the city of Pittsburgh, in the year 1829, were provisionally hindered from attending the last meeting in the city of Philadelphia, beg leave to offer their reasons of dissent, and have the same entered in the minutes.

Reason 1st. That circumcision, in the room of which baptism came, was administered to the members of the household, and not confined to the natural posterity of professing parents.

2d. That the reason why the members of the household of Abraham were entitled to the privilege of this seal, was, that they were under his particular command, and that he had engaged to train them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. (Gen. xviii. 19.)

3d. That baptism does not appear to be confined to the natural posterity of professing parents, by any declaration of scripture; but in Acts xvi. 33, and in other places, the contrary appears to be asserted.

4th. That parents stand in the same moral relation to their adopted children that they do to their natural posterity, and of course the former possess all the religious privileges of the latter, and why refuse them the seal of these privileges?

5th. That the act of this Synod appears to determine that the entailment of the covenant of grace is by natural generation, and not by promise, contrary to Rom. ix. 8.

Signed, JOHN WALKER,
ROBERT BRUCE.

Answers to Reasons of Dissent from a deed of the Associate Synod of North America, at Pittsburgh, 1829, respecting the right of infant children to baptism: by the Rev. Messrs. Walker and Bruce.

The decision of Synod from which these brethren dissent, although they have not taken care to mention it, is the following:

"The natural relation of parentage, alone warrants the presentation of a child for baptism; and this relation entitles the child of a professing parent in all cases."

It is proper, in the first place, to state the doctrine of our subordinate standards on this point; for the decision of Synod not only agrees with it, but is almost in the same words. Confession of Faith, chap. xxviii. sect. 4. "Not only those that do actually profess faith in, and obedience to Christ, but also the infants of one or both believing parents, are to be baptized." Larger Catechism, Question 166. "Unto whom is baptism to be administered? Baptism is not to be administered to any that are out of the visible church, and so are strangers to the covenant of grace, till they profess their faith in Christ, and obedience to him; but the infants descending from parents, either both, or but one of them professing faith in Christ, and obedience to him, are, in this respect, within the covenant of grace, and are to be baptized." Shorter Catechism, Question 95. "To whom is baptism to be administered? Baptism is not to be administered to any that are out of the visible church, till they profess their faith and obedience to him; but the infants of such as are members of the visible church are to be baptized."

The dissenters oppose this doctrine for the following reasons—

Reason 1. "Circumcision, in the room of which baptism came, was administered to the members of the household, and not confined to the posterity of professing parents."

Answer. If the dissenters mean that in Israelitish families or households, others were circumcised beside the children of these Israelites, it makes nothing for their opinion; but if they mean that male children in these families, whose parents had not made a profession of the true religion, were circumcised, it is denied; and the dissenters have not attempted to prove it. We cannot understand how children of heathen or unbelieving parents could be in the families alluded to; for the same law which required such children to be circumcised, required also the male parents to be circumcised.—Gen. 17. 13: "He that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised." Therefore the children of these household servants were, by natural parentage, within the covenant of grace, and were to be circumcised. This was the way in which Abraham understood the law of circumcision, as appears from his practice in obedience to it. Gen. 17. 27: "In the self-same day was Abraham circumcised, and Ishmael, his son; and all the men of his house, born in his house, and bought with his money of the stranger, were circumcised with him."

Reason 2. "The reason why the members of the household of Abraham were entitled to the privilege of this seal, was, that they were under his particular command, and that he had engaged to train them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

Answer. According to the common way of arguing, the dissenters should have said that Abraham's authority over these children, and his engagement to give them a religious education, gave him a right to circumcise them; and not that these children had thereby acquired a right to be circumcised. But the doctrine, that the right of an infant to the initiating seal of the covenant of grace may originate in the authority or duty of a master, is not only new, but is also without any foundation in Scripture or reason. The authority of a parent or master to govern and instruct his household, is a right or moral power belonging to that relation, and is common to all men, independent of circumcision. Were the believing parents of a child both dead, and their authority at an end, its right to baptism, by the natural relation of parentage, would still be the same; because it does not originate from that authority.—As the dissenters do not object to the doctrine, that the "natural relation of parentage warrants the presentation of a child for baptism, but only that that *alone* warrants it, there is reason to conclude that they believe there are two ways in which children may have a right to this seal of the covenant of grace: one way for children of believing parents, that is by parentage; and another way for the children of heathens and others, out of the visible church, that is, the authority of the believing master, and his engagement to bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. This notion receives no support or countenance from the only text of Scripture to which we are referred: "I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him; and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment," Gen. 18. 19. There is no allusion in these words, or in their preceding or following contexts, to the right of Abraham's household to circumcision, nor even to circumcision itself. Abraham had the same authority over his household before the institution of circumcision that he had after it, and had performed the same duties in his family before circumcision that he performed after it. The text referred to contains, first, an expression of the divine approbation of Abraham's faithful discharge of domestic duties; and, secondly, a declaration of the divine favour to him on that account.

Reason 3. "Baptism does not appear to be confined to the natural posterity of professing parents, by any declaration of Scripture; but, in Acts 16. 33, and in other places, the contrary appears to be asserted."

Answer. The doctrine of infant baptism is supported from three sources of argu-

ment. First, from the subjects of circumcision under the Old Testament dispensation; and we are sure that the male children of believing parents were commanded to be circumcised. Secondly, from the fair and necessary consequence of such as the two following texts: "Suffer little children to come unto me; for of such is the kingdom of heaven," Matt. 19. 14. These children could be members of the visible church, or "of the kingdom of heaven," in no other way than by the natural relation of parentage. Acts 2. 39: "The promise is to you, and to your children;" where Peter's anxious hearers were referred to the ancient promise to Abraham, and to his seed. Thirdly, infant baptism is proved by such texts as plainly assert that the "infants of both or one believing parent, are within the pale of the visible church, and, therefore, have a right to baptism. 1 Cor. 7. 14: "The unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else were your children unclean; but now are they holy." This is properly considered as meaning that such children, and such only, are externally, relatively, and federally holy, a seed separated to the Lord, and entitled to the privileges of the covenant of grace. If the dissenters grant that these texts prove the right of infants of believing parents to baptism on account of their relation to their natural parents, infant baptism should be confined to them, unless it can be very clearly shown that there is some other appointed way in which they can acquire that. The dissenters have only referred us to Acts 16. 33; and to "other places," where they say it "appears to be asserted." In Acts 16. 33, it is said the jailor was baptized, and all "his straightway." There is nothing said here about servants or strangers in the jailor's house; and surely the most safe and natural way of understanding the expression, "all his" is, that it means his own family, his wife, and children.—In the 15th verse of this 16th chapter of the Acts, it is said, "Lydia was baptized and her household;" and in 2 Cor. 1. 16, the Apostle says, "I baptized the household of Stephanas." These are the "other places," we suppose, to which the dissenters refer. But they surely know that Pedobaptists consider these passages as strongly supporting the doctrine of the baptism of the infants of members of the visible church; because the word *oikos*, in these texts rendered household, and the word *bayith* in the Old Testament exactly agreeing with it, commonly and properly signifies, not strangers or servants in a family, but children in a strict and natural sense. But, supposing the term were taken in the sense for which the anti-pedobaptists plead, and in which the dissenters understand it, as including servants, it would prove nothing in opposition to the doctrine we are defending; for, if there were adult servants, they were baptized upon their "professing their faith in Christ, and obedience to him;" and, if they had children, they were baptized as "infants of such as are members of the visible church."

Reason 4. "Parents stand in the same moral relation to their adopted children that they do to their natural children; and, of course, possess all the religious privileges of the latter; and why refuse them the seal of these privileges?"

Answer. The dissenters have not been careful to express some things in this fourth reason so as to be easily understood; nor to support their opinion, which is neither self-evident, nor entertained by many others, with so much as an attempt to prove it. By "adopted children" it is not known whether they mean children that are bound in a family, for life, or for a time; or children whose adoption is sanctioned and rendered binding by an act of the legislature: perhaps they mean both. They assert that "parents stand in the same moral relation to their adopted children that they do to their natural children." Whether the moral relation is, in some degree, the same, in the case of adopted and natural children, we need not dispute; but we are sure it is not the same to the full extent of the natural relation between parents and children. The fifth commandment does not require this kind of parents to have the same ardour of affection, the same anxious care, the same unceasing labour, and endeavours to promote the welfare and happiness of any kind of adopted children they should have for their natural offspring. Neither does it require such adopted children to have such a warmth of love and gratitude, such reverence and confidence, such a lively concern for the honour, the lives and comfort of this kind of parents by adoption, as children should have for their natural parents.

The love of parents for their natural offspring is employed by the Holy Spirit as the finest and strongest figure to express the love of God for his people; and the love of children to their parents is also used to express the piety of his people toward himself. Speaking of the religious privileges possessed by these adopted children, the dissenters ask, "Why refuse them the seal of this privilege?" Baptism is not a seal of privileges; it is itself a privilege, and a seal of promises. But this confident assertion, that the adoption of children by persons making a religious profession gives such children a title to baptism, cannot by any means be admitted; no artificial or civil relation, like that between masters and servants, and between those who become parents and children by an act of adoption, can make these servants and children members of the visible church, or give them a right to baptism.

Reason 5. "The act of Synod appears to determine that the entailment of the covenant of grace is by natural generation, and not by promise, contrary to Rom. 9. 8."

Answer. The dissenters have certainly mistaken the meaning of the Synod's determination; for all pedobaptists found their doctrine principally upon the covenant promise to believing parents, and to their children, and the dissenters should not have suspected or suggested that the Synod would assert the right of children to baptism, by the natural relation of parentage, in opposition to the promise. The covenant of grace, or the promise of that covenant, is not mentioned in the Synod's decision; it was not necessary; it was to be expected that all in communion with the Synod would know that it was included. The doctrine of the Synod in that decision is, that the promise of the covenant of grace is conveyed to children by the natural relation of parentage. Indeed, this objection to the Synod's decision is so groundless and unreasonable, that it scarcely deserves a serious refutation. As to the text, Rom. 9. 8, to which the dissenters refer, as if it were contrary to the judgment of Synod about the warrant for the baptism of the infants of believing parents *only*, it seems necessary to remark, that the Apostle is not, in that place, treating of circumcision, or baptism, or of the way in which children have a title to the seal of the covenant of grace; but of a very different subject. In the sixth verse of that chapter, Rom. 9, the Apostle introduces an instance and illustration of God's sovereignty in making such a difference between persons who were, in themselves, alike. "They are not all Israel;" that is, true Israelites in God's account, or interested in the saving blessings of the covenant of grace, "that are of Israel;" that is, the natural offspring of Jacob, and who belong to the nation and visible church of Israel. He then refers to that remarkable instance of divine sovereignty in making such a difference between Isaac and Ishmael: "neither because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children: but in Isaac shall thy seed be called," verse 7. The Apostle treats of the same subject in the fourth chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians, verse 23. "He who was born of the bond woman was born of the flesh;" that is, in the order of nature, and by the power of nature; "but he of the free woman was born by promise;" that is, though according to the order of nature, yet not by the power of nature, but by the *promise* of God. Then the Apostle says, "these things are an allegory;" or, these two were typical persons. Ishmael, who was born after the flesh, according to the order, and by the power of nature, was a type of men in their natural state, and trusting in something of their own for justification. Isaac, who was born after the Spirit, was a type of those who are begotten by the almighty power of God, by means of the word, and who believe the promise of salvation through Jesus Christ. The Apostle is speaking on the same subject here, Rom. 9. 8. *They that are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God; but the children of the promise are accounted for the seed.* It is not easy to say in what sense the dissenters understand this text; but, by the literal construction they put upon it here, and by the way in which they apply it in opposition to the Synod's decision, they exclude all infants from baptism who are born "according to the flesh," or by natural generation; a consequence they surely did not intend.

THOMAS ALLISON.

ALEXANDER DONNAN.

Reasons of dissent by Dr. Bruce, from the decisions of Synod in the case of the Presbytery of Vermont, were read. Mr. D. Blair craved the privilege of joining in these reasons if he shall see proper to do so.—Messrs. Smart and Walker were appointed a committee to answer said reasons.

The committee to whom the petition from the Associate congregation of Troy was referred, presented a Report, which, after a free discussion, was, on motion, adopted, by the following vote, namely:

Ayes.—Drs. Ramsay and Beveridge, Messrs. Imbrie, Walker, Murray, J. Scroggs, Anderson, Miller, Hanna, Campbell, Martin, M'Elwee, S. Wilson, Templeton, Smart, Henderson, J. Bruce, Hall, B. Boyd, Lindsay, D. Gordon, Webster, T. Wilson, J. P. Ramsay, M'Arthur, John S. Easton, Irvine, Dickson, Patterson, E. N. Scroggs, and D. Thompson, Ministers.—Messrs. John Robertson, James Reid, John Bishop, John Law, James Smiley, Elisha Putnam, Samuel Johnston, Wm. S. Young, Aniel Rodgers, Wm. Patterson, H. Hamil, Wm. Scott, John Wilson, Wm. Collier, John Carnahan, John Auld, Thomas Latta, Andrew Glenn, Wm. Robb, Wm. Smith, Wm.

Morris, Wm. Cummings, Samuel Connelly, John Stewart, James Thom, Samuel Brownlee, Samuel M'Ewen, Jos. R. Dickson, John M'Dowell, Alexander Reid, John Sharp, and James Geery, Ruling Elders.—63.

Noes.—Dr. Bruce, Messrs. D. M'Lean, sen., Donnan, France, Heron, D. Blair, Rodgers, Snodgrass, Banks, Douthet, Galbraith, Pollock, M'Gill, D. Goodwillie, and Ferrier, Ministers.—Messrs. David Brown, Thomas Rough, Joseph Stewart, David White, Thomas Mitchell, Alexander Gilmore, Wm. Bell, and Robert Stewart, Ruling Elders.—23.

Non liquet.—Messrs. Wm. Wilson, Isaac, Clokey, D. M'Lean, jr., and Forrester, Ministers.—Messrs. Joseph M'Nary, Robert M'Neil, Robert Marshall, and James M'Cormick, Ruling Elders.—9.

The committee to whom were referred a petition and memorial from the Associate congregation of Troy, beg leave to report, that the answer already given to other memorials and petitions on the same subject, applies equally to this, and renders any thing farther unnecessary. Although this memorial differs in some respects from some others which the Synod has determined to be inadmissible, yet it appears from this paper, that the said congregation, in common with the other petitioners, view themselves as separated from the communion of the Associate church. This congregation appears before us as subordinate to an Associate Presbytery of Albany, with which this Synod has no connexion. The committee think, while the utmost care should be used not to infringe upon the right of petition, and while those not having a right might in many cases be allowed a hearing, that the right of petitioning for a review of the deeds of Synod should not be conceded to such as have not, and avow that they have not, any ecclesiastical connexion with us. It appears to your committee, that the proper course to be pursued by such as think themselves aggrieved, is to contend against what they judge to be wrong in the way of continuing in communion, and not to withdraw till all hope of a present reformation is cut off. Your committee would also recommend the following Resolution:—

Resolved, That the petitioners from the congregation of Troy, and also from other congregations, whose papers, on account of the form in which they were presented, could not be received, be directed to apply to the respective Presbyteries to which they formerly belonged, in respect to cases which have been referred to these Presbyteries; and that in respect to all matters properly coming before the Synod, they be instructed not to assume in their petitions such names and titles as are in contradiction to the Synod's deeds, and which, for this reason, might be judged to imply a contempt of the Synod's authority.

T. BEVERIDGE,
J. WALKER,
J. SCROGGS.

On motion, resolved, that a committee be appointed to inquire and report this afternoon, whether a more convenient place for Synod's meetings can be procured. Messrs. Bell and Mitchell were appointed said committee.

Resolved, that the hour of meeting in the afternoon, hereafter be half past 2 o'clock.

Adjourned. Closed with prayer.

Half past 2, P. M.

• The Synod met, and was opened with prayer. Members present as above, together with Mr. Barnard Gilleland, Ruling Elder from the Presbytery of Allegheny.

The minutes of the forenoon sitting, were read and approved. Mr. France gave intimation that he joined with Mr. Wm. Wilson in his dissent from the decision of Synod, in the case of the Rev. A. Whyte.

Mr. Wm. H. Walker being present was, pursuant to a former resolution, called upon for his excuse for the non-fulfilment of his

appointment in the Presbytery of Miami. The excuse being heard, was sustained.

Mr. Miller was, at his own request, released from the committee, to whom the paper from the Presbytery of Stamford had been referred.

The committees appointed to examine the records of the Presbyteries of Muskingum and Miami reported, and their reports were accepted.

The report of the commission that met at Massie's Creek, last July, was presented as follows, and, on motion, accepted, and ordered to be spread upon the records.

The commission appointed by Synod, to examine and issue all matters affecting the standing of the Rev. James Adams, met according to appointment, at Massie's Creek Meeting House, July the 5th, 1838. The Presbytery of Miami, being in session at the same time and place, transmitted to the commission a libel against Mr. Adams, charging him with five instances of intoxication, and with the habit of intemperance. These charges being judged relevant and admissible, testimony for and against the accused was taken and recorded. The testimony being read, and the parties heard, the commission found the Rev. James Adams guilty of four of the specifications in the libel, and of the habit of intemperance. For these offences, persisted in, in despite of warning and reproof, the commission judged him worthy of deposition from the holy ministry, and of suspension from the church, *sine die*; and did depose and suspend him accordingly. This conclusion, the commission arrived at, after careful and painful, and, they trust, impartial examination of the evidence in the case. Having appointed Mr. Samuel Hindman, a member of the commission, to preach the following Sabbath in Massie's Creek, announce the sentence of the court, and declare the congregation vacant, the commission closed with prayer and praise, and the pronouncement of the Apostolic Benediction by the Moderator, on Friday evening, the 13th of the month aforesaid.

THOMAS HANNA, Moderator.
WILLIAM M. M'ELWEE,
SAMUEL HINDMAN.

The next meeting of Synod, was appointed to be held at Baltimore, on the the 4th Wednesday of May next, at 4 o'clock, P. M.

Mr. Rodgers was appointed the Moderator's alternate, to preach the synodical sermon.

The report of last year's committee, on the report of the Presbytery of the Carolinas was called up, and, after some discussion, referred to a select committee, with all the other papers on this subject. Messrs. J. Scroggs and Patterson were appointed said committee.

On motion, resolved, that a new edition of the Declaration and Testimony be published by Mr. Wm. S. Young, as soon as practicable. Two thousand copies were ordered, and Mr. Young was authorized to draw upon the Synod's Treasurer for the expense of publication.

A resolution was offered to reconsider the deed of Synod last year, in relation to the Presbytery of Albany. This resolution, after considerable discussion, was negatived by the following vote, namely:

Ayes.—Dr. Bruce, Messrs. Wm. Wilson, D. M'Lean, sen., Donnan, France, Heron, D. Blair, Isaac, Clokey, D. M'Lean, jr., Rodgers, Snodgrass, Banks, Douthet, B. Boyd, Galbraith, Pollock, J. P. Ramsay, M'Gill, D. Goodwillie, D. Thompson, and Ferrier, Ministers.—Messrs. D. Brown, Thomas Rough, Joseph Stewart, Joseph M'Nary, David White, Thomas Mitchell, Alexander Gilmore, Wm. Bell, Robert Stewart, and James M'Cormick, Ruling Elders.—32.

Noes.—Drs. Ramsay and Beveridge, Messrs. Imbrie, Walker,

Murray, J. Scroggs, Anderson, Miller, Hanna, Campbell, Martin, M'Elwee, S. Wilson, Templeton, Smart, J. Bruce, Hall, Lindsay, D. Gordon, Webster, T. Wilson, M'Kee, M'Arthur, John S. Easton, Dickson, Patterson, E. N. Scroggs, Ministers.—Messrs. John Robertson, James Reid, John Bishop, John Law, James Smiley, E. Putnam, S. Johnston, Wm. S. Young, Aniel Rodgers, Wm. Patterson, H. Hamil, Wm. Scott, John Wilson, Wm. Collier, John Carnahan, John Auld, Francis Grove, Thomas Latta, Andrew Glenn, Benjamin Babbett, Robert M'Neil, Wm. Robb, Wm. Smith, Wm. Morris, Wm. Cummings, Samuel Connelly, John Stewart, Joseph R. Dickson, John M'Dowell, Alexander Reid, John Sharp, and James Geery, Ruling Elders.—59.

Non liquet—Messrs. J. Hindman and Henderson, Ministers.—Messrs. Robert Marshall, James Thom, Samuel Brownlee, and Samuel M'Ewen, Ruling Elders.—6.

Against the above decision, Mr. Heron protested, for reasons to be assigned, and was joined by Dr. Bruce, Messrs. Donnan, D. M'Lean, sen., Ferrier, D. Blair, Brown, and White.

Mr. Francis Grove asked and obtained leave of absence during the remainder of the session.

On motion, resolved, that Mr. J. W. Harsha be referred to the Presbytery of Chartiers, during the remainder of his probationary year, and that whatever calls may be in readiness for him at the expiration of that period, be referred to said Presbytery for presentation.

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

Wednesday, May 29.

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

Mr. Joseph Stewart asked and obtained leave of absence during the remainder of the session.

Mr. Allison gave notice that he joined in the protest taken last evening against the decision, refusing to reconsider the decision of last year, in relation to the Presbytery of Albany.

Papers being called for, there was given in a paper signed "A Seceder." Said paper, having a fictitious signature, was judged inadmissible, and was not read.

A petition from certain individuals of the congregation of Ryegate, praying for a review and reversal of the Synod's deeds of last year, in relation to the Presbytery of Albany, Dr. A. Bullions, and Mr. Stalker, was read, and, on motion, referred to the committee, to whom the other memorials of the same nature had been referred.

A petition was read from Mr. Beggs, praying that he may be heard on his case, either before the committee or the Synod itself. It was, on motion, agreed that he be heard before the Synod, and that the committee on the case be discharged. The Synod entered on the consideration of the case, and Mr. Beggs was heard. After some discussion, it was agreed to postpone the further consideration of the case for the present.

The committee of Supplies presented a report, which was, on

motion, recommitted. Dr. Ramsay was, at his own request, released from said committee, and Mr. B. Boyd appointed in his room.

On motion, it was resolved, as a standing rule of Synod, that at the close of each session of the Theological Seminary, the professors assign to such students as the board agree to recommend, subjects of trial for licensure.

The following preamble and resolution were offered and adopted, namely, "Whereas, there are demands for supply of preaching, which this Synod find themselves unable fully to answer; therefore resolved, that a committee be appointed to inquire what can be done to encourage and facilitate the education of young men, whereby candidates for the gospel ministry may be placed at Synod's disposal."—Messrs. Templeton, McElwee, and Miller, were appointed said committee.

The committee on the memorial from certain persons in the congregation of Dumfries, in the Presbytery of Stamford, reported. The Report was on motion accepted, and laid on the table.

On motion, resolved, that a copy of the above memorial be referred to the Presbytery of Stamford, and that said Presbytery be ordered to appear before Synod at next meeting in their own defence.

The Report of the committee on the Report of the Presbytery of Cambridge, was given in and read. While this Report was under consideration, a motion was made that Mr. Stalker be heard. The Moderator decided that the motion is not in order.

The Report was then on motion adopted, as follows:

The committee on the report of the Presbytery of Cambridge ask leave to state, that they find in it a complaint of the continued insubordination of the brethren whose sentence of deposition was confirmed last year, Dr. A. Bullions and Mr. Stalker.—That their example seems to have a pernicious effect in encouraging others to disregard the discipline of the church.—That, not contented with forming a party within their own bounds, they are endeavouring to extend the schism into the bounds of other congregations under the inspection of that Presbytery. That they claim the right to pursue the above course under their protest of last year, and finally, that they have proved contumacious to all their citations, and thereby baffled every attempt to deal with them according to the order they received from Synod last year. Under these circumstances, they ask the Synod's advice with regard to farther measures in the cases of these men respectively.

On the case as thus presented, your committee report, that as the course pursued by those deposed brethren and their adherents has evidently been dictated by a latent hope, that they may yet be saved the necessity of submitting to the decisions of the Presbytery and Synod in their case, by having those decisions set aside; the evil may, in their opinion, be fully met by proposing the following resolutions:

Resolution 1st.—That as the Synod still believe their decision of last year, in the case of the above named brethren, was founded in truth and right, and based on sufficient evidence, so they are firmly resolved to adhere to it.

Resolution 2nd.—That if the deposed brethren have any submissions to make, the Presbytery of Cambridge, to which they belonged, are fully competent to receive those submissions, and restore them to their former standing without the intervention of the Synod.

Resolution 3rd.—That said Presbytery be directed to continue to deal with them yet farther, with a view to their restoration. That, however, they be directed to certify to them, that if they persist in their present contumacious and disorderly course, they may find themselves impelled, by a suitable regard to the interests and safety of that part of the church under their inspection, to proceed to the highest censures.

All which is respectfully submitted.

JAMES RAMSAY,
J. SCROGGS.

Mr. Brown craved to have it marked that he voted in the negative.

Answers to Mr. Heron's reasons of protest against the Synod's deed of May 26th, 1838, in the case of the Presbytery of Albany were read, and, on motion, adopted;—Mr. Brown craving to have it marked that he voted in the negative.

On the 26th of May, 1838, this Synod passed an Act, declaring for reasons assigned in the deed, that "the body of which Mr. Stark was a member, is not the Associate Presbytery of Albany; but that said body was irregular in its constitution, and all its acts null and void;—and farther declaring, that the body of which Messrs. Martin and Campbell are members, is truly the Associate Presbytery of Albany." Against the above decision, I, along with some other brethren, entered my protest at the time, and now proceed respectfully to lay before your Rev. body a summary of my reasons for doing so.—and,

1. I protest against the above decision, because, according to my views, it sustains and approves a high-handed act of insubordination. Whether the Synod of 1837 acted right or not, in restoring Mr. Stark, for the time being, to his seat as a member of the court, the deed was done. Your records show that he left the Synod in the enjoyment of all his rights. Yet, notwithstanding this, the Presbytery of Albany, of which he was a member, refused him a seat as a member of that body, and that without any new charge preferred or tried. Now I am not disposed to dispute their right to call Mr. S. to account on any new charge which they had against him, and even to suspend him, if they thought it expedient to do so, till the cause was tried. Nothing, however, of this kind was done. The Presbytery set him aside at once, without any new charge tabled, or trial had; thereby, in my view, evidently nullifying the decision of Synod, and the Synod, by the deed of which I complain, have said that they did right. Presbyteries, as well as individuals, have an undoubted right to protest, remonstrate, or memorialize, when they are aggrieved by a decision of the court above; but they have no right to *set aside* such decision, or declare it null and void.

2. I protest against the aforesaid decision, because it introduces into the government of the church a principle hitherto unknown among Presbyterians, namely: that an act of mal-administration vitiates, not only the proceedings, but the very existence of a court. In the decision protested against, it is expressly said, that "Mr. Stark's illegal admission to a seat vitiated all their proceedings;" and from this, together with certain other premises, the conclusion is drawn that they "are not the Associate Presbytery of Albany; but were irregular in their constitution, and all their acts null and void."

For a long series of years the fathers of the Secession, together with many other friends of truth, had complained loudly, and complained justly, of many decisions of Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assembly, as illegal, oppressive, and injurious to the cause of God and truth. But they never viewed these deeds as vitiating the existence of the courts. They considered them as *corrupt* courts, and their unscriptural decisions as null and void; but they still professed and yielded submission to them in the Lord, as courts of Christ's house. And if the principle embodied in this decision be admitted, where can we look for a legal or constitutional court of Christ on earth? It is believed that there can be none; for while composed of fallible men, exemption from every act of mal-administration cannot be pretended. Where, on this principle, will be the Associate Synod itself? Has there never been an act of mal-administration committed by the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania, or the Associate Synod of North America? None, I believe, will affirm this. Yet, as it appears to me, the late decision gives to any man, who conscientiously believes that an act of mal-administration has been committed, a right to say to the Synod—"Your very existence is vitiated, and all your acts are null and void."

I have no wish to vindicate the regularity of the proceedings of the brethren, in the manner in which they admitted Mr. Stark to his seat. As far as I know any thing of presbyterial order, I believe that when their protest was taken against the former deed excluding him, they ought to have presented their appeal before the superior court, and if they could not regularly obtain a reconsideration, let the matter rest till this was done. But whatever irregularity attended the proceedings, it could only affect the decision itself. It could never affect the constitutionality of the court.

3. I protest against the aforesaid decision, because it opens a door for endless anarchy and confusion. This, I believe, it does, by sanctioning the conduct of Messrs. Martin, Campbell, and Milmine, in withdrawing from the meeting, and constituting themselves into a Presbytery. If these brethren were aggrieved, they had a presbyterial remedy, and one that they could in a short time have applied. That remedy was, appeal to the superior court. And if in the tyrannical exercise of power this sacred right should be denied, still they could have come before the Synod by memorial and complaint. And had they done so, they had no reason to doubt but that their

grievances would have been redressed. But instead of this, these brethren take the matter into their own hands, retire, and constitute themselves into a Presbytery, without waiting for the action of Synod; and the Synod have said that they did right. According to this decision, whenever a number of the constituent members of any inferior court, sufficient to constitute a quorum, are aggrieved by a decision, all that they have to do is to retire, and form a new court, and transact business in their own way. This is the first time, I believe, in which a Presbytery was formed in the Associate Church in this manner; but as it has received the sanction of the Associate Synod, it will not probably be the last. In this matter, it seems to me to be a mere question of moonshine, whether the brethren aforesaid, previous to their retiring, proclaimed their design or not. They had, on presbyterial principles, no more right to take the step with such declaration of intention than without it.

Respectfully submitted.

May 21st, 1839.

ANDREW HERON.

Answers to the foregoing Reasons of Protest.

As the protester has lost sight of some important and governing facts in the case, it will be proper, before proceeding to consider his reasons particularly, to give a brief history of the case itself. The Associate Presbytery of Albany, in January, 1836, tabled a libel against the then Rev. Andrew Stark, which contained sundry charges, deeply affecting both his moral and ministerial character. Two citations to appear before Presbytery and answer to said charges, he treated with silent contempt; and in answer to the third, he sent in a paper containing a declinature of the Presbytery's jurisdiction. The Presbytery, then, for reasons, which to them appeared satisfactory, referred the libel to the Synod for adjudication, reserving, however, at the same time, the right to deal with Mr. Stark in relation to his paper of declinature. This reservation was recognised by the Synod as proper; and, accordingly, the aforesaid paper was returned to the possession of the Presbytery. In the month of June, 1837, Mr. Stark again, after an absence of more than a year, appeared in Presbytery. But as he had declined the authority of that court, and had withdrawn from them, his name was dropped from the list of the members; and when a motion was made to have his name restored to the list, the motion was negatived, among other reasons, because he refused to take back, when requested, the aforesaid paper of declinature; in which he had not only refused subjection to the Presbytery, but had also abused several of its members in a truly outrageous manner. Against this decision, Messrs. Stark, Bullions, and Blair protested and appealed to the Synod, and afterwards gave in their reasons of protest, which were answered by a committee of the Presbytery.

The Presbytery were, some time afterwards, constrained to table certain charges against Dr. P. Bullions, involving his moral and ministerial character, and he was cited to answer to the same, at the bar of the Presbytery, on the 18th of April, 1838.

On the said 18th day of April, at a very few minutes after the hour appointed for the meeting of the Presbytery, Messrs. Campbell and Martin, together with an elder, entered the place of meeting, and were immediately informed that the Presbytery was constituted: that Messrs. Bullions and Blair had withdrawn their protests, and that in consequence thereof, Mr. Stark and his elder had been admitted to seats in the court. Messrs. Campbell and Martin pronounced such procedure to be utterly subversive of presbyterial order, and offered to protest against it, but this truly presbyterian privilege was strangely denied them. Dr. P. Bullions, moreover, offered a resolution to suspend, from their seats in Presbytery, Messrs. Campbell and Martin, together with their elders, for an alleged opposition to the Synod in having voted, the preceding year, that Mr. Stark's name ought not to be put on the roll till he would, at least, withdraw his offensive declinature. As this resolution was about to be put to the vote, and that, too, without allowing the persons, whose presbyterial standing it affected a full opportunity of expressing their abhorrence at seeing such outrages committed in the name of Zion's King, they withdrew, declaring that they could not regard that disorderly body as a court of Christ, and that the Presbytery would be constituted elsewhere. This was accordingly done, an additional elder having previously arrived.

Hence, there appeared on the floor of last Synod two bodies, each claiming to be the Presbytery of Albany. And the Synod decided in favour of those who withdrew, together with such as adhered to them. And this decision was made on the following grounds:—

1. Mr. Stark having declined the jurisdiction of the Presbytery, that court was right in refusing him a seat as long as he refused to withdraw his declinature.

2. The withdrawal of the protest and appeal, above referred to, could only have the effect of confirming the deed against which that protest had been entered.

3. The admission of Mr. Stark and his elder was, therefore, in fact, the admission of individuals who had no right nor title to seats in the Presbytery.

4. The right of protest and appeal was taken away from Messrs. Campbell and Martin, and that, too, under circumstances which must invalidate every claim to the title of a Presbyterian court.

5. The individual who was arraigned for trial, at that time, was allowed to take an active part in the organization of the court, and actually to offer a resolution to suspend from their seats two ministers with their elders, for no other reason than that they had not voted to his mind on a former occasion.

6. As Dr. P. Bullions could not legally take part in any procedure which affected the final issue of the process in which he was involved, while he was taking such part, as in introducing persons into the court who had no right there, and excluding those who had a right, there remained but a single ministerial member who was qualified to sit and act in the case.

7. The great precipitancy and indecent haste with which the protesting brethren of the Presbytery, with their elders, met and proceeded to admit Mr. Stark and his elder to seats, in the absence of all those who had voted against their admission on the former occasion, although it was known that some of these were so near at hand that they could have been called in, in almost a minute's time.

8. There were clear indications given by the protesting brethren of an intriguing design, to circumvent their brethren in this matter—such as the presence of Mr. Stark and his elder: the anxiety manifested about the arrival of a distant member; the presence of Dr. P. Bullions, at that hour, contrary to his practice for twelve years; having the resolution which provided for the suspension of Messrs. Campbell and Martin with their elders, from seats in Presbytery, prepared beforehand, &c.

The foregoing reasons, together with other circumstances, were all before the Synod, and were urged by members previously to the taking of the vote on the resolutions protested against by Mr. Heron; and although they are not all mentioned in the resolutions, they are not to be regarded as *after-thoughts*. It is not usual for church courts to embody in their minutes all the reasons which govern the votes of members. This is impracticable. One member may have but one reason, and another may have a score for giving precisely the same vote. Hence it is unfair to infer that a judicatory has no more reasons for any of its decisions than those which it may choose to publish in its records.

In view, then, of the foregoing reasons, taking them altogether, who can hesitate to express his approbation of the Synod's decision in the case? It is not, indeed, pretended that the Presbytery of Albany became *annihilated* by the unlawful deeds above referred to; the Presbytery still existed in those members who withdrew and transacted Presbyterian business in another place. Nor is it pretended to fix upon the precise and solitary deed which rendered it evident that the persons who first assembled under the name of the Presbytery, lost all title to that name. It is difficult to determine at what particular point a true church may cease to be such, and, on the contrary, become a *synagogue of Satan*. A succession, however, of anti-Christian acts, at length, may determine the matter. So in the present case; a succession of anti-presbyterial, oppressive, disorderly, and violent measures, such as are mentioned above, gives decisive evidence as to the character of the body from which those measures proceeded. It ceased to be a court of Jesus Christ, and the Presbytery was preserved in those members who bore testimony against those measures, and proceeded to act as a Presbytery in another place, which members would have been unfaithful to their Master, and would have acted inconsistently with their ordination engagements, had they done otherwise, or ceased to act as Presbyters at all, as the protester would have had them do.

After the above history and view of the case, the reasons of the protester will require but brief answers.

1. His first reason is, that the Synod sustained by their decision a high-handed act of insubordination in the Presbytery. But there is no foundation for this reason in fact. The Presbytery did not meddle with the deed of Synod removing Mr. Stark's suspension, as the protester intimates. They did not sit in judgment upon it. They never questioned the validity of it. Neither did they, in the smallest degree, act in insubordination to it. But on the contrary, they manifested their obedience to the Synod in taking the very first opportunity of dealing with Mr. Stark on account of his offensive declination, as Synod directed, or at least, allowed them to do, at its meeting in 1836. (See Minutes of Synod for 1836.)

2. The second reason proceeds on the false assumption that the Synod decided that an act of mal-administration vitiated the very existence of the body which had been guilty of such act. But the Synod only say that it vitiated their *proceedings*. There was, as has been already stated, a succession of mal-administration acts, which, together with all the other circumstances combined, led the Synod to judge that the body in question ought not to be recognised as a true and lawful Presbyterian court, and that the powers of the Presbytery of Albany, of right belonged to those who resisted those unlawful deeds until they were, in a measure, thrust out,

and who then met in another place, and acted as a court in conformity to presbyterian rules. And their conduct was so far from contradicting the views of the early fathers of the secession, that it was in strict accordance therewith. For those eminent men maintained that the judicatures of the established church had ceased to be lawfully constituted courts of Jesus Christ, because of the admission of the "intruders" into them, together with other high-handed acts of mal-administration.

3. In answer to the third reason of protest, it is sufficient to say that the evil decreed by the protester, would be far more likely to arise, had the Synod decided otherwise than they did. If it were ever again to happen, that a few protesting ministers, in a Presbytery under the inspection of this Synod, should be found meeting with the manifest design to circumvent their brethren of the majority, and should proceed to withdraw their protests with the view of killing the decision against which they were entered, admit persons to seats who had no right there, suspend the privilege of protest and appeal, attempt to thrust out the members belonging to the majority, as they arrived, allow a member, under process for scandal, to take an active part in having the court that was to try him composed only of such members as he knew would vote in his favour, and do all these things in a hurried, if not profane manner, the Synod would say, to such members as might refuse to acknowledge such a disorderly body to be a court of Jesus Christ, and who might retain and transact Presbyterian business elsewhere, "Brethren, you did right."

JAMES MARTIN,
JAMES P. MILLER,
A. ANDERSON.

Adjourned till the usual hour. Closed with prayer.

Half past two P. M.

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

Answers to reasons of protest by Mr. Heron against the deed of Synod of May 28th, 1838, adopting the Report of a committee suspending the brethren of the Presbytery of Albany, were read, and, on motion, adopted.

On the 28th of May, 1838, this Synod adopted the report of a committee, in reference to certain brethren of the Presbytery of Albany, thereby suspending said brethren from the exercise of their offices, and the communion of the church. Against this decision I entered my protest at the time, along with other brethren of the Synod, and now proceed to assign some reasons which have induced me to take this step.

As this decision reduplicates on that of the 26th of May, 1838, in reference to the same brethren, all the reasons which I have already assigned for protesting against that decision apply to this, and to these I beg leave to refer, without repetition.

The following are some *additional* reasons of protest.

1. The decision in question appears, in its spirit, to deny, or at least unduly to limit, the right of protest. It declares that the paper of the suspended brethren, purporting to be some of their reasons of protest, offers a contemptuous opposition to the authority of this Synod. The decision protested against by the brethren was nothing less than the annihilation of their presbyterial existence. Such being its nature, there was evidently no middle ground between unconditional submission to the deed, and holding it null and void. They could not conscientiously submit, and, therefore, there was no alternative left for them but to hold it null and void as they say. I am not aware of any thing in these brethren's protest that is or can be cavilled at, except this declaration. And if they are censured for embodying in their protest a declaration, which *any* protest in their circumstances necessarily implies, does not the inference seem to be a fair one that they are censured for protesting at all? I may add, that the language of the brethren in their protest, in which they say that they hold the decision null and void, is not stronger than that employed by the fathers of the Secession in their celebrated protest. Nay, your own published records contain, at least, one protest, which holds the same language respecting the decision protested against, yet no fault was found with it.

2. The decision seems to imply the alarming doctrine that every instance of non-submission involves the guilt of "contemptuous opposition to rightful authority." They must have clearer optics than mine who perceive any thing contemptuous in the *language* which the brethren employ. The contempt must be in the deed. And that this is the contempt meant by Synod seems clear from the language of the deci-

sion itself; for it declares, that by continuing to claim to be the Presbytery of Albany, they "contemptuously" refuse submission to Synod. If I understand the language of the Synod here, their doctrine is, that any and every act of non-submission involves the guilt of contempt of church courts and their authority. I do not charge the Synod with *holding* this anti-protestant doctrine. But by the adoption of the report they have (inadvertently I trust) used language which seems to me fairly to imply it. Non-submission and contempt may be found together, but there is no necessary alliance. Still less are they one and the same thing.

3. I consider the deed in question as incompatible with that Christian tenderness and caution by which church courts should always be characterized in the exercise of discipline. It has been usual in presbyterial courts, previous to the infliction of such weighty censures on brethren, first to try all affectionate and gentle methods to reclaim, before cutting them off. But by this act these brethren are precipitately suspended from the exercise of their office, and from the communion of the church, without any previous step taken to reclaim them. To me it seems evident, that if these brethren were in error, it would have been more in the spirit of the gospel, previous to cutting them off, to deal with them, either by the court itself, or a committee appointed for the purpose. Patience and long-suffering are no less becoming in the disciples of Christ, than unflinching fidelity to his cause.

Respectfully submitted.

May 21st, 1839.

ANDREW HERON.

Answers to the foregoing Reasons.

1. The first reason of protest is, that the deed of Synod in question either denies or unduly limits the right of protest. That the Synod had no such intention, is evident from a previous deed expressly conceding to the brethren of the Presbytery of Albany, the right of protesting against the deed with which they were dissatisfied. The ground of the Synod's action in this case, was not the protesting of these brethren, but their refusing all submission, declining the authority of Synod, and holding the deed protested against to be null and void. If such insubordination is to be tolerated and justified, it must put an end to all church government. The protester, however, says that there was "no middle ground between unconditional submission to the deed, and holding it to be null and void." To this we answer, that the submission required, was only to unite and act with their brethren of the Presbytery as before, and this they might have done without conceding a single principle for which they contended, so that we are at a loss to perceive how their consciences could be aggrieved, or how their case could be of such a character as to shut them up to insubordination and secession, as imperative duties. The present protester, taking the same view of their case as these excised brethren, yet does not appear to find himself in the same dilemma, which he pleads as their apology. He does not put their names upon the roll, nor refuse to acknowledge those whom the Synod has recognised as the Presbytery of Albany, to be that Presbytery; but, while he protests, he submits to the deed against which he protests. Why then should he regard non-submission an imperative duty in them, while he yields submission himself in the same case? If his views be correct, how can his conscience and principles be less affected than theirs? We cannot regard the deed of Synod as annihilating their presbyterial existence. It regards them as a part, but not as a whole of the Presbytery of Albany, and while it does not sustain their disorderly proceedings as presbyterial acts, it yet allows of their returning to their brethren, whom they had irregularly suspended from their seats.

The language of these brethren, it is said, is not stronger than that of the fathers of the Secession, in their celebrated protest. We are, however, persuaded that our modern seceders have by no means the same grounds for secession. The protest of the fathers of the Secession originated in zeal for the truths of God, and the liberties of his people. The protest of the present seceders has originated in attempts to defeat the discipline of the church, and to injure the reputation of brethren by slanderous publications. In the other case of protest, supposed to be referred to by our brother, the language is not that the deed protested against shall be held to be null and void; but that "it is, and ought to be null and void," which makes a radical difference. In a word, the whole of this reason is based on the supposition that persons may decline the authority of the church, and yet be retained in it, and that refusing them this liberty may be construed as a denial of the right of protest.

2. In the second reason, the protester infers a general principle from a particular act of Synod: because the Synod in a particular case, charges non-submission as implying contempt, the protester seems to think that they have adopted the general principle, "the alarming doctrine, that every instance of non-submission involves the guilt of contemptuous opposition to rightful authority." As it is admitted by him, that "non-submission and contempt may be found together," and as no argument is offered to prove that this is not a case of the kind, this reason may be dismissed without farther remark.

3. The third reason is founded upon the alleged precipitancy of the act of suspension. So long as persons continue in their connexion with a church, the steps proposed in this reason may be very proper; but they are not, at least, commonly employed towards those who, by declining the authority of a church, appear to shut the door against such dealings. In other cases of declinature, a vote of suspension has been instantly passed, in the present instance a declinature was twice offered, and twice committees were appointed to report upon them; we think also we are safe in saying, that nearly half the time of the last meeting of Synod was occupied upon the case of these brethren before the final action of the court, so that there seems no room for the charge of precipitancy.

JAMES MARTIN,
JAMES P. MILLER,
A. ANDERSON.

Answers to reasons of protest by Mr. Heron against the deed of Synod last year in the case of Mr. Stalker, were read, and, on motion, adopted;—Mr. Brown craving to have it marked that he voted in the negative.

Against the Synod's decision of June 1, 1838, affirming the decision of the Presbytery of Cambridge, in the case of the Rev D. Stalker, I recorded my protest, for which I now assign the following reasons:—

1. Because the aforesaid decision tends to abridge the due liberty of speech. The charge against Mr. Stalker was based upon his speech read before the Presbytery, when a case of Dr. A. Bullions was under consideration. That speech was read with permission of the court asked and obtained. After having examined it with all the attention in my power, I can find nothing in it which I consider sufficient to justify a prosecution. Mr. Stalker, indeed, expresses his honest conviction respecting the spirit manifested throughout certain proceedings of the Presbytery, with which he had felt himself aggrieved; and it is possible, that, in the expression of these convictions, his language may not always be the happiest selection that could be made. But to torture a man's language, so as to put the most unfavourable construction on it that it can be made to bear, seems too near a kin to "making a man an offender for a word," and seems not to be in accordance with that charity which "hopeth all things, and believeth all things." And are church courts, or those who compose them infallible, so that we must in no case think that an unchristian spirit is manifested, or an unscriptural course pursued? or, if we think it, must our lips be sealed, that we dare not speak it? It is admitted that liberty and licentiousness of speech are very different things; but surely great care should be taken that in our attempts to check the one, we do not infringe upon the other. This I consider the Presbytery of Cambridge as having done, and the Synod have, by their decision, said that they have done rightly.

2. Because no regard was paid to the defendant's solemn disclaimer. As the Presbytery's proof of their charges was found in Mr. Stalker's written speech, so his defence was presented in a paper of explanation and disclaimer. This paper was before the Synod, and speaks for itself: and such, to my mind, is the spirit of honesty and candour that breathes through the whole, that unbiassed minds will be satisfied that the views imputed to him are not his. Yet the Presbytery considered the one paper as containing sufficient evidence for his condemnation, but attached no weight to the other for his exculpation: and the Synod sanctioned their procedure as correct.

3. Because the decision involves the dangerous principle, that the Narrative of our Testimony is a term of ministerial and Christian fellowship. One of the charges on which Mr. Stalker was condemned, and that one which I believe operated most against him, was, his alleged disagreement with the Synod in their views respecting the United Secession Church in Scotland, expressed in a certain foot note inserted in the Narrative. Whether Mr. Stalker's views respecting this note are correct or otherwise, I do not here inquire: but that an approbation of it should be required of any, as a condition of fellowship, is contrary to the Synod's declaration in the act adopting the Narrative; and it is also at war with the fact, that when this note was adopted by Synod, a part of the members voted against it, and some, I believe, recorded their dissent. Yet the Presbytery of Cambridge have virtually said, by their decision, that an approbation of it shall be required as a term of church fellowship; and the Synod, by sustaining their decision without limitation, have said the same thing.

Respectfully submitted.

ANDREW HERON.

Answers to Reasons of Protest given in by Mr. Heron against a decision of Synod, in the case of Mr. Stalker.

1. The first reason alleges that the decision of Synod "tends to abridge the due liberty of speech," because the charge against Mr. Stalker was based upon his writ-

ten speech, which was read before Presbytery. But Synod must not confound liberty and licentiousness. It is licentiousness to offer conjectures as facts, to assert for facts what is mere suspicion, and to make heavy charges without proof, and which cannot be proved. Mr. Stalker did not merely give his opinions, as the reason under consideration alleges, that the Presbytery manifested an unchristian spirit, but that in a certain cause before them they acted under this spirit *alone*. As little as could justice be required of him, certainly was, to acknowledge the fact contained in his written speech, and retract a grievous charge which he could not prove. But this he would not do. It is a strange plea advanced here, and often made in Synod, that to hold members responsible for slanders, or errors advanced in debate, is a restraint on liberty of speech. Do those who make this plea really believe that a liberty to advance gratuitous charges and hard suspicions, as facts, is necessary to the investigation of truth, or the maintenance of justice? Do they wish to see a Presbytery or Synod which is constituted in the name of Christ, a licensed house of slander, indecorous language, and ungoverned passion?

2. The second reason asserts that no regard was paid to Mr. Stalker's solemn disclaimer, which was made by him in a written defence. This is a gratuitous misstatement of fact. It is of a piece, therefore, with some publications against the Presbytery of Cambridge and the Synod, and with some memorials which have been read, and speeches made at the present meeting. If it be free discussion to assert what might suit the attaining of an object rather than ascertained facts, let such free discussion be the privilege of our opponents only, and let them alone embrace it. It is, however, *this* liberty that is agitating the church so much at present, and perverting and alienating the minds of so many members. The Presbytery of Cambridge did pay regard to Mr. Stalker's disclaimer; but as it was a disclaimer only of a meaning or intention, the Presbytery asked a retraction of the words or acknowledgment of fault in them, which he absolutely refused. It was impossible, therefore, to attach much weight to a disclaimer which was contradicted by unequivocal words still adhered to.

3. The third reason alleges that the decision of Synod protested against "involves the dangerous principle, that the Narrative of our Testimony is a term of ministerial and Christian fellowship." This is a mistake of the case. We request so much candid attention to the matter in question, as to consider whether an approbation of historic statements in the Narrative, and adherence to an authoritative act of Synod, respecting the principles of our profession, recorded not only in the minutes, but published in the Narrative, be the same thing. Does its publication in the Narrative destroy its obligation as an act of Synod? It was not the Synod's Narrative, but this act published in the Narrative, that was required by Presbytery and Synod to be recognised. Nor would a special recognition of that act of Synod have been required of Mr. Stalker at the time it was required, if he had not called that act and its truth and authority in question. But this he did once and again, gratuitously. A dissent from, or protest against an act of Synod, to which this reason refers, does not warrant open opposition to it, or resistance of it; but Mr. Stalker's declaration in Presbytery and Synod was open resistance. People may readily be found, who join in a profession, while they entertain sentiments utterly at variance with it. This, Mr. Stalker actually did, not only by acknowledging that many good things are found in the United Secession Church, which is not denied by us, but by justifying his connexion with them, in all their apostacy, and by refusing to testify against them. It was the duty of Synod to testify against that union as far as they deviated from that profession in which a part of them had been united with us, and they have a right to exclude from their communion all who justify that union which they have condemned. The Synod did not require of Mr. Stalker to testify against any thing which is found good in that church, nor to be silent in approving of such things, but to unite with us in testifying against specified evils in her.

A. ANDERSON,
JAMES MARTIN,
JAMES P. MILLER.

The Presbytery of Cambridge asked and obtained leave to retire a short time for the transaction of presbyterial business.

The committee on Missions reported on the petition of the 2nd congregation of New York, and the report of the Female Missionary society of Massie's Creek, which had been referred to them.

The report was, on motion, laid on the table.

A communication from Mr. Stark, explaining the reason of his absence when the Synod finally passed upon his case last year, was read, and, on motion, laid on the table.

Answers to Dr. Bruce's reasons of dissent from the Synod's deed;

in relation to the Presbytery of Vermont, were read, and, on motion, adopted.

Reasons of Dissent from a Decision of the Associate Synod, passed the 25th of May, declaring the Presbytery of Vermont suspended for one year from Presbyterial action, and attached, during that time, to the Presbytery of Cambridge.

My first reason of dissent is, Synod's inconsistency of action in the present case, and in that of the Presbytery of Albany last year. At last meeting the principle of Synod's action was, that a seat in Presbytery granted to a member, and occupied by him without a right to that seat, destroyed that Presbytery's existence: this year, as it seems, the judgment of Synod not being founded on the immutable basis of truth, is not destruction of existence, but suspension for one year. Convinced that a man who sits in the superior court may be present also in an inferior, my vote in Synod in the present case was, that the Presbytery of Vermont exist and exercise her rights, till brought before us; but Synod could only be consistent with herself by denying the power of self-government and demolishing the Presbytery. "I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality."

My second reason is, a Presbytery insulated by itself, and a hundred miles from any other, with its hands manacled, is a useless and an unaccountable phenomenon. What is a Presbytery? It consists of ministers and elders, and the members of the congregations. A Presbytery is not made up of the ministers and elders separated from the people, but they are vitally connected together. The officers are overseers; and when you take out of their hand the key that the Lion of the tribe of Judah hath put into it, you disorganize that part of the church. The sheep are without a shepherd. Can the ministers of Vermont baptize a child? They dare not judge of character, nor decide on that of an individual. This belongs to church discipline, and admits of protest and appeal. They cannot hold a session. Their character there, and rules of acting are the same as in Presbytery. The elders are an essential part of representation in a Presbytery, but they cannot act by themselves:—they are bound to the idle gaze of listlessness, having their hands tied along with their pastors.

My third reason is, that it is untender and unedifying to subject them to the actings of Cambridge Presbytery. It is untender, because the ministers of Vermont Presbytery had been, when united with it, deprived against their wills of their seats, and to force them now to go there, without the protection of their office upon them or the privilege of representing their own congregations, is to place them, like an idiot child, by a step-mother's side: an object of aversion and of scorn, to the more favoured branches of the family. This is also unedifying; because destroying presbyterian parity, an ordinance of God, it must, of necessity, kindle into a greater flame those discontents, which the fatherly eye of this Synod could not but see was unhappily in that quarter of her household. The Synod's words should be, and the Synod's actings should be, "Love one another." But when you punish one part without being tried, and constitute a sovereignty over them in the other, you place accountability where nothing but sorrow can be in the humiliation, and words of the deepest discontent in almost every instance of the exercise of the superior power. This power, too, is that of the ancient Roman over his slave. The law committed absolutely to him the right of life and death. These ministers of Vermont, not being private members in the church, and having no legal standing in Presbytery, can neither protest nor appeal: they are in a state of tutelage rendering them incapable of action, except by the lifting up of the voice in the preaching of the gospel. The power which is over them, being undefined by any particular law, or regulated by usage, may, during the year, arraign for treason, and cut off or expatriate. Can Cambridge Presbytery summon, at pleasure, the ministers of Vermont to come before them? or are they never to interfere, during the year, with any member within the bounds of Vermont, except when application is made to them? If this last be the plan, we hope, before they apply often, that they will consider well the old proverb, "They shall surely ask counsel at Abel, and so they ended the matter."

My fourth reason of dissent is, that the Synod's decision establishes a species of Episcopacy, and this in its worst condition. Episcopacy is the superintendence of ministers in the church by other ministers, and the giving of these latter a power of prescribing to the former, and controlling their operations. The Presbytery of Cambridge is appointed by Synod to occupy this condition: and, I say, it is the worst; because the superintendents are non-residents. The cure is in another state, and separated by great distance and mountains from the overseer's eye. The eye of their own pastors is closed, and this arrangement of Synod is not, in form, an ordinance of

God: it destroys the parity which he hath appointed, and it is likely that his voice will be, "I am against the shepherds, and I will require my flock at their hand, and cause them to cease from feeding the flock, neither shall the shepherds feed themselves any more; for I will deliver my flock from their mouth, that they may not be meat for them."

My last reason of dissent is, because simplicity and consistency of conduct here are so easy, but not attempted. If the Presbytery of Cambridge had not, at last meeting of Synod, been approved of in excluding four members against their will from their seats, the Presbytery of Vermont could not have acted as they have done. It is the first letting in of water which accounts to us for the channel which is worn so deep. One unguarded step leads to another. The present decision of Synod may be almost certainly predicted to lead farther into the mire. The power of men, when they mistake their will for the authority of Christ, in ecclesiastical stations, is the origin of many of the bitings and devourings of one another, which occupy the empty chambers of brotherly love. The Synod, as the remonstrants of last year against the exclusion of these members must believe, should leave the Presbytery of Vermont in the exercise of pastoral authority over their flocks, and next year call them to account for their conduct. They should, like the holy king of Israel respecting Absalom, who was acting against the highest just authority, say in their council chamber, to each other, "Deal gently." Said Saul, to protect a decision that had no foundation but his sovereignty, "God do so to me, and more also, if thou shalt not die, Jonathan;" but said David, "Deal gently, for my sake, with the young man." This was something like our Heavenly Father's voice, "I will have mercy, and not sacrifice.

Signed,

ROBERT BRUCE.

Pittsburgh, May 28, 1839.

Reasons of a second Dissent, at the same sederunt, from a Decision of the Associate Synod, in the case of Vermont Presbytery, admitting Dr. Bullions to be a Member.

The resolution of Synod is, that the Presbytery's decision in the case of the Dr. was null and void from the very first. This case cannot be understood in its true bearings, till it be taken up among all its connected circumstances. Paul and Silas acted most uprightly in refusing to quit the prison till the authorities which confined them should come and release them. Yet, the Angel of God, in another arrangement of circumstances, opened all the prison doors, and carried off the prisoners. It was unlawful for any but the priests alone to eat the show-bread; yet David and his men eat of it, and were blameless. The circumstances show us the morality of an action, and not the name which marks the deed in the ordinary course of human affairs.

Several points may be indefensible about an action, and yet the deed not null and void: yea, in subordinate stations, they may be deliberately adopted against the superior authority, and yet the being of actions not be destroyed. The original Presbytery of Seceders withdrew from the general Associate Synod, and that Synod never declared their organization null and void. The Gibeonites ran to Joshua with a lie in their mouth, and beyond their own ancient or presbyterial land, and yet the league was sacred between them and the Israelites, and no man dared dissolve it. The conduct of Vermont Presbytery was apparently, at least, contemptuous to Synod's authority, as well as it was unguarded to the prospect of their own existence. They could not be ignorant, that in ordinary cases the step they were taking would be anti-presbyterial, and it was impossible to forget the immediately preceding decision of Synod in the case of Albany Presbytery, that the admission of a member, who has no right to sit in a court, corrupts it and destroys its very existence; and they could not but see that the case of Dr. Bullions was much more glaringly out of order than Albany Presbytery's admitting, when constituted by their regular moderator, one of their own members; and who, though under process before Synod, was admitted to a seat in Synod herself, and to the privilege of voting according to the principles of our discipline in all neutral causes. The Presbytery, therefore, must have acted, and must be supposed as conceiving themselves acting, not as in the common course of affairs, but among a peculiar arrangement of circumstances; and hence, till they could be heard, the Synod should not have nullified Presbytery's authority, but expressed a warning disapprobation of their deed. Dr. Bullions is not personally reached by the decision of Synod: it is the Presbytery, and that alone, on which the stroke of Synod falls; and it might have been sufficient to bring them and their act together, as is usual in the cases of the trials of men, to be examined and decided upon.—For what is Synod to try the Presbytery of Vermont at next meeting? Have we any account of other disapprovable deeds of theirs than this? I know of none. Why try them at all? The thing is decided, and they are now under punishment for their deed. They

acknowledge the stolen property, and Synod says no possible combination of circumstances can possibly justify the taking the bread off another's table, and she has shut them up not to be tried for this deed, for they are already under punishment for it. Of old it was said, "Doth our law condemn any man before it hear him?" and our books of discipline suppose libel, prosecution, and defence, before any are condemned.— I dissent, therefore, from the decision of Synod because it looks at the deed of Presbytery as in common circumstances; because in human courts men can be tried for actions only, and their action, their single and only action, is already tried; without citation too, and in the entire absence of the parties: and because it is contrary to the natural sentiments of men, and the usages of all nations to bring men to trial twelve months after they have been condemned. The culprit who has robbed on the highway is, indeed, sent to the penitentiary for safe keeping and reformation; but if he had not been first tried and found guilty, he could not have been sent there; and the just course of Synod would have been not to have acted in the face of all precedents, civil and ecclesiastical, but to have summoned them, as the Presbytery of Vermont, to appear at next meeting of Synod to account for their conduct. Then we could have said under the two olive trees of warning and citation, and the two candlesticks of the God of the earth, examination, and defence, that we lay hands suddenly on no man, neither are we partakers of other men's sins.

Signed, ROBERT BRUCE.

Pittsburgh, May 28, 1839.

Answers to Reasons of Dissent, by Dr. Bruce, against the decision of Synod, suspending the Presbytery of Vermont from Presbyterial action for one year.

Reason 1st. Synod's inconsistency of action, in the present case, and in that of Presbytery of Albany last year.

Answer. This reason is based on the supposition that the two Presbyteries were of the same character. This supposition, however, is not founded on fact. For, first, the Synod created the Presbytery of Vermont. The Presbytery of Albany was self-created. Second, the Presbytery of Vermont owed obedience, but the Presbytery of Albany owed no presbyterial obedience to any power above, inasmuch as no power above had produced it. Third, the proceedings, alone, of the Presbytery of Vermont were unconstitutional, but the existence of the Presbytery of Albany was unconstitutional.

Reason 2d. A Presbytery insulated by itself, and a hundred miles from any other, with its hands manacled, is a useless and an unaccountable phenomenon.

Answer. This reason goes upon the supposition, that an ecclesiastical court above cannot suspend one below. For, if any conduct could justify the suspension of an inferior court, that of the Presbytery of Vermont did justify suspension. The propriety of such suspension will appear by considering—

First. That a court is as truly an individual as a man, and that the exercise of its power can be as truly controlled.

Second. Neither the distance, nor the Green Mountains intervening between the Presbytery of Cambridge and that of Vermont, can alter the relation or give to the Presbytery of Vermont an independency to which, from their Presbyterial procedure they were not entitled.

Third. If the 'Lion of the tribe of Judah,' authorized the Synod to put the key of Presbyterial government into their hands, whenever it became manifest that they were incapable of using this key, according to the laws of his house, the same authority bound the Synod to take it away and never to restore it, but upon the clearest evidence of honesty and ability for the use of it.

Fourth. It is absurd both in ethics and physics, to declare that the Synod can create a body, over whose being or action they have no control.

Fifth. As the Synod's deed only respected their presbyterial action, the latter part of this reason is entirely irrelevant.

Reason 3d. It is untender and undifying to subject them to the actings of Cambridge Presbytery.

Answer. This reason is doctrinally incorrect, and is based upon the principle that church courts may be formed by affinity. The dissenter intimates, that it will not do to put the ministers and congregations of the Presbytery of Vermont under the care of the Presbytery of Cambridge, because they cannot agree. But let the Dr's. step-mother and children mutually perform their duty, and without doubt, they will agree. "They should love one another," and the Synod should never have separated them, until they conformed to this law of mutual love. They are brethren of the same family, under the same laws, and making the same profession of the truth, and should, therefore, be willing to remain together while Synod judges such connexion necessary for edification. Their power of memorializing Synod or complaining of

any improper procedure in the Presbytery of Cambridge is not, by Synod's decision, taken from them; of course the last part of this reason is irrelevant.

Reason 4th. The Synod's decision establishes a species of Episcopacy, and this in its worst form.

Answer. Suspended courts, like suspended individuals, should be under the care of some power for specific objects; otherwise, their conduct would be wholly irresponsible; and why this should be called Episcopacy, we cannot tell. Episcopacy is one ruling over many; but in this case, we have the court above, controlling the action of an inferior, by committing them to the care of another. Neither can the fact that the Presbytery of Cambridge is non-resident, have influence in this matter; for surely the Presbytery of Vermont cannot complain, as they themselves admitted Dr. A. Bullions when he was, in every sense of the word, a non-resident. But, farther, the Presbytery of Cambridge is not now any more non-resident than when the members of Vermont Presbytery were component parts of that Presbytery.

Reason 5th. Because simplicity and consistency of conduct here are so easy, but not attempted, &c.

Answer. We hope, for the credit of religion, and the standing of our brethren of the Presbytery of Vermont, that this reason of the dissenter is not true. Is it possible that the members of the Vermont Presbytery, in order to be revenged on the Presbytery of Cambridge, for refusing them a seat on a former occasion, wherein that Presbytery believed they could not be impartial judges, would restore a brother deposed by that Presbytery? Would the dissenter, or any other minister of Christ, justify a course of that kind? It was certainly abhorrent to the feelings of every American, to hear members of the last congress justifying revenge on the floor of the house, how much more affecting to the followers of the meek and lowly Jesus, to hear gospel ministers justify the same principle in documents, to be spread before the whole church.

Answers to Reasons of Dissent by Dr. Bruce, against a decision of Synod in the case of the Vermont Presbytery, admitting Dr. A. Bullions to a seat.

To these reasons of dissent, we would answer, in general, and briefly, that the whole assumption upon which they are founded is incorrect.

First. That suspension for trial, is trial and condemnation, which no person before the dissenter, as far as we know, has ever assumed.

Second. The conduct of the Presbytery of Vermont cannot be right under any circumstances. Had they been a Presbytery of another communion, the whole matter would have been entirely different; but for one Presbytery, subordinate to Synod, and solemnly pledged to co-operate with a sister Presbytery, utterly to disregard both, and yet remain in the same communion, can never be right.

Third. The reference to the covenant between Israel and the Gibconites, cannot prove any thing for the dissenter in the present case, as that covenant was not immoral in its nature, but only wrong in its circumstances, while the conduct of the Presbytery of Vermont was not only wrong in its circumstances, but in its very nature.

JOHN G. SMART,
JOHN WALKER.

The Report of D. Houston, treasurer, was read, and, on motion, referred to the committee on the Funds.

Daniel Houston in account with Associate Synod.

Dr.		Dr.
1838.		
May 15th,	To balance in treasury, as per report, 8,053.15½	To amount brought forward, \$8,143.15½
June 22,	To cash contribution from North and South Buffalo, 16.00	1838.
22,	To cash per Rev. Thomas Beveridge from eastern treasury,* 50.00	Nov'r. 5, To cash, received for interest, 33.00
Sept. 29,	To cash received for interest, 24.00	Dec'r. 17, To cash, received for interest, 12.00
		22, To cash, received for interest, 24.28
	\$8,143.15½	\$8,212.43¼

* This was money belonging to Wm. S. Young. Dr. B. paid it to Mr. H., who remitted a draft on the eastern treasurer. See Report of Eastern treasurer, p. 31.

	<i>Dr.</i>
Amount bro't forward,	\$8,212,43½
1839.	
Feb'y. 5, To cash, for interest,	120.00
April 1, To cash, interest from treasurer on Erie Land,	184.80
6, To cash, for interest,	6.00
17, To cash, rent from William Anderson,	100.00
May 13, To cash, contribution from Chartiers congregation,	25.75
17, To cash, contribution from Sugar Creek congregation,	7.87½
27, To cash, from Xenia congregation contribution,	20.00
27, To cash, from Cadiz congregation contribution,	16.00
27, To cash from Baltimore congregation contribution,	68.85
27, From Mrs. Jane Stevenson, Cambridge, New York, donation,	10.00
27, From Washington, Pa. con. contribution,	8.00
27, From Argyle congregation contribution, N. Y.,	30.00
27, From Florida congregation contribution N. Y.,	10.00
27, From Carmel congregation contribution, Ia.,	15.00
27, From Hebron congregation contribution, N. Y.,	11.62½
27, From Salem congregation contribution, N. Y.,	7.62½
27, From Pittsburgh congregation contribution,	20.00
27, From Mount Hope congregation contribution,	10.00
27, From Cross Creek congregation contribution,	10.00
27, Donation from Daniel Williamson, Putnam, N. Y.,	5.00
28, From Monteurs congregation contribution,	10.00
28, From Truro congregation contribution,	4.05
28, From Slippery Rock congregation contribution,	8.00
	\$8,926,95½

	<i>Dr.</i>
Amount bro't forward,	\$8,926,95½
1839.	
May 28, From Pigeon Creek congregation contribution,	10.00
28, Cash for interest,	32.25
28, From Mr. John Rodgers, Henderson congregation donation,	2.50
28, From Deer Creek congregation contribution,	7.50
28, Cash, received for interest,	9.00
28, Cash, Wooster congregation contribution,	5.55
28, Cash, Dalton congregation contribution,	3.00
28, Cash, Ligonier congregation contribution,	15.00
28, Cash, Carmel and North Union congregation contribution,	8.00
28, Cash, legacy from Mrs. Ann Lowrie, Xenia,	30.00
28, Cash, legacy from Daniel Collins, Xenia,	1.00
28, Cash, King's Creek congregation contribution,	12.00
28, Cash, Unity congregation contribution,	10.00
28, Cash, 1st Philadelphia congregation quarterly collection,	25.50
28, Cash, Dumfries congregation, U. Canada,	13.30
28, Cash, York and Covington congregation, N. Y.,	9.00
28, Cash, Thomas Burns, Genesee, N. Y.,	5.00
28, Cash, Londonderry congregation,	8.00
28, Mount Pleasant congregation, Pa.,	10.00
28, Cash, West Union and Four Mile congregation,	13.00
28, Cash, Liberty congregation,	5.06
28, Cash, Albany congregation,	65.44
28, Cash, Stone Valley congregation,	10.00
29, Cash, interest on Mrs. E. Henry's legacy, per Rev. J. P. Miller,	169.28
29, Cash, South Buffalo congregation,	10.00
29, Cash, Haysville congregation,	3.00
	\$9,419,33½

\$8,926,95½

\$9,419,33½

	<i>Dr.</i>
To amount bro't forward, 1839.	\$9,419,33½
May 29, Cash, Mansfield congregation,	1.43
29, Cash, North Washington congregation,	1.44
29, Cash, South Washington congregation,	1.93
29, Cash, Shenango and Salem congregation,	10.00
	\$9,428.38½

Contra.

Treasurer claims credit for the following disbursements.

	<i>Cr.</i>
1838.	
June 7, By cash paid Emery and Hanna for plastering,	\$9.25
July 31, Cash paid executor of Rev. Samuel Douthet,	44.00
Aug. 15, Cash paid postage,	37½
Sept. 27, Cash paid Rev. T. Beveridge for books,	31.25
Nov'r. 5, Cash paid school tax on moneys loaned,	4.00
27, Cash paid postage,	18½
Dec. 10, Cash paid Levi Griffiths, in full, for wash-house,	175.00
11, Cash paid McCulloch and Co., for door handles,	2.25
22, Cash paid J. B. M'Fadden,	2.75
Dec. 24, Cash paid J. B. Enos, for chairs,	6.50
24, Cash paid G. W. Lewis, for desk,	3.50
1839.	
Jan'y. 10, Cash paid S. Brobst, for sconces,	1.00
10, Cash paid Robert Henderson, for door lock,	3.25
	\$283,31½

	<i>Cr.</i>
To amount bro't forward, 1839.	\$283,31½
Jan'y 10, Cash paid J. Hart, for chimney tops,	3.75
26, Cash paid J. Hart, for chimney tops,	3.75
Feb'ry 1, Cash, Rev. T. Beveridge, half year's salary,	250.00
1, Cash paid Rev. T. Beveridge, postage,	75
March 30, Cash paid room rent for Titus Basfield,	10.00
April 2, Cash paid Robert Ralston, for putting tops on chimneys,	9.00
12, Cash paid Levi Griffiths, for coal box, &c.,	1.25
17, Cash paid William Anderson, room rent,	30.31½
May 3, Cash paid Rev. James Ramsay, D. D., salary,	300.00
3, Cash paid Rev. Thos. Beveridge, D. D., salary,	250.00
3, Cash, William Anderson, coal for students,	5.00
28, Cash paid Rev. A. Heron, Synod's Cl'k.,	100.00
28, Cash paid Rev. J. Martin for printing Minutes,	40.00
28, Incidental expenses,	10.00
	1,287,12½

Payments made as per account, 1839.

May 29, Balance in Treasury, 8,141.26½

The above account shows a balance in the treasury of \$8,141.26½, all of which is at interest, except what has been lately received.

Respectfully,

DANIEL HOUSTON, *Treasurer.*

The report of the committee of Memorials, on the memorial from members of the congregation of Ryegate, was read, and, on motion, adopted.

The committee to whom was referred the memorial from members of the Associate Congregation of Ryegate, Vermont, respecting the proceedings of the last meeting of Synod, report that they see no occasion for any thing to be done beyond what has been done respecting other memorials on the same subject.

T. BEVERIDGE,
J. WALKER,
J. SCROGGS.

The committee appointed to converse with Mr. John Patrick, student of theology, reported, and their report was, on motion, adopted.

The committee to whom the report of the Presbytery of the Carolinas for 1838 had been referred, reported, and the report being amended, was adopted.

Your committee to whom was referred the report of the Presbytery of Carolinas of last year, present the following report.

1. The complaint of the Presbytery against the conduct of Synod in cutting off the appendages of the act on slavery, comparing this to the Egyptian taskmasters, is highly unjust and disrespectful.

2. The demand which they make that the Synod give them a correct interpretation of the act, that they may know the relation in which they stand to Synod, is altogether unreasonable, because the act is sufficiently plain and decisive, and requires no additional interpretation.

3. This Synod cannot see, that physical impossibilities and legal enactments present such insurmountable obstacles to emancipation as are complained of in the report, because the way is still open for the removal into free states, and besides God must be obeyed in all cases rather than man.

Your committee would, therefore, recommend the adoption of the following resolutions.

1. That as we have no evidence that the Presbytery of Carolinas has made any exertions heretofore, or are now using any to carry into execution the requisitions of the act, the Synod see no reason why they should any longer delay final action upon this subject.

2. That the ministers, elders, and other members belonging to the Presbytery of Carolinas who still continue in the practice of slave-holding, and refuse to comply with the act of this Synod by which slavery is declared to be "clearly condemned by the law of God," and that no person holding a human being in the character of a slave "be retained in the communion of this church," are discharged and prohibited from dispensing and enjoying sealing ordinances in the Secession Church.

J. SCROGGS.

JAMES PATTERSON.

The Presbytery of Cambridge gave into Synod the following Report; namely, "Mr. Stalker, having appeared before the Associate Presbytery of Cambridge, and requested Presbytery to transmit to Synod a petition for the final settlement of his case, which Presbytery agree to transmit to Synod without passing any judgment, either on the paper or on his right to a hearing, under his disobedience to their former decisions.

Pittsburgh, May 29, 1839.

A. ANDERSON, *Presbytery Clerk.*

A pamphlet accompanies, by Mr. Stalker's request. The papers thus transmitted were, on motion, returned to the Presbytery of Cambridge.

From this decision Messrs. Heron and Brown entered their dissent.

Mr. John Robertson requested certain extracts from the minutes of this and last year, in relation to matters connected with the business of the Presbytery of Cambridge. The request was granted, and the clerk and Mr. Robertson were appointed a committee to attend to this business.

Adjourned till the usual hour to-morrow morning.

Closed with prayer.

Thursday, May 30.

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

Mr. Ferrier gave notice that he joined in the dissent taken last evening from the deed of Synod, returning the papers in Mr. Stalker's case to the Presbytery of Cambridge.

On motion, the reading of papers was dispensed with, in order to take up the case of Mr. Beggs. Certain papers connected with the case were read, and the following resolution offered, and after a brief discussion adopted; namely,

"Resolved, that Mr. Beggs' acknowledgments do not invalidate

Sarah Vaughn's affidavit, but corroborate it in its material points, and therefore, that Synod judge him guilty of the sin charged."

Previous to taking the vote, a brother addressed the throne of grace in prayer.

Mr. Heron asked and obtained leave of absence, and Mr. Hanna was appointed clerk *pro tem*.

On motion, resolved, that Mr. Beggs be deposed from the office of the holy ministry, and suspended from the communion of the church, and referred to the Presbytery of Illinois, for farther dealing, and farther, that the papers connected with the case be transmitted to said Presbytery, as also a statement of the confessions of Mr. Beggs before this Synod.

The committee to examine the records of the Presbytery of Allegheny presented their report, which was, on motion, accepted.

The following motion was offered, and adopted, namely,

Whereas, it appears from papers laid before Synod by Mr. D. Stalker, that he is labouring under such prejudices against several members of the Presbytery of Cambridge, as is a barrier in the way of submitting to the dealings necessary to his restoration in his proper Presbytery,—

Resolved, that a committee be appointed to meet in conference with members of the Presbytery and Mr. Stalker, and ascertain whether there is a reasonable prospect of Mr. Stalker's restoration, in consistency with the rules and principles of the church, and report what farther measures might be proper to be taken in this case. Messrs. S. Hindman and Clokey, and Dr. Beveridge, were appointed said committee.

The committee to examine the records of the Presbytery of Indiana reported, and the report was accepted.

The committee appointed to inquire what can be done to encourage and facilitate the education of young men for the ministry, reported, and the report was adopted, as follows; namely,

Your committee appointed to inquire what can be done to encourage and facilitate the education of young men, who may be placed at Synod's disposal as candidates for the gospel ministry, report for adoption the following resolutions.

Resolved 1st. That in view the Synod find themselves unable to answer the calls addressed to them for supply of preaching and a dispensation of gospel ordinances, and in view, farther, that the glorious doctrines and principles of the gospel, are in many places through ignorance utterly shut out, or through grievous errors and corruptions greatly obscured and prevented, and so multitudes of the people of the land are left in a benighted and perishing condition, Synod declare the great need there is for orthodox and learned and faithful men to fulfil the gospel ministry, that the pure and unadulterated word of truth may be propagated.

Resolved 2. That Synod recommend to Presbyteries, sessions, and church members, as is competent to them respectively, to look out young men, of suitable natural gifts, and endowments, and of piety, and to aid and to encourage them unto a course of education, and the acquisition of such classical and scientific attainments as may qualify them for the profitable exercise of their gifts.

Resolved 3. That godly parents who love and pray for the welfare of Zion, and for the good of souls; who have sons possessed of suitable endowments, and who are in circumstances putting it in their power to bestow upon them a liberal education, are invited to dedicate them to the service of the Lord in the gospel.

Resolved 4. That this Synod take what order may be necessary to create an education fund, for the aid of young men members in communion with us, of indigent circumstances, who are dutifully and piously preparing themselves for the ministry.

Respectfully submitted.

JAMES TEMPLETON,
JAMES P. MILLER,
WM. M. MILLWEE.

The following resolutions were offered in connexion with the above report, and adopted; namely,

Resolved, that the following rules be adopted by the Associate Synod for the purpose of raising money for the Bible, Missionary, Students, and Synod's funds.

First, That Synod appoint a committee to draft a circular to the several congregations and vacancies under the inspection of Synod, setting forth the duty and necessity of liberally contributing to the above named funds respectively.

Secondly, That as our years are divided into four quarters, so let every congregation and vacancy have quarterly collections for one or more of the above named funds.

Thirdly, That Synod enjoin it upon the several Presbyteries under its inspection to direct the sessions of the congregations within their bounds, to see that the above collections are duly attended to, and the avails duly paid over.

Fourthly, That it be enjoined on all the Presbyteries, under the care of this Synod, to report annually what has been done in the premises, the amount contributed to the different funds, and to whom paid over.

Dr. Beveridge was appointed the treasurer contemplated in the 3rd resolution, and Messrs. Anderson and Miller the committee to draught the circular.

The committee to examine the records of the Presbytery of Chartiers reported, and the report was, on motion, accepted.

The committee on the memorial from some individuals in Cadiz congregation, reported. The report was adopted as follows; namely,

The subscribers having had under consideration the petition of certain members of the Associate Congregation of Cadiz, in relation to some proposed additions to the bond used in covenanting, adapting it more particularly to the present state of things, respectfully report—

That they consider this matter worthy of the attention of the Synod, and would recommend that a committee be appointed to make such additions to the acknowledgment of sins, prefixed to the bond, as they may judge called for, keeping in view the suggestions contained in the above-named petition, and report to the Synod at its next meeting.

JAMES MARTIN,
T. BEVERIDGE.

Messrs. Hanna and Isaac were appointed the committee contemplated in the above report.

The committee of Supplies presented their report, which, after some amendment, was adopted as follows; namely,

Scale of Appointments.

J. M. Scroggs in the Presbytery of Philadelphia till next meeting.

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

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

William H. Walker, Muskingum, June; Chartiers, July, August; Miami, September; Indiana, October, November; Illinois, December, January, February, March; Indiana, April; Muskingum, May.

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

Samuel M'Lean, Philadelphia, June, July, August; Allegheny, September; Chartiers, October, November; Shenango, December, January; Ohio, February; Richland, March, April, May.

William Smith, Philadelphia, June, July, August, September; Albany, October, November, December; Allegheny, January, February; Chartiers, March, April; Philadelphia, May.

Thomas Gilkerson, Chartiers, June, July; Philadelphia, August, September; Vermont, October; Albany, November, December; Ohio, January, February; Allegheny, March, April, May.

David R. Imbrie, Ohio, June, July, August; Miami, September; Indiana, October; Illinois, November, December, January; Indiana, February, March; Miami, April; Ohio, May.

James A. Brown, Indiana, June; Miami, July; Mission to Lower Canada, August, September, October; Cambridge, November, December, January; Albany, February; Philadelphia, March; Chartiers, April, May.

Rev. T. Ferrier, Shenango, June; Allegheny, July; Ohio, August, September; Miami, October, November; Richland, December, January; Muskingum, February; Ohio, March; Shenango, April, May.

Rev. J. Templeton, Chartiers, June; Miami, July; Indiana, August; Illinois, September, October, November; Indiana, December; Miami, January, February; Richland, March, April; Chartiers, May, or in Tennessee from October, at discretion.

A. Boyd, Shenango, till next meeting.

Rev. G. M. Hall, in event of dismissal, Indiana, June, July, August, September; Miami, October; Albany, November, December; Cambridge, January, February, March; Philadelphia, April, May.

Rev. T. Allison, Chartiers, June, July, August; Allegheny, September, October; Chartiers, November, December, January; Shenango, February, March; Ohio, April; Chartiers, May.

Rev. J. Banks, Allegheny, till next meeting.

A communication, signed Samuel Creswell, containing a petition to Synod, in relation to his case, was read. Said paper was declared by the Moderator to be inadmissible, as being out of order.

The following resolution was, on motion, adopted; namely,

“Resolved, that the overture on discipline be recommitted, and that Presbyteries be enjoined to report to the committee their amendments, and that the committee be required to have the overture ready at next meeting of Synod. Mr. Anderson was added to the committee, and Mr. Martin was substituted in room of Mr. Heron.

The report of the committee on Appeals given in last year, on the appeal of David Jackson and Archibald Collins, from a decision of the Presbytery of Miami, in the case of the former of these appeals, was called up and read. Papers connected with the case were read. After some brief discussion, the report of the committee was adopted, and is as follows; namely,

The committee to whom was referred the appeal of Messrs. David Jackson and Archibald Collins, from a decision of the Miami Presbytery, refusing to sustain David Jackson's appeal from the session of Massie's Creek, upon the first charge of a libel preferred against him by Messrs. Wm. Currie and James McCoy, offer the following as their report.

The charge in the libel alluded to, is in these words: “whereas it is contrary to the law of God, and the subordinate standards of our church, to speak evil of those over us in the Lord,” &c. The specifications which are given in support of this charge, are from a certain publication in a newspaper called the “Xenia Free Press.” The appellants contend that the charge in the libel is not made good by any thing contained in this publication. With this your committee agree. For although there are expressions in said publication that are not strictly courteous, yet they seem not so much designed to cast odium upon any individual, as to place an argument or opinion in the most strong and prominent light. Therefore your committee are of opinion that the appeal ought to be sustained.

T. BEVERIDGE,
F. W. M'NAUGHTON,
J. G. SMART.

On motion, the Presbytery of Chartiers were ordered to call Mr. French to account for absence from the meetings of Synod, without leave.

The Presbytery of Richland were also ordered to call Mr. Irvine to account for absenting himself from Synod without leave.

Adjourned till the usual hour. Closed with prayer.

Half past 2, P. M.

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

Extracts from the minutes in reference to the Synod's proceedings in the case of the Presbytery of Vermont, were asked on behalf of the Rev. Thomas Goodwillie, and granted.

Resolved, that \$20 be paid to Mr. Alexander Dickson for his services as sexton.

A paper purporting to be a complaint from Mr. Stalker was read, and pronounced by the Moderator to be out of order.

The committee of Bills and Overtures reported on the Ferguson case. The papers in the case were read, and after some discussion the report being amended, was adopted, and is as follows; namely,

The committee of Bills and Overtures, on the appeal from the Presbytery of Miami, in the Ferguson case, beg leave to report, that certain members of a family by the name of Ferguson, were called before Massie's Creek session, one of them for selling a slave, and all of them for holding slaves; which they left hired out in New Orleans. Every attempt to remove these slave-holders from the communion of the church by the friends of the Synod has hitherto failed, being arrested by protests and appeals. The consequence is, that about 14 human beings have been kept in bondage for more than two years, and are now, in all probability, reduced to perpetual slavery in the state of Alabama.

The following resolutions are, therefore, respectfully submitted.

1. That the appeal of the Rev. Andrew Heron and others, against the deed of the Presbytery on the Ferguson case, be not sustained.
2. That all the Ferguson family having interest in the slaves, as stated to the session of Massie's Creek, be by them suspended from the communion of the church.

JOHN WALKER.
THOMAS HANNA.
JOSEPH CLOKEY.

The committee on the letter from the Synod of Original Seceders in Scotland reported, and the report was, on motion, adopted, as follows; namely,

The committee to whom was referred the Letter from our brethren of the Original Associate Church of Scotland, report as follows:

The brethren, after stating that they were gratified when, after we had seen the new statement of their Testimony, we judicially declared that we were so far satisfied with it as to continue in the connexion, which had by a former decision been so happily formed between the two Synods, add,—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 magistrate's power *circa sacra*, and national covenanting. Your committee think, that as Synod cannot now consider these points with that attention which would be necessary, in order, if possible, to arrive at such a statement of our mind upon them as would satisfy our brethren, the subject should therefore be laid over till next meeting.

JAMES RAMSAY.
T. BEVERIDGE.

On motion, a committee was appointed to draft an answer to the above letter to be laid before Synod at next meeting. Drs. Ramsay and Beveridge were appointed said committee.

The committee appointed to consider the letter from the chairman of the convention of Reformed Churches reported, and the report was, on motion, adopted, as follows; namely,

The committee to whom was referred a letter from the chairman of the committee of a convention of some of the Reformed Churches which lately assembled in Pittsburgh, ask leave to state, that from the known principles and usages of some of the churches represented in said convention, on communion, covenanting and other subjects, in which they differ from the public profession and practice of the Associate Church; and also, from the proceedings of the brethren composing the said convention, in which no steps appear to have been taken to produce a greater approximation in principle to our public profession, there appears to be little encouragement to hope that measures will be adopted by them, in which the Associate Synod could concur. However desirous of a scriptural union with others, who make a profession of the re-

ligion of our common Saviour, it is the opinion of your committee that it is not expedient at the present to appoint delegates to the aforesaid convention.

JAMES RAMSAY.
T. BEVERIDGE.

The report of the committee on Missions, formerly laid on the table, was called up, and, on motion, adopted, as follows; namely,

The committee on Missions hereby report on the two following papers, which have been referred to them for consideration, namely:

1st. A petition from the second congregation of New York, praying for supply of preaching at the expense of Synod. The committee consider the condition of this congregation is such as to deserve the serious attention of Synod. Its existence, as a congregation, must cease, if liberal aid be not afforded. To meet, therefore, in as far as practicable, the prayer of their petition, your committee would recommend that as large a portion of the supplies as is consistent with the wants of other sections of the church be furnished to the Presbytery of Albany, that they may have it in their power to furnish this congregation with as frequent supply as possible, and that it be paid by Synod.

2d. The second paper is a report from the Female Missionary Society of Massie's Creek, containing a statement of funds collected for aiding in the support of a Foreign Mission. In relation to this paper, the committee would report, that although the present exigencies of our church do not warrant our undertaking missionary operations in foreign countries, yet we as a church, witnessing for the cause of the Redeemer, ought not to feel insensible to the condition of the unnumbered multitudes of our fellow men who are perishing for lack of knowledge; but ought to be looking forward, and employing preparatory means for the erection of a banner for the truth in distant and foreign countries. They would, therefore, recommend that a fund be formed by Synod, entitled a fund for Foreign Missions, and that collections be solicited from the congregations belonging to Synod for aiding in this good work.

ANDREW ISAAC,
JOHN S. EASTON,
SAMUEL WILSON.

Mr. Wm. S. Young, of Philadelphia, and Mr. William Bell, of Pittsburgh, were appointed treasurers of the fund for foreign missions.

A request was presented by Mr. Thomas McCleary to have the testimony of Mr. W. H. Walker taken in the case of the Presbytery of Stamford, which has been before the Synod, either before the Synod itself, or a committee. The prayer of the petition was granted, and Messrs. S. Hindman and Henderson were appointed a committee for this purpose.

Messrs. Cummings and J. Stewart asked and obtained leave of absence during the remaining sittings of Synod.

The committee on the Funds reported, and their report was, on motion, accepted, as follows; namely,

The Report of the Committee on the Funds.

The committee on the funds offer the following report, on the treasurer's accounts submitted to them.

On May 16th, the balance in the hands of Mr. Murphy, treasurer at Philadelphia, amounted to \$478.09½.

It may be proper to state that one of the items in the disbursements stated in this account is the sum of sixty-three dollars, paid Rev. Joseph McKeo and Rev. A. T. McGill, for expenses to New York and Cambridge, according to appointment of Synod last year: from the vouchers accompanying this report, it appears that, but \$17.00 of this sum were received by Mr. McKeo; that \$46 were claimed and received by Mr. McGill, namely, \$16.00 as travelling expenses and \$30.00 for three days' preaching in New York. By reference to the resolution of Synod last year, appointing these brethren on that mission, it appears that the actual expenses were all that was provided for, in that resolution. And this committee are informed that each of the brethren received from the congregation, while in Cambridge, the full amount, at least, of Synod's ordinary *per diem* allowance to her missionaries.

The report of the treasurer at Canonsburgh shows a balance in the treasury that place of \$3,141.26, showing at this time in the hands of the two treasurers the

sum of \$8,619.36; a sum \$4.89 less than what was remaining in the treasury at the close of the last Synodical year.

These documents show that the current expenses of the Synodical year amounted to \$1,579.12½, and that the current receipts of the year have been equal to the expenses, excepting \$4.89.

The committee are of opinion, that the account, so far, at least, as relates to the expenditures, on improvements, &c., of the Theological Seminary, should be audited by the board of trustees, as no committee can have the facilities necessary for judging of the propriety of the expenditures.

The committee farther report—that, in their opinion, the application of the Presbytery of Miami, for the sum of \$16.40, to defray the expenses of the commission in the case of the Rev. James Adams, ought to be allowed. Also, the application by the Presbytery of Illinois for the sum of 14.00 for aiding that Presbytery in paying off their supplies. And farther, the sum of \$15.00 is due to Mr. James Law, for missionary services in Lower Canada. All which is respectfully submitted.

JAMES P. MILLER,
WM. MORRIS,
C. WEBSTER.

Messrs. B. Boyd and M'Elwee were appointed to draught an act for a fast, to be laid before Synod at next meeting.

Adjourned till half past 8 o'clock to-morrow morning. Closed with prayer.

Friday, May 31.

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

Mr. D. Blair craved to have his dissent marked from the decision of Synod last evening, accepting the Report of the committee of Missions in relation to paying for supply to the 2nd congregation of New York.

On motion, resolved, that the papers in the case of Mr. Todd, from the Presbytery of Miami, be referred to a special committee to report at next meeting of Synod.

Messrs. Hanna and B. Boyd were appointed said committee.

The committee to draught an act for a fast presented a report, which was read, and being amended was, on motion, adopted, as follows; namely,

Act for a Fast.

Once more, we, the Associate Synod, call you, "over whom the Holy Ghost hath made us overseers," to the duty of fasting.

We believe that periodical fasts, without some special call in the providence of God compared with the word, are superstitious. And yet, though we have held an annual fast for many years, we believe it is not at present uncalled for.

The aspect of Divine Providence with respect to peace and health in the land, and the enjoyment of rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, is more favourable than in some past years; for which we have great cause to be thankful; and yet there is ground to fear that this respite is not profitably improved, by the people generally turning to the Lord, and serving him in his great goodness. The carnal mind turns even the mercies of God into occasions of sin. Wealth, ease, and prosperity, where not attended by the sanctifying grace of God, excite and foster all the corrupt principles and appetites of our fallen nature. We have great reason to say, "As he fed us, so we went from him." "Jeshurun waxed fat, and kicked." God's holy name is profaned in this land, not only by the profane swearer, in the vulgar throng, or in the com-

pany of the gay—but in superstitious and heaven-daring oaths, administered by non-legalized and irresponsible persons, in masonic and similar societies; by the light, irreverent, and corrupt manner of administering and taking of oaths of office, and in testimony bearing, in many of our civil courts, &c., and the use of the important ordinance of the lot; where God is often, not only by the confessedly rude, infidel, and profane, but by those who profess the Christian name, called in to decide, by his special providence, who shall be foremost, in vain sport, or the winner of money or property, for which the gainer never intends to give any just equivalent; thus asking the infinite God to trifle, and the most Holy One to go partner with thieves. Add to this, the setting aside, or rather dedicating to scenes of pleasure, or purposes of worldly gain, that portion of time, which God, both as Creator and Redeemer, has in a special manner set apart for his own immediate worship and service, not only by idleness, pleasing ourselves, worldly conversation, and that often at, or in the house of God,—running boats, keeping gates, driving teams, removing families or goods, running carriages, cars, wagons, &c., but especially by driving stages, running packets, and keeping open offices on the Lord's day, for the very purpose of disseminating news, and other communications of a worldly character, under the countenance of the highest civil authority in the land.

In the midst of these scenes, and others of a similar nature, growing infidelity stands forth awfully conspicuous, either in denying the Bible to be the word of God, and the perfect and only rule of faith and obedience, or so perverting its doctrines, denying its claims, and corrupting its ordinances, as to make it not only useless to many, but a "savour of death unto death,"—to make heresy triumphant, and "him that departeth from evil a prey."

The powers that ought to be a terror to evil doers, and a praise to them that do well, are, in many instances, not only bearing the sword in vain, but often turning it so as to produce a pernicious effect, both on morals and religion. An idolizing coveting of the things of this world, too manifestly, not only absorbs all the attention, and exhausts all the energies of the many who confessedly "have their part and portion in this life," shutting up their bowels of compassion from their fellow men, whence springs up also to a great height a spirit of fraud and oppression; but, in many cases, under its perverting influence, even the officers and ordinances of the house of God, are denied, not only a reasonable, but even a necessary support, and that by those who have engaged to "honour the Lord with their substance," and to set Jerusalem above their worldly cares and joys. The abounding of gross immoralities, in lying, stealing, counterfeiting, uncleanness, and shedding innocent blood, are for a lamentation.

Systems of error, from bold-fronted atheism, throughout all the principles of natural and revealed religion, are common in many parts of our land; and none of these, perhaps, doing more mischief than those which are directed against the substitutionary obedience and death of our Lord Jesus Christ, and salvation by grace, in opposition to works, through the imputed righteousness of Christ, and the regenerating influence of the Holy Spirit.

It is also to be noticed, and lamented, that even among many

who are endeavouring to stem these torrents of corruption, in some important points, corrupt modes of worship are not only countenanced, but warmly defended, and the rules of fellowship and the exercise of discipline, in the church, greatly relaxed or perverted.

Slavery, in all its opposition to the law of God, and in its natural and necessary mischief to the bodies and souls of men, in this world and the world to come, is not only legalized, by the constitutions and laws of a great portion of these United States, where liberty and equal rights are the public creed, but even the church of the living God, with a few exceptions, is deeply involved in the evil, and many are zealously engaged in the defence and maintenance of the horrible practice of "dealing in slaves and souls of men." And though the Associate Church has for a period of thirty-eight years declared slavery to be a sin, and for eight years has had an official decision of her supreme judicatory recorded on her books and proclaimed through all her branches, there are still found in our midst some who are too favourable to the principle and practice thus judicially condemned.

Though we have reason to thank God for some good degree of zeal for our holy profession, and of unity and firmness among our members, and in our church courts, in maintaining our scriptural covenanted profession; yet we have to lament the trouble which this costs, the obstinacy and turbulency of some, and the shameful apostacy of others. With some, church government seems to be but a mere name, and, with others, only a rock on which to dash themselves to pieces.

For these, and all the consequent attendant evils, and especially the plagues of our own hearts, we ought to humble ourselves before God, to lift up our cry to him for mercy, depending, in faith, on the imputed righteousness of the Lord Jesus alone, for pardon, acceptance, and peace; and on the sanctifying efficacy of his blood and Spirit by the means of his own appointment, for our sanctification. Let one and all of us come up to the help of the Lord against every thing which exalts itself against God and his law—against Christ and his cause, against the present and eternal interests of ourselves, of our children, of the church, and of our fellow men. Let us pray for the peace, purity, and prosperity of Zion, "and give the Lord no rest day nor night, till he make her a praise and a glory in the earth," and our land and nation be possessed of that righteousness, which exalts a nation in opposition to sin, which is a reproach to any people—looking to God to fulfil his own promise, that the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of the Lord and of his anointed.

The 2nd Thursday of January was appointed as the day of fasting.

The report of the committee to examine the records of the Presbytery of Ohio was read, and, on motion, accepted.

The report of the committee to confer with the Presbytery of Cambridge and Mr. Stalker, was given in, and, on motion, accepted.

On motion, resolved, that the same committee be re-appointed for the same purpose, and Mr. S. Hindman was excused from the committee to take Mr. Walker's testimony, and Mr. J. Hindman appointed in his room.

Mr. Boyd was appointed in the room of Mr. Clokey on the committee to converse with Mr. Stalker.

Resolved, that the minutes be published in the Religious Monitor, and that the expenses be defrayed from the Synod's funds. One thousand extra copies were ordered.

On motion, Synod went into committee of the whole, on the subject of the Bible Society.

When the committee rose, they reported that the Report of the treasurer of the Bible fund had been given in; which report was, on motion, accepted, as follows; namely,

Pittsburgh, May 29th, 1839.

Report of the Treasurer of the Bible Fund for the Year ending May 29th, 1839.

1838.		Dr.	1838.		Cr.
August,	Donation received from Thomas Burns, Genesee Co., N. Y.	5.00	June 7,	Amount of Bibles sent to Argyle, N. Y.,	15.00
May 25,	Received from Baltimore congregation, per Rev. J. G. Smart,	68.72		Amount of Bibles sent to Baltimore congregation, . . .	33.70
May 29,	Received from Argyle congregation, Washington Co., N. Y., per Rev. James P. Miller,	25.00	1839.	Expenses of printing and binding 1000 Psalm Books, . . .	260.00
	Balance from last report, . . .	425.84		Balance, . . .	241.42
	Interest on above balance, . . .	25.56			—
		<u>\$550.12</u>			<u>\$550.12</u>

WM. S. YOUNG.

On motion, resolved, that the edition of the Psalms published by Mr. Young be retained by him, as his property, with the understanding that the money expended for the Bible Fund in the publication be refunded.

Resolution for disposing of Bibles by Probationers.

Resolved, that the treasurer of the Synod's Bible Society be authorized to give to probationers and other travelling preachers, Bibles to be given to the poor and destitute, or disposed of at their discretion, and report to Synod accordingly.

On motion, the executive committee and treasurer of Bible Fund of last year were re-elected.

On motion, resolved, that the executive committee be instructed to republish the constitution of the Bible Society in the Religious Monitor.

The Presbytery of Chartiers gave in the following reference of certain cases which had been before them; namely,

The Presbytery of Chartiers agreed to refer the following cases to Synod for judgment.

1. A protest and appeal of the Rev. William M. M'Elwee against a decision of Presbytery, by which they judged James Harper not guilty of bearing false testimony in a case in which he was charged with having done so before Presbytery.

2. A protest and appeal of the said Rev. William M. M'Elwee against a decision of Presbytery, by which they cleared David Ramsay of the charge of having violated a solemn agreement made before Presbytery, which violation he afterwards denied and endeavoured to prove his innocence by false testimony.

JAMES RAMSAY, *Presbytery Clerk.*

On motion, the reference was accepted, and a committee appointed to report on said cases at next meeting of Synod.

Messrs. Walker and Hanna were appointed said committee.

A remonstrance by certain members of Synod against the decisions of Synod, in the cases of the Presbytery of Albany, Dr. A. Bullions, and Mr. Stalker, was read, and pronounced by the Moderator to be inadmissible.

The committee appointed to take the testimony of Mr. W. H. Walker in the case of the Stamford Presbytery, reported, and the report was, on motion, accepted.

Report of the Committee appointed to take the Testimony of William H. Walker, in the Case of the Memorialists against the Presbytery of Stamford.

Your committee report that they called upon Mr. Walker for his testimony, in the above case. That Mr. Walker expressed a hesitancy as to the propriety of his acting as a witness in the case, on account of the indistinctness of his recollection concerning the matter: and your committee deemed it not proper for them to insist. Respectfully submitted.

JOHN HINDMAN.
JAMES M. HENDERSON.

The committee appointed to converse with the Presbytery of Cambridge and Mr. Stalker reported, and the report was, on motion, accepted, as follows; namely,

Report of the Committee appointed to conduct a conference between the Presbytery of Cambridge, and Rev. D. Stalker.

Your committee, after a careful interview held by the parties named, in our presence and under our direction, have to report that the Presbytery and Mr. Stalker still adhere to their respective positions, with reference to the alleged charge of false swearing, brought in Presbytery by Mr. Stalker against two members of said Presbytery. And that Mr. Stalker still adheres to his declaration made in Synod last year, respecting his submission to Synod's requisition then made; and also refuses to acknowledge that he did wrong in exercising his ministry contrary to the order of Presbytery and Synod.

SAMUEL HINDMAN.
T. BEVERIDGE.
B. BOYD.

The minutes of this sitting were read and approved, and the Synod adjourned, after prayer, singing the 122nd Psalm, and the apostolical benediction pronounced by the Moderator.

ANDREW HERON, *Synod Clerk.*

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF CHARTIERS.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
Wm. Wilson	Montcur's Run	Clinton . . .	Allegheny	Penn.	40	140
	Robinson,	Washington	do	42	150
David Thompson	Mt. Hope . . .	W. Middletown	do	do	33	85
	Cross Creek	Brooke, . . .	Va.	24	64
Jas. Ramsay, D.D.	Chartiers . . .	Canonsburgh	Washington	Penn.	122	430
David French . . .	N. & S. Buffalo	Washington . . .	do	do	110	240
Alex. Donnan . . .	Mt. Pleasant . . .	Hickory . . .	do	do	105	220
	Burgetstown	do	do	85	180
Wm. M. McElwee	Service & King's c.	Frankfort . . .	Beaver	116	264
Bankhead Boyd	Pigeon Creek . .	McCullough's	Washington	do		
T. Beveridge, D.D.	Washington . . .	Washington . . .	do	do		
James McCarrell	Tumbleston's Run	31	53
Vacancies . . .	Noblestown	Allegheny	do	50	
	Ohio	Economy	do	70	
	Peter's Creek	Washington	do		
Without charge	Bethesda . . .	W. Alexandria	do	do		
	Wheeling . . .	Claysville	do		

Thomas Allison

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	153
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.		
	Fall River . .	Fall River		Mass.		
<i>Without charge</i>						
David R. De Freest		West Troy	Albany	N. Y.		

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF ALLEGHENY.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.
Robert Bruce, D. D.	Pittsburgh . . .	Pittsburgh	Allegheny	Penn.
John Dickey . . .	Rich-Hill . . .	Kittaning	Armstrong	do
	Buffalo . . .			
Joseph Scroggs . .	Fairfield . . .	Ligonier	Westmoreland	do
	Donegal . . .			
David Blair . . .	Indiana . . .	Indiana	Indiana	do
	Crooked Creek			
John Hindman . . .	Mahoning . . .	Glade Run	Armstrong	do
	Glade Run . . .			
	Concord . . .			
	Berachah . . .			
Wm. Galbraith . . .	Freeport . . .	Freeport	Armstrong	do
	Bethel . . .			
	Turtle Creek			
John M'Auley . . .	Warren . . .	Brookville	Jefferson	do
	Jefferson . . .			
	Upper Piney . .			
James Rodgers . . .	Cherry Run . .	Allegheny	Allegheny	do
	Allegheny . . .			
Vacancies	Conemaugh . .	Kittaning	Armstrong	do
	Lower Piney . .			
	Kittaning . . .			
	Gibson's . . .			
	Clearfield . . .	Punxctawny	Jefferson	do
		Curwinsville.	Clearfield	do
<i>Without charge</i>				
Joseph Banks		Pittsburgh	Allegheny	do

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF PHILADELPHIA.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
F. W. M'Naughton	Mercersburgh .	Mercersburgh	Franklin	Penn.	102	
	M'Connelsburgh	do . . .	do . . .	do		
	Octorara . . .	Sunflower . .	Lancaster . .	do		
W. Easton . . .	E. Nottingham	do . . .	do . . .	do	65	
	Muddy Run . .	do . . .	do . . .	do	20	
John Adams . . .	Guinston . . .	L. Chancelford	York	do	100	
	Lower Chancelf'd	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. Phila. .	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	do	86	230
John G. Smart . .	Baltimore . . .	Baltimore	Baltimore	Md.	39	70
Jos. T. Cooper . .	2d Cong. Phila. .	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	Penn.		80
Vacancies . . .	Carlisle . . .	Carlisle	Cumberland	do		
	Dickinson . . .	do . . .	do . . .	do		
	Wheatfield . . .	do . . .	do . . .	do		
	Huntingdon . .	Huntingdon	Huntingdon	do		
	Belfonte . . .	Belfonte	Centre	do		
	Sinking Creek	Potter's Mills	do . . .	do		
	Rehoboth . . .		Union	do		

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF CAMBRIDGE.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
James I. Miller	Argyle . . .	Lake P.O., N.Y.	Wash'n.	N. Y.	120	300
A. Gordon . .	Putnam . . .	Putnam . . .	do	do	48	105
D. Gordon . .	Salem . . .	Anaquasscook	do	do	50	80
A. Anderson . .	Hebron . . .	Salem . . .	do	do	72	157
	{ Cambridge . . .	Cambridge . . .	do	do		150
	{ North Argyle . . .	North Argyle . . .	do	do		110
Vacancies . .	{ Hemmingsford	do	L. C. . .		
	{ Beech Ridge	do	do . .		
	{ Hinchbrook	do	do . .		

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF SHENANGO.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
Daniel M'Lean,	{ Venango . . .	Hart's x roads	Crawford .	Penn.	200	500
	{ Salem	do		
John France, .	{ Glade Run . . .	Bakerstown .	Butler . . .	do	60	200
	{ Conecut . . .	Meadville . .	Crawford . .	do	25	50
Matth. Snodgrass,	{ French Creek	do	do	32	30
	{ Cherry Run	Venango . . .	do	20	80
Wm. C. Pollock,	{ Harmony . . .	Harrisville . .	Butler . . .	do	80	120
	{ Unity	do	do	55	100
E. Small, . . .	{ Springfield	Mercer . . .	do	48	110
	{ Rocky Spring	do	do	56	126
	{ New Castle . . .	New Castle . .	Mercer . . .	do	32	70
Vacancies . .	{ Neshannock	do	do	20	43
	{ Mount Prospect	do	do	25	45
Without charge	{ Mercer . . .	Mercer	do	26	83
A. Boyd . . .						

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	70	150
Alex. Murray .	{ Mountville . . .	Portersville . .	Butler . . .	do	70	140
	{ Slippery Rock	do . . .	do	80	150
Elijah N. Scroggs	{ West Union . . .	New Lisbon . .	Columbiana	Ohio.	75	150
	{ 4 Mile Square	do		
David Goodwillie	{ Poland . . .	Poland . . .	Trumbull . .	do	67	139
	{ Liberty	do	79	115
Wm. Douthet .	{ Milton . . .	Warren . . .	Trumbull . .	do		
	{ Palmyra	Carroll . . .	do	8	
	{ Newton	do	18	87
James P. Ramsay	{ Deer Creek . . .	New Bedford . .	Mercer . . .	Penn.	103	210
	{ Northfield	Ohio.		
Vacancies	{ Stow	do		
	{ Springfield	do		
	{ West Beaver	do		

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF VERMONT.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	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.	States.	Fam.	Com.
Nath. Ingles .	{ Burnett's Creek . . .	Lockport . . .	Carroll . . .	Ind.		
	{ Pleasant Run	do		
J. M. Henderson	{ Carmel . . .	South Hanover . .	Jefferson . . .	do	69	160
	{ Clarke	do		
George M. Hall	{ Madison . . .	Bryantsburgh . .	Jefferson . . .	do		
	{ Big Creek	do		
James Dickson .	Raccoon . . .	Portland Mills . .	Putnam . . .	do	41	96
J. L. M'Lean .	{ Princeton . . .	Princeton . . .	Gibson . . .	do		
	{ Midway	do		
Vacancies . .	{ Otter Creek	do		
	{ Bloomington	do		

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF THE CAROLINAS.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
A. Whyte, jr.	Steel Creek . . .	Charlotte . . .	Mecklenburg	N. C.	27	60
	Bethany . . .				38	93
Horatio Thompson	Ebenezer . . .	Lexington . . .	Rockbridge	Va.		
	Timber Ridge	Timber Ridge	do . . .	do		
	Old Providence	Steel's Mill . . .	Augusta . . .	do		
	Broad Creek	Natural Bridge	Rockbridge	do		
	New Lebanon	Union . . .	Monroe . . .	do		
	New Stirling	Statesville . . .	Iredel Co. . .	N. C.	50	100
	Cambridge . . .	do . . .	do . . .	do	20	43
	Virgin Spring	Bogles . . .	do . . .	do	12	22
	Nob Creek . . .	Wilsonville . . .	Lincoln . . .	do	11	20
	McGalliard's	Morgantown . . .	Burke . . .	do	7	12
Vacancies . . .	Cochran's Vale	Old Fort . . .	do . . .	do	5	9
	Piedmont . . .	Franklin . . .	Macon . . .	do	7	15
	Sharon . . .	Yorkville . . .	York Dis. . .	S. C.	16	40
	Neiley's Creek	Coates' Tav. . .	York . . .	do	23	60
	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 Hanna . . .	Cadiz . . .	Cadiz . . .	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	38
Thomas Wilson	Carmel . . .	Carrollton . . .	Carroll . . .	do		
	Sandy . . .	do . . .	do . . .	do		
James Patterson	North Union . . .	do . . .	do . . .	do		
	Scroggsfield . . .	Scroggsfield . . .	Carroll . . .	do	70	150
	Yellow Creek . . .	do . . .	do . . .	do		
Samuel McArthur	Glade Run . . .	do . . .	do . . .	do		
	McMahon's Cr'k	St. Clairsville . . .	Belmont . . .	do	29	55
James McGill . . .	Belmont . . .	do . . .	do . . .	do	36	56
	Cambridge . . .	Cambridge . . .	Guernsey . . .	do		
	Claysville . . .	do . . .	do . . .	do		
Vacancies . . .	Clear Fork . . .	do . . .	do . . .	do		
	Jefferson . . .	Harrison . . .	Harrison . . .	do		
	Salem . . .	do . . .	do . . .	do		

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF STAMFORD.

Ministers	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
John Russell . . .	Stamford . . .	Queenston . . .		U. C.	35	80
James Strang . . .	Dumfries . . .	Galt . . .		do		230
D. Strang . . .	York . . .	Peoria . . .	Genesee	N. Y.		63
D. Coutts . . .	Esquising . . .	Esquising . . .		U. C.		70
Vacancies . . .	London . . .			do		11
	Chinguacoucy . . .					25

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF ILLINOIS.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	State.	Fam.	Com.
James C. Bruce . . .	Henderson . . .	Monmouth . . .	Warren . . .	Ill.	90	207
William Bruce . . .	Bethel . . .	Ellison Creek	Warren . . .	do	20	41
Vacancies . . .	Unity . . .	Columbus . . .	Randolph . . .	do		
	Apple Creek . . .	White Hall . . .	Green . . .	do		
	Sugar Creek . . .		Madison . . .	do		
	Hennepin . . .	Hennepin . . .	Putnam . . .	do		
	Buffalo . . .	Louisiana . . .	Pike . . .	Mo.		
	Sharon . . .		Lincoln . . .	do		
	Crooked Creek	Wopalaw . . .	Louisa . . .	Iowa		

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF MIAMI.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.	
A. Heron . . .	Cæsar Creek . . .	Jamestown . . .	Greene . . .	Ohio	45	120	
Samuel Wilson . . .	Xenia	Xenia	do	do	75	186	
James Wallace . . .	Cherokee	Cherokee	Logan	do	30	62	
	Darby	do	Union	do	31	64	
Thomas S. Kendall	Fork Creek	Madisonville	Monroe	Ten.			
Jas. P. Smart . . .	Massie's Creek	Xenia	Greene	Ohio	91	202	
	Sugar Creek	Centreville	Montgomery	do	50	120	
	Big Spring	do	Blount	Ten.			
	Pistol Creek	Maryville	do	do			
	Salem	do	do	do			
	Limestone	do	do	do			
	Rocky Spring	Abingdon	Washington	Va.			
	Vacancies . . .	Tuscaloosa	Tuscaloosa	do	Ala.		
		Salt River	do	do	Ky.		
		Poplar Ridge	Ottoway	Putnam	Ohio		
		Planefield	Finley	Hancock	do		
		Kenton	Kenton	Hardin	do		
Round Head		Round Head	do	do			
Cherry Fork	Cherry Fork	Adams	do				

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF RICHLAND.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
Samuel Irvine . . .	Salt Creek	Fredricksburgh	Wayne	Ohio	75	120
	Millersburgh	do	do	do		
Samuel Hindman . . .	Mansfield	Mansfield	Richland	do	25	57
	Clear Creek	do	do	do		
David Lindsay . . .	N. Washington	do	do	do		50
	Jona's Creek	Wooster	Franklin	do	17	27
Joseph McKee . . .	Goshen	do	do	do		
	Licking	do	do	do		
Robert Forrester . . .	Wooster	Wooster	Wayne	do	26	50
	Dover	do	do	do	16	42
Vacancies . . .	Truro	Reynoldsburgh	Franklin	do	28	60
	Killbuck	do	Wayne	do		
	Mohican	do	do	do		
	Clear Creek	Vermilion	Richland	do	18	41
	Delaware	do	do	do		
Bucyrus	do	Crawford	do			

SUMMARY OF THE PRECEDING TABLES.

PRESBYTERIES.	Ministers.	Congregations rec- tled and vacant.	Families.	Communicants.
Cambridge	4	9	547	1431
Carolinas	2	19	248	554
Ohio	6	16	690	1431
Chartiers	10	15	828	1926
Miami	5	19	392	638
Philadelphia	7	20	198	912
Allegheny	8	24		
Muskingum	9	21	572	1223
Albany	4	9	194	451
Shenango	6	14	679	1557
Stamford	4	6	35	479
Indiana	5	11	110	256
Illinois	2	9	110	248
Richland	5	16	205	447
Vermont	2	2	145	343
Ministers itinerating	10			

Total

89 210 4,953 11,869

Art. II.—Obituary of the Rev. Robert Laing.

DIED, at Bovina, Delaware County, N. Y., on Wednesday, 29th May, Rev. Robert Laing, in the 89th year of his age, and the fifty-second of his ministry.

It is nearly four years since he was able to attend public worship, and the last time he was at church he assisted in the dispensation of the Supper, and sat down at the table of the Lord for the last time with those among whom he had, as their Pastor, formerly broken the bread of life. Since that time his bodily health decayed, and infirmities of old age increased so that he was, until the day of his death, unable to walk any distance. His mind, at times, when conversing about family affairs, gave symptoms of weakness and confusion; but when speaking about spiritual and eternal things, showed its former strength, accuracy, and clearness. He spent much of his time in reading, meditation, and prayer, and was glad when any one called upon him to converse about the affairs of the Church, in which he took a deep interest, and of which he spoke with the greatest feeling and concern to the last of his moments. He said, he had loved to see the Associate Church in this country spread her influence far and wide, and many congregations erected, and faithful ministers set over them to maintain the cause which he had espoused in his youth, and which, by the help of God, he had endeavoured to defend and promote; but it grieved him to the heart that she had been wounded in the house of her friends, by the late unwarrantable separation which had taken place, and the sinful means employed to break up her unity and peace; and all this done by those who had been nourished and brought up in her very bosom.

He was anxious to know the result of the late meeting of Synod at Pittsburgh, but it pleased the Lord to take him away from the troubles and concerns of the Church below, before the news reached him, to give him a place, we trust, in the mansions of everlasting day. His funeral was attended by many who knew his value when he was a minister of Christ, and who mourned his departure from them. A sermon was preached on the following Sabbath, to an attentive audience from a suitable text: "And his disciples came, and took up the body, and buried it, and went and told Jesus."—Matth. 14. 12.

Mr. Laing was a native of Scotland, born a few miles south from the city of Perth, where he enjoyed many advantages for acquiring the rudiments of his education from distinguished teachers, and he had the benefit of the godly example, and prayers of intelligent and faithful Seceders, who composed the congregation of Abernethy, of which, in his early years, he became a member.

After having completed his classical studies at College, he attended the Divinity Hall, under Professor Moncrieff, at Alloa, and was licensed to preach the everlasting gospel.

His popularity as a preacher, even when he was a young man, was unusually great, being possessed with a strong, well-regulated, and commanding voice, a dignified appearance, a ready flow of words, accompanied with solid learning, and a clear, comprehensive and practical knowledge of divinity, he failed not to attract the attention, and gain the affections of the people wherever he

was sent to preach. He soon obtained a call from the congregation of Dunse, in the south of Scotland, which he accepted, and was afterwards settled among them, much to the satisfaction of their former minister, who was still living, and the other members of Presbytery. He was highly esteemed by some of the most distinguished ministers of the Secession at that time, and was frequently employed in assisting them, viz. Mr. Gibb, of Edinburgh, Dr. Pringle, of Perth, Dr. Young, of Harwick, Mr. Arnot, of Midholm, Mr. Morrison, of Norham, and many others, the mention of whose names and places are dear to many readers of the Monitor.

After being at Dunse for nearly eight years, the Presbytery thought it most for the edification of the church to loose him from his charge, after which he came to this country about the year 1795. He was employed immediately upon his landing, and preached some time in New York with great acceptance, as well as in other places. The clear scriptural manner in which he unfolded the unsearchable riches of Christ, and the energy with which he enforced them upon the attention of his audience, must be fresh in the remembrance of many who were favoured with hearing him; and to his accurate acquaintance with church rules and order, his brethren in the ministry are prepared to attest that few ever excelled him. Few men in the ministry have endured more trials and changes than Mr. Laing, and we may say few ever had such a share of divine grace, and bodily strength granted to surmount them. He was settled in three different congregations; first in Buffalo, Pennsylvania, then in South Argyle, Washington Co. N. Y., and last in Bovina, Delaware Co., N. Y. It appears that he had been about the same number of years in each of these places as their minister, and about the same length of time also in Dunse. In these three first mentioned places, he had to contend with many hardships; for he went among them when their numbers were small, their means of support not adequate, and their places of worship far from being suitable. Both in Buffalo and Argyle he preached in log-houses in the winter, when he went first among them, and in the summer he preached in the fields or woods. When he came to Bovina he had to preach in barns, school-houses, or dwelling-houses. Now, in these places, there are numerous and wealthy congregations, with commodious places of worship, and the people able and willing to support their ministers. It would be well if these and other congregations would remember God's kindness to them, in sending his grace to find them in the wilderness, in blessing their small beginnings, and causing their latter end greatly to increase, while others have been left destitute of the means of grace, and their eyes never permitted to see their teachers: also, that they would lay to heart what the Holy Spirit says, Hebrews 13. 7, 8, "Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken to you the word of God; whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation: Jesus Christ the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever." To say that Mr. Laing was entirely free of vanity, that his own natural temper never involved him in difficulties, or obtained the ascendancy over his judgment, or that in a debate he felt no desire to tease and vanquish an opponent, is what none of his friends will maintain. But though he was not without his faults and failings, yet these, we are disposed

to believe, were too often magnified, dwelt upon, and circulated, and that too frequently by those who were deeper in the mire of guilt, in the sight of God, than he was, though they escaped the censure of men. A conviction of this, and a sense of his innocence when called upon in Presbytery to face his accusers, tended to rouse his mind and summon all his powers to defend himself, or assail his adversaries, not only with strong arguments, but with sharp, pointed and poignant sarcasm, so that he caused to lie prostrate before him, rank and file, a host of written documents, the questionable testimony of prejudiced witnesses, and many a long speech, which had been carefully prepared and eloquently delivered; or, to use a favourite phrase of his, "he cut them all to pieces." He often said that he had been a man of war from his youth, and was determined to die with his face to the enemy; but long before he left this world of troubles, he changed his sentiments, and put on the bowels of forgiveness, patience, meekness, and love. For these two years past he was never heard to speak a word unfavourable even of those whom he thought had injured him. His latter end was peace. He has left a widow; also, four sons and three daughters to lament his departure. He was a kind husband, an affectionate father, and an able minister of Jesus Christ. He had written some able prayers on divine love, which were published in the Monitor. They are specimens of the sermons he used to preach, and of his acquaintance with Owen and Bradbury, his two favourite authors. There is only one sermon left in readiness for the press, being the last he prepared with his own hand, and which, perhaps, will be published in the Monitor.

J. G.

ART. III. *Explanatory Remarks.*

Our readers are requested to suspend their judgment respecting the typographical execution of the Monitor till they receive the July number. It will be seen that the minutes of Synod contain nearly or quite double the usual quantity of matter. Although we have adopted as large a page as could be conveniently printed by the present publisher, and very near the former size, and have printed all the Reports, &c., in small type, the minutes have extended to seventy-two, instead of forty-eight pages, the usual size of a number. This must be our apology for detaining the first number so long beyond the usual time of publication. In the anxiety and haste to issue it with as little delay as possible, some errors have no doubt escaped correction, yet it is hoped they are not numerous, nor of a serious character.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—"A. R." may be looked for in the next number, and probably, also, "Pilgrim." "A Friend of Dr. B." is inadmissible, because altogether of a *personal* nature; and we have already declared that matters *merely* of a personal character cannot be admitted. Such cases belong to the church courts having jurisdiction over the individuals concerned. Farther, it cannot be reasonably expected, that we should insert an anonymous production contradictory of statements made under the authority of a responsible name. The manuscript will remain subject to the writer's order.

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,
AND
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

JULY, 1839.

ART. I. *Answer to Logan's Interrogatories.*

MR. EDITOR—I have perhaps more than once intimated my design of not wielding the sword of a controversialist on the subject of slavery. This is not the result of timidity or fearfulness. True, I have no taste for such strife, and perhaps as little talent to make an advantageous display in exhibitions of intellectual tilts and tournaments; but if I am wrong, let me stand corrected; if right, let others enjoy the benefit of my reflections. I trust my reluctance proceeds from higher and purer motives than those of a selfish nature. I think I have before stated, that it was very far from my desire, (and fully persuaded I am, that yourself and the great body of your readers are similarly minded,) to see the pages of the Religious Monitor converted into a battle field in which gladiatorial champions may display their prowess. It is true, that in the course of my remarks on the treatment of our coloured population, I have occasionally very briefly noticed pieces which have been published in opposition to my views; but it was often rather to correct misapprehensions than to reply to arguments, and when I have thus replied, it was in the most mild and laconic manner. Your correspondent Logan, in putting forth a formidable chain of *interrogatories*, doubtless expects an answer, and I feel bound to regard the insertion of them as a tacit understanding, if not a formal invitation on your part, that I should, if possible, satisfy him. I shall endeavour to do so with all the brevity which the nature of the subject admits.

Before noticing the interrogatories, let me make a few remarks on the author's temper, and the temper of the times. If this were done in a suitable manner, a better service could not be rendered many of your readers. "It requires," says he, "the meekness of Moses to keep in temper, arguing with those who are still willing to enslave a human being." If it requires such meekness to keep in temper with one, in arguing calmly, dispassionately, and I hope, not foolishly, a grave and highly important subject, would it not put in requisition all the patience of the man of Uz, to be perpetually called upon to rectify misconstructions and correct miscon-

ceptions? Why is it that my opponents so often mistake my meaning?—neither giving my sentiments nor my language. It is an easy matter for a writer to raise up a man of straw, and then with his foot kick him over. It is much to be regretted, that such a practice prevails so extensively. Candour as well as courtesy requires that the most favourable construction be put upon the language and conduct of both friends and foes. What have I ever said that manifests a *willingness* that any human being should be enslaved? Have I not repeatedly disavowed every sentiment of such an import? In the face of such disavowals, why charge me with it? If I, in the most remote degree, comprehend my own meaning, nothing that I have ever written can, by the most forced construction of language, or inference of reasoning, be made to convey such an idea. I stated, in reply to the remarks of the former editor, that I never spoke of slavery as an institution of God, unless the toleration of an evil should be so regarded. Will a conscientious man *willingly* encourage the extension or even the existence of any evil whatever? Why is any evil tolerated? Simply, because to eradicate it under existing circumstances would do more harm than to bear with it. Slavery, in the view which I have taken of it, is regarded by the divine law not as essentially immoral, but as an evil or an ill, which duty requires us to remove whenever practicable. The difference of the two cases is immense. If it be essentially immoral, the removal of it admits no consideration of prudence, nor even time for deliberation. Whatever be the consequences to either party, the slave must be put *immediately*, (not a moment of time to intervene without a gross violation of God's law,) in possession of unconditional freedom. On the other hand, if it be an evil of that description which we denominate maladies, misfortunes, ills, &c., not only time is allowed for consideration, but the remedy may be either immediate or more remote; it may be conditional or unconditional, just as the law of love may dictate.

Is it possible that the author of these interrogatories drew the conclusion that I was willing to see a human being enslaved, from pointing to a very common case in which I supposed it would be fulfilling the law of love to enslave a person? Is the condition of a slave *necessarily* worse than any other condition which can possibly be imagined? Is it more cruel to enslave captives than to torture them to death, or to maim or dismember them, and cast them upon the cold charities of an unfeeling world? Does the man who would save them from such a horrid fate by enslaving them, when circumstances are such that nothing better can be done for them, manifest a *willingness* to see his fellow creatures thrown into bondage? Where slaves are fettered down in chains, and the laws of the commonwealth forbid that they shall be knocked off, does the man commit an act of moral turpitude, who buys them from a tyrannical and cruel master, and treats them with humanity, kindness, and equity? Does the culprit go willingly to the gallows, when he uses his legs, rather than be dragged? Persons who can come to such conclusions, have evidently lost the powers of ratiocination, and are more the objects of commiseration than of severe reprehension.

What necessity is there for arraigning the motives and judging the hearts of those who are opposed to us in sentiment? I am not, nor have I ever been, a political friend to Mr. Clay or Mr. Calhoun, and I doubt not, that, in reference to the subject of slavery, I have no communion in feeling or sentiment with them; but why denounce them by name, as those who "walk by sight," those who "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 interfere between the believer and his God?" If these gentlemen be sinners above all men, I confess, nevertheless, that it affords me no satisfaction, when I see torrents of vituperation and calumny poured upon their heads. This is bad enough in all conscience, coming from party political curs, whose vocation it is to tarnish with foul slander the fairest characters of the land, but when this hideous monster, (defamation) shows its head, as it too often does, in professedly religious publications, it merits a stern rebuke. These gentlemen stand in no need of a eulogy from me, but I may be permitted to say that I admire them for their talents, and I respect them for their virtues. That they have their blemishes, who will deny, or who will say, that he is himself clear of them? With respect to Mr. Clay, it is generally believed that he loves not the system of slavery, for its own sake, but, on the contrary, he is anxious to get rid of it, on conditions which are doubtless satisfactory to himself. Certain it is, he once put in requisition the utmost efforts of his gigantic mind to have it *abolished* in his adopted state. Of Mr. Calhoun's personal predilections, in reference to this matter, I have not been informed, but for lofty gentlemanly bearing and kind social feeling, he has few equals, and perhaps no superiors amongst us. As to the relation in which either of them stand to the God that made them, Heaven forbid that I should express an opinion. One thing is true, they have both done the state some service, and their country owes them a debt of gratitude. This perpetual defaming of our magistrates, is a great evil under the sun. How professed Christians can so freely indulge in it, is not a little strange. According to the generally received opinion, this is a glaring violation of the fifth precept of the decalogue—a speaking evil of dignities. It is perhaps true, that we are not warranted in saying that our rulers are peace, and our exactors righteousness, but Christians ought to be thankful that they are permitted to live quiet, peaceable lives, and that they see, for the most part, equitable laws faithfully executed. Without question, there are many things amongst us which call for reformation, and we ought to labour and pray that in all points we may become more and more reformed. It ought, however, to be remarked, that our magistrates are generally honest and respectable, and that public opinion is the platform where such reformations as may be necessary ought to commence.

What charity can we expect to see exercised towards those who may be regarded as men of the world, while we witness the most bitter and rancorous feelings indulged towards those whom duty requires us to treat as brethren in the strictest sense of the word? Our own section of the church is to a fearful extent alienated

and torn, and the signs of the times but too clearly indicate that her Head is pleading a controversy with her; and it becomes us all anxiously to engage in an earnest, heart searching examination, why he is contending with us. The causes may be many, and of various kinds, but there is none more obvious than a spirit of ambitious self-importance which scorns restraint, and would lay at our feet as humble suppliants, all who dare to differ from us. I have not much opportunity of making personal observations on these things, but I would say, in the language of the apostle, "It hath been declared unto me of you, that there are contentions among you—whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men? If ye have bitter envying and strife in your hearts, glory not, and lie not against the truth. This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish. If ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another." Plead not that your provocation has been great, that the magnitude of the interests at stake is such as must necessarily arouse the passions into fury. Such pleas will stand the test neither of revelation nor sound philosophy. "Ye have not resisted unto blood, striving against sin." "In your patience possess ye your souls." "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth." But why multiply Scripture proofs, which meet the eye at almost every page?

What is the verdict of sound reason—of common sense? So far as a man is under the influence of excited passion, just so far is he insane. This unfits us for the performance of duty in various respects. It throws us open to the thrusts of our adversaries, and unfits us for making a proper defence of the truth, and it also closes up the avenues to the understanding, so that truth itself in vain knock for admission. The magnitude of the subject in controversy, instead of justifying, or even excusing passion, is the very strongest argument that can be advanced, why we ought to pursue a contrary course. How then does the case stand? Any of us would be ashamed to acknowledge, that for a trifle we would suffer our passions to obtain the ascendancy over us, and at a glance we must perceive that, even on the score of self-interest, it is the worst thing we can do in matters of importance. Can the folly then of using intemperate language on the subject of slavery be too strongly reprobated, or the indulgence of passion too vigilantly guarded against? What shall we do with the people of colour, if not a difficult question in its very nature, is rendered so by the circumstances of the case. In any action on the subject, many regard their secular interests as deeply involved; many regard their personal security as at stake; many are persuaded that our political institutions and social relations may be endangered. It would be an endless task, as well as a useless one, to undertake to point out all the varieties of opinion which prevail amongst us, and all are impressed with the belief that no more important question has been agitated in our country. It is manifest that if any change is to be effected for bettering the condition of the people of colour, it is to be a work of time, of patience and great labour. Who, then, can have any faith in that headlong, hotspur mode of doing business, which appears to be the only course that

will satisfy the ardent desire of many? This giddy, reckless mode of transacting business may do well enough in church matters, where every person seems to think he has a right to do and say what he pleases; but in movements where the consent of a mighty nation is requisite, in order to move harmoniously together, things wear a quite different aspect.

If any person feels persuaded that he sees plainly the path of duty, which the nation ought to pursue, is it not folly, is it not madness in him to insult and traduce those who agree not with him in opinion and measures? Is this the way he expects to gain the listening ear, and secure the studious attention, and win the confiding hearts of those who are opposed to him? Preposterous conclusion! Such persons ought to know that it is the opinion of all men conversant with the structure of the human mind, the nature of the passions, and the manner of their excitement, that there is no more sure test of weakness, and a consciousness that we cannot successfully resist the attacks of opposing combatants, than a manifestation of turbulent passion. This is perfectly consistent with the plainest deductions of common sense. If I have a clear conscience, am convinced of the purity of my motives and integrity of my purposes, entertain no doubts about the goodness of my cause, and am satisfied of my ability to sustain myself in defending it, where are the elements on which turbulent passions are likely to feed? The full grown man smiles at the efforts of the stripling to throw him off his feet, so the man armed in the panoply of everlasting truth, defies all the assaults of earth and hell, with all their minions.

Is it come to this, that we cannot speak or write our sentiments, in a sober dispassionate manner, on subjects deeply affecting our everlasting happiness, or our temporal prosperity, without encountering enough abuse and vilification to exhaust the vocabulary of Billingsgate? Dare we not differ in opinion with our neighbours, on matters which in their very nature are not to be determined but by common consent, without sacrificing all the charities of social life? Is "a man to be set at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law"—are "a man's foes to be they of his own household," because one says that the people of colour must be sent to Africa, and another says no, they must remain amongst us? Who is it that rejoices and triumphs over our revilings and bitterness of spirit? Do angels and saints—they weep and mourn. It is the devils and their willing instruments, that laugh and shout and triumph, when they witness such contentions in our camp. "Brethren, these things ought not so to be." We ought not thus to cause our good to be evil spoken of. For what did our fathers pray, and fight and bleed and perish at the stake? Was it not for the precious boon of liberty of thought, liberty of speech, liberty of action? Are we ready to acknowledge ourselves the degenerate sons of a noble race of progenitors? In what light do men of the world contemplate such conduct? It was once said, "Behold how these Christians love one another!" but I fear it may be too justly said of many of us, behold how these Christians hate one another! But to the interrogatories.

It will not be necessary to follow Logan regularly through his long list of questions. Such a task would not only be burdensome to me, but would, in all probability, be tiresome, if not disgusting to your readers. I shall, therefore, notice only his leading ideas. He would have greatly facilitated the business of answering his queries, if he had explained what he means by "the general rules of the law of nature." If he means some refined, ethereal, authoritative, infallible standard of moral rectitude, superior to the emanations of the Divine Mind, and to which the revealed law is to be brought in contact, that we may learn what is *exceptionable*, and what not—learn what demands approval, and what is unworthy the approbation of beings of such exalted capacity and purity of nature as we are, he ought in kindness to have pointed it out. What a pity our modern *ETHEREALISTS* keep their discoveries so much in the dark! They must not, however, think it hard, if plain honest unpretending Christians continue to regard the law of God as perfect in its nature, and broad as the wants of our fallen race, so long as they fold themselves up in the robes of superior intelligence and sanctity.

If it is understood that the general rules referred to mean the governing principles which appear to actuate the conduct of animated nature, so far as we are conversant with it, both rational and irrational, I would unhesitatingly answer, that not only the particular laws to which exception appears to be taken, but that the whole of divine revelation may be said to be an exception to such "general rules." What does nature teach, viewed in this light? The strong tyrannizes over, and oppresses the weak. The wolf eats the lamb; the cat plays with, tortures and destroys the mouse. Bulls fight and gore one another, and man conducts himself by precisely the same rules of action. We are sometimes entertained with dissertations on the simplicity, if not the purity of savage manners. Among savages there is doubtless often found something a kin to equality in small communities, but it is generally the equality of thieves and robbers, and tacitly entered into, that they may be able to exercise their unhallowed energies with more effect and greater security. That nature instructs us to love others as we love our-selves, that it teaches us to protect the rights of others as we protect our own, is a mere figment of a disordered imagination, and has no place except in the heads of infidels and those who follow in their footsteps. I have heretofore spoken of this being an infidel scion, transplanted into our Theological Seminaries, and it is much to be regretted, that it seems to grow as if the soil were quite congenial to its nature.

If this querist means by "the general rules of the law of nature," the impress of God's image on man at his creation, as I presume he does; if, indeed, he has any distinct idea at all, then I answer no, with the most unhesitating assurance. This plan of putting God at variance with himself, which is becoming so fashionable, is not only matter of astonishment, but matter of lamentation. It is no slavery question, but a question involving the authority of the Divine Law-giver. Once admit the proposition that God *can* give, as a rule of life, for the direction of his rational creatures in the performance of duty, that which is not in perfect conformity with his justice, his holiness, his benignity, &c., and you tarnish his character and over-

throw his government. What would satisfy the pride of a worm of the dust in replying against his Maker? One thinks it an exception to the general rules of the law of nature to buy servants of the heathen; another thinks it was so to take usury of the heathen; another thinks it was cruel to destroy the Canaanites; another insists that it was barbarous to cut off men, women, and children, after a single refusal to capitulate; another is quite certain that it was an open violation of this super-godly code to marry more than one wife; another is quite shocked to think that the law requiring an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth, should ever lay claim to a heavenly origin; another would torture language and ideas out of every simple and appropriate meaning, rather than admit the possibility that the law of a benignant *nature* ever did or ever could require us to put a guilty wretch to death, simply because he sent, perhaps, the most useful man in the country to eternity, with a violent hand; another—but I will add no more. When we undertake to lay down exceptions to God's law, we may find a place where to begin; but I venture to assert, we will find no place where to end. Who cannot see that this is the very way to "make void the law of God by our traditions?"

It does not derogate from the unchangeable sameness of the Divine Being to suppose that he suits his law to the various conditions of his creatures. When the condition and wants of the same creature change, it is not absurd to suppose that a beneficent God would modify his law to suit it in its altered situation; but to speak of the unchangeable God, as instituting positive laws, which are exceptions to the principles of perfect moral rectitude, is absurd, if not impious, and clearly indicates a desire to be wise above what is written. This is a stumbling-block over which many fall in explaining Scripture. They erect a standard of their own. Some beautiful theory, perhaps derived from the fiction of the ancient poets, which represented destiny or the decrees of fate as fixing, unalterably, the affairs and conditions of gods and men, and over which even Jove had no control, to which every thing must bend, as if the law of nature were superior to the God of nature. If there be difficulties in expounding some parts of God's law, and reconciling them according to our views with other parts, is it a matter of surprise? "His ways are not as our ways, nor his thoughts as our thoughts." Much better to humbly confess our ignorance than "charge God foolishly."

Having, as I trust, put a satisfactory negative upon the first query, it may seem a work of supererogation to pursue the subject farther, as it would appear that, according to the author's own view, the balance were, more or less, supported by it, and of course, must share its fate. I feel, however, disposed to give some of his ideas a passing notice. He evidently confounds the providence of God with the law of God. Why does he put the special command to destroy the Canaanites on the same footing with the judicial law of the Jews? Only admit that God gave the Israelites a law permitting them to buy slaves of the heathen, and to hold them as such, and the question of the morality of holding slaves, under certain circumstances, must be for ever settled with those who believe that the government which God exercises is a moral government, unless a positive command to the contrary can be shown. Such laws can-

not be referred to his providence any more than the law that required a tooth for a tooth, or an eye for an eye, or that four sheep should be given for one that had been stolen. Such mixing together incongruous things, shows the want of a discriminating understanding, or rather a mind overwhelmed by a one-sided view of the subject.

The author asks, "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. I know as little about this as any other person, nor ought any one to expect me to know more. I do hope the readers of the Monitor will not receive every declaration, from whatever quarter it may come, as being *my* sentiments. *Ye accusers*, do if you please, produce your testimony. I believe I have never said that slavery was of God, nor that it was not of God. Nor have I ever said we had any authority to enslave the Africans; nor have I ever spoken of the justice or propriety of holding one of them one hour in bondage, except as a remedial measure against greater evils. I have fully admitted the national guilt of slavery; I have, likewise, admitted a heavy charge of individual guilt. This may well consist with entertaining doubts, whether slavery be essentially immoral. Of the remedy I have never spoken particularly; whether it should be mediate or immediate; whether it should be conditional or unconditional. According to the aspect in which I have presented it, this is a fair subject of deliberation, and one that demands a most candid, dispassionate, and thorough investigation. It demands an examination which I fear the public mind is not in a condition to make.

Logan appears to be full of nature. At times we hear nature most terribly traduced and evil-spoken of. One would think she was the foulest old jade that ever set foot in a brothel, nothing to be seen about her, but sick heads, faint hearts, bloody garments, stinking wounds, leprous skins—dead to all sense of right too, both as it respects God and man. At other times we are delighted to see this same lady in the full bloom of youth, sparkling with beauty, dressed in rich, but modest apparel, smiling with benevolence, and bestowing the most precious gifts and graces upon her whole family, which comprises all the sons and daughters of our great progenitor. Now it requires no great effort of the imagination to conceive, how, through mental illusion, different persons can see, or think they see, in the same object, qualities directly opposed to each other; but how the same person can, at the same time, see the same object, both lovely and hateful, both beautiful and ugly, both pure and impure, &c., rather exceeds my comprehension.

One word more, and I have done. I am asked, "If Jesus were on earth, would you, in any case, enslave him?" It will be time enough to answer this question when the mighty God, the Creator of heaven and earth, needs the assistance of a worm of the dust. I have seen it stated, that some of the ardent partisans in this warfare, insisted that our Saviour *was* (perhaps they ought to have said *is*) a negro. It is certainly far from being pleasant to reflect that there are those who need to be told, that such things are in bad, very bad taste, and that their propriety is, perhaps, more than questionable.

A. R.

ART. II.—*Remarks on Malachi, Chapter III. 8—12.*

“Will a man rob God? Yet ye have robbed me. But ye say, Whercin have we robbed thee? in tithes and offerings. Ye are cursed with a curse: for ye have robbed me, even this whole nation. Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse, that there may be meat in mine 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, that *there shall not be room to receive it.* And I will rebuke the devourer for your sakes, and he shall not destroy the fruits of your ground; neither shall your vine cast her fruit before the time in the field, saith the Lord of hosts. And all nations shall call you blessed; for ye shall be a delightsome land, saith the Lord of hosts.

THERE is no way in which professed Christians more clearly manifest their want of faith in God, than by refusing to take him at his word. A profession of his name, an acknowledgment of the obligations which he has laid us under to maintain his truths, and oppose whatever is derogatory to his character, is a sacrifice which costs us little, and can be readily made, while the corruptions of the heart remain entirely unsubdued. But to receive with the confiding simplicity of a child the declaration, “Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and all these things shall be added unto you,” manifests a work of the Spirit of a quite different nature. With the genuine child of God the lusts of the flesh, the lusts of the eye, and the pride of life—honours, riches, and pleasure have lost their controlling power, their fascinating charms, while in the heart of the mere professor, they continue to exist, are not only undiminished in force, but the outward restraints which he finds placed around him fixes them deeper in his soul, and renders them doubly dear to his affections. Hence it is, that men who make no pretension to godliness, who are avowedly conducting themselves according to the policy and maxims of the world, are often more liberal in supporting the ministry and spreading the gospel, than are thousands who have taken the vows of God upon them, and openly declared before their Maker, before angels and men that they have devoted themselves and property, all that they have and are to the service of that Master whom they profess to obey.

It was not my design in turning the reader’s attention to the scripture cited above to make a regular theological lecture in methodical order, but rather, if it be possible, to arouse him to the necessity of a more faithful and diligent performance of a duty shamefully neglected by the church in our land, and may I not add, *especially by that branch of it to which we belong?* It is to be feared, if the charge were solemnly sounded in our ears from on high, “Ye have robbed me, even this whole nation,” our lips would be sealed in silence, and a fearful looking for of that judgment would seize our souls, which we find denounced against those of whom the complaint is made: “I was a hungered, and ye gave me no meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me not in; naked, and ye clothed me not; sick and in prison, and ye visited me not.” This strange misconception seems to have seized our minds, that because God has declared he will not accept at our hands other than willing sacrifices, therefore, his demands upon the church are not so great as they were in former ages, when her light was comparatively dim and her privileges circumscribed within

narrow limits. The perversity of such reasoning needs only to be looked at, that we may see it in all its horrid deformity. If God has been pleased in much mercy to grant us great light and remove from our shoulders a burdensome ritual, does it follow as a matter of course that our sacrifices shall be few and small and far between? If he has dispensed with a legal requisition and permitted us to make the estimate ourselves, shall we say *he needs them not?*

In the farther prosecution of this subject I shall first endeavour to show that the demand of a tenth, which God made of his people, during a former dispensation, was moral as well as judicial. Second, That the necessities of the church are as great now as they ever were. Third, that the church is as able to contribute now as at any former period. Fourth, That this duty can be complied with, without impairing our worldly prosperity, or lessening our temporal enjoyments—concluding with some reflections on what we might reasonably look for as the consequences resulting from a faithful performance of the duty.

First. Is it not pretty evident that the demand of one-tenth made by God of his people during the existence of the Jewish polity was moral as well as judicial? This may be fairly inferred from the practice of the patriarchs. Abraham paid tithes to Melchizedek, and we find Jacob vowing unto God, and declaring, "That of all that thou shalt give me, I will surely give the tenth unto thee." Here we have the obligation acknowledged by one eminent saint, and the duty performed by another. Was this a remarkable coincidence of isolated cases which had no reference to the general practice of the saints? This conclusion appears to be not at all logical. The only condition prescribed by Jacob is, that God would keep him in the way of peace, and give him bread to eat and raiment to put on. Did this vow bind Jacob to the performance of one act only, or was it a solemn declaration of a rule of life which he considered it his duty ever to observe? I am aware that it may be, and, perhaps, generally is regarded in the former light, but is it not so regarded without due consideration? We find Jacob poor and friendless, pursuing his journey to not only a foreign, but to a heathen land. He had indeed the promise of God for his support, but his way was dark and his duties arduous. What then is the simple import of his vow? Was it not that if God would prosper him in his undertakings, when he returned he would build an altar and attend to the regular and stated worship of God in his family? To this purpose he solemnly devotes one-tenth part of his substance, not to be used on one particular occasion, making a great parade and show of piety and benevolence, and afterwards neglecting it. Such a view is not only derogatory to the character of so eminent a saint, but is inconsistent with any rational aspect, in which we can contemplate the worship of the Divine Being during the patriarchal ages. We have no account of the positive institution of sacrifices before the establishment of the Aaronic priesthood, yet it would be absurd to suppose that the early saints have no warrant for such offerings. The reasoning is as sound, proving that the church had an intimation that one-tenth should be devoted to the Lord, as that sacrifices would be acceptable. If contributions are to be made for any purpose whatever, it is absolutely necessary that some data or rule should be laid

down whereby we can with reasonable certainty determine what is required of us. A supposed failure in this particular would be a reflection on the character of the Almighty, and would leave his worshippers in a state of blindness little better than that of heathen darkness.

The point contended for is abundantly sustained by the positive institutions of God himself. None will deny that what God requires is reasonable and just, and that if he requires the performance of a duty by his creatures at one time, he requires it at all times under similar circumstances, unless for wise reasons he intimates a change of purpose. Now, if it can be shown, as I trust I shall show, that the ability of the people of God is as great to contribute to the Lord now as it ever was, and that the demands of the church are as pressing as at any former period, the argument will be complete, that to devote one-tenth of our substance to the Lord is of moral and of course of perpetual obligation. It is true that the Mosaic dispensation is spoken of in the New Testament as a yoke, which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear, but it is evident that it was the ritual which was meant, and not the contributions which were demanded. I will not weary the reader's patience by pointing out the innumerable authorities which enjoin it as a duty to contribute of our substance for religious and benevolent purposes. That this obligation rests upon us will be conceded on all hands. The inquiry then presents itself, how much shall we bestow? Shall God prescribe the rule, or shall we prescribe the rule ourselves? If we have really authority to lay down the rule, and do punctually perform duty according to *that rule*, no matter how little we cast into the treasury, we cannot be arraigned for unfaithfulness. If it be asked where have we the rule prescribed by divine authority, I answer, as before intimated, in the practice of the patriarchs and in the positive institutions of God himself. There was nothing strictly ceremonial in the contributions under the former dispensation, and the setting aside the Jewish polity, only divested the subject of its judicial features; so that now we are not authorized to compel by legal process a performance of the duty, but its moral obligation remains unchanged.

The introduction of the gospel dispensation has enlarged the privileges of the church, but is it not absurd to argue from this fact that her *duties* have also become circumscribed? If God in mercy has removed from us the terrors of a judicial process, shall we in return for that favour rob him of that which is his due? Our privileges under the present dispensation are not only enlarged, but our light is greatly increased. This increase of light, may in some measure be regarded as the reason why, what we may call the involuntary system was set aside and the voluntary one adopted. This is perfectly in accordance with rational conceptions of divine wisdom. Formerly, the light being comparatively dim, the Christian's track was marked out, so far at least as it respected external duties, with much precision and particularity. This could then be readily done, as the church had but one temple, and was pretty much confined to one province, and that not a large one. Widely different is the case now, her constitution being coextensive with the world, embracing in its arms all nations, however diversified their laws,

manners, or customs, comprehending individuals of every tribe, no matter what may be their occupation, their colour, or their circumstances. Here then is abundant reason for admiring the goodness and wisdom of her Head; for removing whatever was involuntary, and substituting that which is voluntary in its room.

Second. Are not the necessities of the church as great now as they ever were? Formerly, as has already been stated, the church had but one temple, and a priesthood confined within the limits of a small province. It is evident then, that so far as she required contributions to maintain the interests of religion, they were to be expended within the limits of a narrow compass. It is true the priesthood was relatively numerous, when compared with the dispensation under which we live; but it is equally true, that looking to the wants of a perishing world, we require a ministry at this time as numerically great in proportion to the Christian community, as were the Levites to the body of the Jewish nation. It ought, too, to be kept in mind, that the priesthood of old was hereditary, and that whatever may have been the necessary qualifications for the proper discharge of duty, they were transmitted from father to son, and required not that expense, and laborious devotedness which is absolutely necessary to constitute an efficient and respectable ministry in our day. We are all daily engaged in offering up prayers for the speedy conversion of the world. Now can any one point out a way, in which this is at all likely to be accomplished under God, but through the instrumentality of an enlightened and well qualified ministry? If this be so, how shall we obtain a ministry adequate to accomplish the desired end, without making contributions, at least equal to those insisted on? Seminaries must be erected and endowed, teachers must be employed and paid, young men of promise must be encouraged to consecrate themselves to the work. Outfits must be made, and, for a time at least, missionaries must be sustained in heathen lands.

Whether or not there be or can be among men such a principle as *disinterested* benevolence, I do not pretend to decide; but it must be admitted that the benevolence of the Christian religion is a *diffusive* benevolence, that in watering others we water ourselves. Better for our spiritual growth that we be half our time destitute of public ordinances, than that we should by our selfishness deprive others of the bread of life. Is there not room for well grounded apprehensions, that on this point we commonly labour under a fearful mistake? We can hardly consent, even under circumstances of the utmost necessity, to be deprived of a few sabbath days' preaching, that others who are perishing may be supplied with the crumbs which are falling from our gospel table. Whether this be indeed owing to our hungering and thirsting after spiritual nourishment, or, whether our attendance on public ordinances affords us a kind of recreation, which through habit has become necessary to us, I shall not pretend to determine; but so it is; it exerts an unhappy influence on the general interests of religion. This diffusive principle of Christianity ought not to be confined merely to the proclamation of the glad news of salvation. The happiness of the human family is dependent upon, and intimately connected with, innumerable springs of action; and in our benevolent enterprises

we ought to have an eye to the mental, moral, political, and physical improvement of mankind. Here is a wide field open for the bestowment of charitable donations. No one who has studied the nature of man, and made the least inquiry relative to the struggle which must be sustained in overthrowing the kingdom of Satan, can be at a loss to discover that it will fill the now heathen world with incalculable suffering. How can it be otherwise? Will the interested stand quietly by, and witness the subversion of institutions under whose shade they and their ancestors have reposed in peace through revolving centuries, and not make an effort to save them? The ways of Providence are inscrutable, and it is possible that such a change may be brought about without realizing these awful forebodings; but so far as his future operations can be viewed through the medium of past experience, we are warranted to conclude that the "overturning, overturning, overturning" of the nations which is to usher in the latter day glory, will be attended with physical evils, if not of an enduring nature, at least of incalculable magnitude. The enemies of the cross still possess the strong holds of power; their armies are innumerable, and their discipline complete, and yield without a contest, they will not. The tragic scenes of pagan persecution, and the more recent exhibitions of Papal cruelty, may yet pass before our eyes on a theatre wide as the world itself. Let it not be said then, that the calls of the church are less urgent now than they have been in former times.

Intimately connected with this view of the subject, is the inadequate compensation which our ministers generally receive. The Head of the church works in the kingdom of grace, as he does in the kingdom of Providence, through the instrumentality of means. It is vain therefore, as a general rule, to expect young men of talent to devote themselves to a calling where poverty is continually staring them in the face. It is certainly a fact, that a fat, lazy, worldly ministry is a great curse to the church; but surely the labourer is worthy of his hire, worthy of such hire as similar labour, expense, and preparation would command in open market. Three, four, and five hundred dollars is a yearly compensation which would not be looked at by a respectable clerk in a merchant's store. Indeed, I much doubt whether there are many of our respectable mechanics who would be satisfied with it. Now it will not be pretended that the preparation of our ministers is less expensive, less laborious, or, that their duties are less difficult, less responsible than that of a clerk or mechanic. We would not willingly intrust the welfare of our bodies, or the security of our property in the hands of men, unless we considered them such as, from superior attainments and elevation of character, were worthy of our confidence and esteem. Is it because we set less value upon the things intimately connected with the welfare of our souls, that we are contented to place them in the hands of men who will labour for inferior wages? Let it not be supposed, however, that I speak disparagingly of our ministry. Far from it. It is not only respectable, but much superior to what we might reasonably expect under existing circumstances; but the course pursued in giving them such a scanty remuneration has discouraged, does discourage, and if persevered in, will discourage young men of piety and talent from taking upon themselves the pastoral office.

A sum of money which is barely sufficient to support a man and small family in genteel circumstances is not enough. Extravagance certainly does not become the humble, meek, and lowly messenger of peace and good-will to sinners; but the shepherd of the flock ought to be given to *hospitality*—his house, his table, his whole establishment, ought to present to the visiter that neatness, simplicity, and comfort which it is more easy to admire than to imitate. It might be unwise to load them with salaries which would tempt them into wild schemes of speculation; but we ought not to blame them for aiming by lawful means to better their condition. This is a wholesome spring of action which we all need; one, it is true, we generally abuse, but which we would be wretched without. Our ministers have expended in their preparatory course, in time, labour, and money what is equal to a small estate, (in many parts of the country it would pass for a very respectable one,) and shall we, because of their devotion to the service of their Master, compel them to labour for a bare subsistence, when there are lawful callings in which they could obtain wealth and distinction?

In estimating the compensation due to ministers of the gospel, there is one important item which is often entirely overlooked. It must be obvious to persons of the least reflection, that young men, when they leave the Theological Hall, instead of being thoroughly furnished for the performance of the arduous work which they have undertaken, can only be regarded as having laid a good foundation on which to build. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that the materials should be furnished them, and that they should be furnished in due season. All men of studious habits know that a habit of study cannot be laid aside and resumed at pleasure, they know too, that it cannot be maintained without a constant supply of literary food. Nothing can be more unfortunate for a young minister and the people of whom he may have charge, than the want of a suitable library. It is not enough that he be furnished with as many books as he can read, and that he be enabled to procure them as fast as he can peruse and digest them. Many of our preachers cannot enjoy the advantage even of a country or village library, and if they could, it would avail them little; for such books as are suited to the taste of the general reader, are not the kind that will answer the desired end. The profound theologian will desire to have an *epitome* at least of the whole circle of literature spread before him, not for the purpose of becoming intimately acquainted with every art and science, but merely that he may have a store house of knowledge to which he can have reference in the pursuit of his appropriate studies. Now I will not venture to conjecture what would be *enough* to supply such wants; but I will say that an amount equal to several years' salary, such as they usually get, would not be *too much*.

Third. But granting that the necessities of the church are as great as they ever have been, are the people equally able to bear the burden? It is scarcely necessary to say one word on this point, for in reference to it there can be but one opinion. What was the condition of the Israelites, during what we may call the dispensation of types and shadows? It was burdensome truly, as the Apostle declares, but the burden, as before stated, consisted not in the paying of tithes, but in the external forms of their worship, in their

triennial pilgrimages to the temple, and their frequent calls there on other occasions, in their observance of numerous festivals, purifications, &c. &c. From these burdens the church has been released, and for every weight from which she has been thus relieved, she is able to bear one equivalent to it, without making her condition more intolerable than it was before. We see that the burden complained of has been entirely removed, and nothing laid on to compensate it, so that this is to us all clear gain, and instead of pleading inability to pay tithes, we could well pay two or three tenths without feeling the oppression which the church of old endured.

That our plea of inability to perform this duty is hypocritical, we have evidence as clear and conclusive as any mathematical demonstration in Euclid. Out of our own mouths we stand condemned. If one of us be blessed or *cursed* with a little spot of *terra-firma* more than we feel disposed to occupy, and a poor neighbour surrounded with a numerous and helpless family is desirous of using it, do we content ourselves with tithing him? No verily. The poor man thinks himself lucky, if he escapes with any thing short of a quadruple tithing. For the use of that which God has a perfect right, we think it hard to pay a tenth; but for the use of that to which our right is quite imperfect, we charge a poor brother not a tenth, but a third, perhaps a half. "Cleanse your hands, ye sinners; and purify your hearts, ye double-minded."

(To be concluded in next number.)

ART. III.—*Terms of Communion.*

THERE is, perhaps, no part of the ministerial work, more important to the church, or more difficult in the faithful performance, than the admission of persons to communion in sealing ordinances.

There is danger on the one hand, of being untender to the weak, discouraging the sincere, by keeping them back from those precious ordinances that are designed to strengthen and comfort them. The inspired instruction on this point is, "Him that is weak in the faith, receive ye." But while endeavouring to follow this instruction, there is danger on the other hand, of being too tender to those whose weakness is a want of love, whose deficiencies are the result of carelessness; admitting the ignorant and unholy, we defile God's ordinances, and wrong them.

We are not called upon to judge the heart, any farther than it is manifested by the profession and practice; and, perhaps, some may think that our terms of communion, stated in our Testimony, are a rule on this subject, sufficient to obviate all difficulty; namely,

"The profession of faith required of those, who desire communion with us, shall be, an adherence to the Westminster Confession of Faith, Larger and Shorter Catechisms, Form of Presbyterial Church Government, and Directory for the Public Worship of God, as these are received and witnessed for by us in our Declaration and Testimony; and also that they approve of said Declaration and Testimony." This rule is both good and necessary, in order that we may with one mind, and with one mouth glorify God, even the

Father. But the great difficulty lies in the application of this very rule.

First, The profession here required, is of vast extent; even the doctrinal parts of these standard books, embrace a body of divinity, requiring the diligent study of years to produce an acquaintance with them necessary to make the required profession intelligently.

Secondly, These standard books are of a complex character; they not only exhibit a form of sound doctrine, but have also a special respect therein to a covenanted reformation of former times, and the prevailing errors of present times. They not only show what the church now holds, but also the steps and struggles by which she has reached her present position, &c.

The subject is so large, that we do not hesitate to assert, that very few, even of old members, have a familiar acquaintance with it in all its extent. How then can we expect a prompt and intelligent answer from those who are only entering? There was much truth in what was once assigned as a reason for laying aside a Testimony from being a term of communion; namely, that "it was too abstruse for common people," though the remedy adopted in that case was somewhat worse than the disease.

When we receive an affirmative answer, in one word, to the question of adhering to our standards, there is often reason to fear that more regard is paid to the supposed wish of him who asks, than to the judgment and conscience of him who answers. If applicants for admission were always persons of mature judgment and experience, there would be less difficulty; but it is only a very small proportion of them that are of this description. Many are young, and it is very desirable that the young should come forward to appear on the Lord's side in a public profession: we consider backwardness among the young in this matter a sad evidence of a languid state of religion, affording a comfortless prospect for time to come. "Lo, children are a heritage of the Lord, and the fruit of the womb is his reward:" many are of small natural capacity, yet they are not to be rejected. "The bruised reed he will not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench." Many have had little advantage of a religious education, perhaps they come from the profane world, and we are to rejoice over them in so doing. Many, in new and remote places, have great difficulty to obtain even a sight of our standard books, and among all these classes of persons there are many, so little in the habit of reading, or of exercising their judgments on what they do read, that it is only a rare individual that can be said to have perused our standards intelligently. How shall we proceed in the important work of admitting to fellowship? Perhaps the most who apply are familiar with the letter of the Shorter Catechism, some may have read, in some manner, the doctrinal part of the Confession and Testimony; but the Larger Catechism, the Form of Church Government, and Directory for Public Worship, are seldom so much as looked at, the importance or Scripture foundation of any of these, scarcely ever understood or considered. The same is to be remarked of the necessity and peculiar nature of our Testimony, the manner in which the Confession is there received and witnessed for, &c.

Now, in such cases, what becomes of our rule and measure for a profession? It may be answered, that it is expressly provided in

our terms of communion, that "the weak are to be received when there appears in them an honest humble desire to make progress."

This is a very necessary provision, though very indefinite; now let us see how we can proceed by the help of it. We begin with some of the first principles of religion, and some of its plainest duties, and even here answers are very sparing, frequently the bare affirmative or negative, when prompted by the question. Yet it is difficult to judge whether it arises from embarrassment, or gross ignorance, or the disadvantage of having no previous knowledge of the particular points of examination, or the particular questions to be asked, and no form as a means of preparation, or how far all of these contribute to it, but so it is. The only forms we can refer to are the Confession and Testimony; if they have been read at all, it is rare that any particular doctrine in either can be remembered; if any one is stated, it is seldom that any text is remembered in which it is taught; seldom that any difference is observed between the Confession and Testimony, and nothing is ever found objectionable, as not according to Scripture: this last would be very well if it did not arise from a very partial acquaintance with the whole subject. A ready assent is given, however, to all requirements, to study our standards carefully, to embrace every means of fartherance in the knowledge and practice of godliness, to continue steadfast in the profession of the truth as now made, to guard against wavering, to be submissive to discipline, &c. On these grounds many, we might say the greater part are admitted to fellowship with us, and if they were honestly followed up, all would be well; but, alas, facts show a very different result; and of our present system as producing this result, we must observe—

1. That it is impossible, according to our present practice, to attain to that unity of sentiment and profession as a church, which our standards contemplate, and which we justly consider so important in a body of witnesses. All who know the actual state of the church, know that such unity exists in a very imperfect manner, indeed: it is true we have none within the church making positive and formal opposition to any part of our standards; but this amounts only to what may be called a negative unity. It is a fact, as we have seen, that we have two distinct measures for profession to be made by those admitted to our fellowship. We are not, therefore, one, but at least two distinct classes; perhaps some would prefer to call it different degrees of attainment and conformity to the same rule and measure, which is not the same as a diversity. Granting this, still it must be allowed that those of the lowest degree, (whom we have seen to be the greater part) stop entirely short of all that can be called the peculiarities of the Secession church; hence so many readily unite with any other denomination, having a general resemblance to our own, when circumstances seem to require it, and are not sensible of any inconsistency in so doing.

2. It is a fact that the church by this means becomes filled with a people who know nothing and care nothing for Secession principles, who not only are unsteadfast themselves, but instruments of unsettling others, and disturbing the whole body. Such are always most suitable materials for disorderly and schismatical men to work upon, easily carried about by their slight and cunning craftiness; as the state of our church at this day, abundantly shows.

3. It is a fact, that though we have two distinct classes of members at their admission, we have a standard book or form, for one of them only, I mean the Confession and Testimony, which is the measure for the more intelligent, who might (if any must) more reasonably do without any; while the weak and ignorant are left indefinitely to answer, without premeditation, whatever may be asked; this is undoubtedly the most severe way of examining, even though the questions may be considered simple. I am aware that it is not merely from the words of answers given, that we are to judge in such cases, but still it must be allowed the method we speak of has every disadvantage, both for ascertaining what knowledge the applicant has, and for communicating farther information.

4. Though persons at their admission promise to prosecute the study of the profession diligently in an humble and teachable spirit, yet we have no definite formal means of requiring the fulfilment of these promises, and the requiring of them is frequently considered only a sort of exhortation, very good at the time, but that those to whom it was addressed, are not expected to remember it. The diligent pastor, in some measure, forwards them in acquaintance with the principles, especially by family visitation and public catechising; but these are far from being adequate to the real wants in the case. Such, then, we consider to be our difficulty: what remedy is proposed?

To be concluded in next number.

ART. IV.—*Final Decision of the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, in the celebrated case at issue between the "Old" and "New School" Presbyterians of the General Assembly.*

It is believed we cannot render the readers of the Monitor a better service, than to insert at length the opinion of the court, in this interesting case. It settles important principles deeply affecting the ecclesiastical rights of religious bodies, which had been previously involved in doubt. It cannot fail to yield unfeigned satisfaction to the friends of good order, in every denomination, and ought to be preserved for future reference.

OPINION OF THE COURT.

GIBSON, C. J., delivered the opinion of the Court, on Wednesday morning, May 8th, as follows:

To extricate the question from the multifarious mass of irrelevant matter in which it is enclosed, we must, in the first place, ascertain the specific character of the General Assembly, and the relation it bears to the corporation which is the immediate subject of our cognizance. This Assembly has been called a *quasi* corporation; of which it has not a feature. A *quasi* corporation has capacity to sue and be sued as an artificial person; which the Assembly has not. It is also established by law; which the Assembly is not. Neither is the Assembly a particular order or rank in the corporation, though the latter was created for its convenience; such,

for instance, as the share-holders of a bank or joint-stock company, who are an integrant part of the body. It is a segregated association, which, though it is the reproductive organ of corporate succession, is not itself a member of the body; and in that respect it is anomalous. Having no corporate quality in itself, it is not a subject of our corrective jurisdiction, or of our scrutiny, farther than to ascertain how far its organic structure may bear on the question of its personal identity or individuality. By the charter of the corporation, of which it is the handmaid and nurse, it has a limited capacity to create vacancies in it, and an unlimited power over the form and manner of choice in filling them. It would be sufficient for the civil tribunals, therefore, that the assembled commissioners had constituted an actual body; and that it had made its appointment in its own way, without regard to its fairness in respect to its members: with this limitation, however, that it had the assent of the constitutional majority, of which the official act of authentication would be, at least, *prima facie* evidence. It would be material to the legality of the choice that the majority had expelled the minority, provided a majority of the whole body concurred in the choice. This may be safely predicated of an undivided assembly, and it would be an unerring test in the case of a division could a quorum not be constituted of less than such a majority; but unfortunately a quorum of the General Assembly may be constituted of a very small minority, so that two, or even more, distinct parts may have all the external organs of legitimate existence. Hence, where, as in this instance, the members have formed themselves into separate bodies, numerically sufficient for corporate capacity and organic action, it becomes necessary to ascertain how far either of them was formed in obedience to the conventional law of the association, which, for that purpose only, is to be treated as a rule of civil obligation.

The division which, for purposes of designation, it is convenient to call the Old school party, was certainly organized in obedience to the established order: and, to legitimate the separate organization of its rival, in contravention, as it certainly was of every thing like precedent, would require the presentation of a very urgent emergency. At the stated time and place for the opening of the session, the parties assembled, without any ostensible division; and, when the organization of the whole had proceeded to a certain point, by the instrumentality of the Moderator of the preceding session, who, for that purpose, was the constitutional organ, a provisional Moderator was suddenly chosen, by a minority of those who could be entitled to vote, including the excised commissioners. The question on the motion to elect, was put, not by the Chair, but by the mover himself; after which, the seceding party elected a permanent Moderator, and immediately withdrew, leaving the other party to finish its process of organization, by the choice of its Moderator for the session.

In justification of this apparent irregularity, it is urged that the constitutional Moderator had refused an appeal to the commissioners in attendance, from his decision, which had excluded from the roll the names of certain commissioners who had been unconstitutionally severed, as it is alleged, from the presbyterian connexion by a vote of the preceding session. It is conceded by the argument, that if the synods with the dependent presbyteries by

which those commissioners were sent, had been constitutionally dissolved, the motion was one which the Moderator was not bound to put, or the commissioners to notice; and that whatever implication of assent to the decision which ensued, might otherwise be deduced from the silence of those who refused to speak out, about which it will be necessary to say something in the sequel, there was no room for any such implication in the particular instance. It would follow also, that there was no pretence for the deposal of the Moderator, if indeed such a thing could be legitimated by any circumstances, for refusing an appeal from his exclusion of those who had not colour of title, and, consequently, that what else might be reform, would be revolution. And this leads to an inquiry into the constitutionality of the act of excision.

The sentence of excision, as it has been called, was nothing else than an ordinance of dissolution. It bore that the synods in question, having been formed and attached to the body of the Presbyterian Church under, and in execution of, the plan of union, "be, and are hereby declared to be, out of the ecclesiastical connexion of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America; and that they are not in form or in fact, an integral portion of said church." Now it will not be said that if the dissolved synods had no other basis than the plan of union, they did not necessarily fall along with it, and it is not pretended that the Assembly was incompetent to repeal the union prospectively, but it is contended that the repeal could not impair rights of membership which had grown up under it. On the other hand, it is contended that the plan of union was unconstitutional and void from the beginning, because it was not submitted to the presbyteries for their sanction; and that no right of membership could spring from it. But viewed, not as a constitutional regulation which implies permanency of duration, but as a temporary expedient, it acquired the force of a law without the ratification of those bodies. It was evidently not intended to be permanent, and it consequently was constitutionally enacted and constitutionally repealed by an ordinary act of legislation; and those synods which had their root in it, could not be expected to survive it. There never was a design to attempt an amalgamation of ecclesiastical principles which are as immiscible as water and oil; much less to effect a commixture of them only at particular geographical points. Such an attempt would have compromised a principle at the very root of presbyterial government, which requires that the officers of the church be set apart by special ordination for the work. Now the character of the plan is palpable, not only in its title and provisions, but in the minute of its introduction into the Assembly. We find in the proceedings of 1801, page 256, that a committee was raised "to consider and digest a plan of government for the churches in the *new settlements* agreeably to the proposal of the General Association of Connecticut;" and that the plan adopted in conformity to its report, is called "a Plan of Union for the new settlements." The avowed object of it was to prevent alienation—in other words, the affiliation of Presbyterians in other churches, by suffering those who were yet too few and too poor for the maintenance of a minister, temporarily to call to their assistance the members of a sect who differed from them in principles, not of faith, but of ecclesiastical government. To that end, Presbyterian ministers were suffered to preach to Congregational churches, while Presby-

terian churches were suffered to settle Congregational ministers; and mixed congregations were allowed to settle a Presbyterian or a Congregational minister at their election, but under a plan of government and discipline adapted to the circumstances. Surely this was not intended to outlast the inability of the respective sects to provide separately for themselves, or to perpetuate the innovations on presbyterial government which it was calculated to produce. It was obviously a missionary arrangement from the first; and they who built up presbyteries and synods on the basis of it, had no reason to expect that their structures would survive it, or that Congregationalists might, by force of it, gain a foothold in the Presbyterian church, despite of presbyterial discipline. They embraced it with all its defeasible properties plainly put before them; and the power which constituted it, might fairly repeal it, and dissolve the bodies that had grown out of it, whenever the good of the church should seem to require it.

Could the Synods however be dissolved by a legislative act? I know not how they could have been legitimately dissolved by any other. The Assembly is a homogeneous body, uniting in itself, without separation of parts, the legislative, executive, and judicial functions of the government; and its acts are referrible to the one or the other of them, according to the capacity in which it sat when they were performed. Now had the excinded Synods been cut off by a judicial sentence without hearing or notice, the act would have been contrary to the cardinal principles of natural justice, and consequently void. But though it was at first resolved to proceed judicially, the measure was abandoned; probably because it came to be perceived that the Synods had committed no offence.

A glance at the plan of union is enough to convince us that the disorder had come in with the sanction of the Assembly itself. The first article directed *missionaries* (the word is significant,) to the new settlements to promote a good understanding betwixt the kindred sects. The second and third permitted a presbyterian congregation to settle a congregational minister, or a presbyterian minister to be settled by a congregational church; but these provided for no recognition of the people in charge as a part of the Presbyterian body—at least they gave them no representation in its government. But the fourth allowed a mixed congregation to settle a minister of either denomination; and it committed the government of it to a standing committee, but with a right to appeal to the body of male communicants if the appellant were a congregationalist, or to the Presbytery if he were a presbyterian. Now it is evident the Assembly designed that every such congregation should belong to a Presbytery as an integral part of it; for if its minister were a congregationalist, in no way connected with the presbyterian church, it would be impossible to refer the appellate jurisdiction to any Presbytery in particular. This alone would show that it was designed to place such a congregation in ecclesiastical connexion with the Presbytery of the district; but this is not all. It was expressly provided in conclusion, that if the “said standing committee of any church, shall depute one of themselves to attend the Presbytery, he may have the same right to sit and act in the Presbytery as a ruling elder of the presbyterian church.”

For what purpose if the congregation were not in presbyterial fellowship?

It is said that this *jus representationis* was predicated of the appeal precedently mentioned; and that the exercise of it was to be restrained to the trial of it. The words, however, were predicated without restriction; and an implied limitation of their meaning would impute to the Assembly the injustice of allowing a party to sit in his own cause, by introducing into the composition of the appellate court a part of the subordinate one. That such an implication would be inconsistent with the temper displayed by the Assembly on other occasions, is proved by the order which it took as early as 1791, in the case of an appeal from the sentence of the Synod of Philadelphia, whose members it prevented from voting on the question, (Assembly's Digest, p. 332,) as well as by its general provision, that "members of a judicatory may not vote in the superior judicatory on the question of approving or disapproving their records." (Id. page 333.)

The principle has since become a rule of the constitution, as appears by the Book of Discipline, Chap. VII. Sect. 3, paragraph 12. As the representatives of those anomalous congregations therefore could not sit in judgment on their own controversies, it is pretty clear that it was intended they should be represented generally, else they would not be represented at all in the councils of the church, by those who might not be Presbyterians; and that to effect it, the principle of presbyterial ordination was to be relaxed, as regards both the ministry and eldership; and it is equally clear that had the Synods been cited to answer for the consequent relaxation as an offence, they might have triumphantly appeared at the bar of the assembly with the plan of union in their hand. That body, however, resorted to the only constitutional remedy in its power: it fell back, so to speak, on its legislative jurisdiction, in the exercise of which, the Synods were competently represented and heard by their commissioners.

Now the apparent injustice of the measure arises from the contemplation of it, as a judicial sentence pronounced against parties who were neither cited nor heard; which it evidently was not. Even as a legislative act, it may have been a hard one, though certainly constitutional, and strictly just. It was impossible to eradicate the disorder by any thing less than a dissolution of those bodies, with whose existence its roots were so intertwined as to be inseparable from it, leaving their elements to form new and less heterogeneous combinations. Though deprived of presbyterial organization, the presbyterian parts were not excluded from the church, provision being made for them, by allowing them to attach themselves to the nearest Presbytery.

It is said there is not sufficient evidence to establish the fact that the excinded Synods had actually been constituted on the Plan of Union, in order to have given the Assembly even legislative jurisdiction. The testimony of the Rev. Mr. Squier, however, shows that in some of the three, which were within the state of New York, congregations were sometimes constituted without elders; and the Synod of the Western Reserve, when charged with delinquency on that head, instead of denying the fact, promptly pointed to the Plan of Union for its justification. But what matters it whether the fact were ac-

tually what the Assembly supposed it to be? If that body proceeded in good faith, the validity of its enactment cannot depend on the justness of its conclusion. We have, as already remarked, no authority to re-judge its judgments on their merits; and this principle was asserted with conclusive force by the presiding judge who tried the cause. Upon an objection made to an inquiry into the composition of the Presbytery of Medina, it was ruled that "with the reasons for the proceedings of 1837, (the act of excision,) we have nothing to do. We are to determine only what was done: the reasons of those who did it are immaterial. If the acts complained of, were within the jurisdiction of the Assembly, their decision must be final, though they decided wrong." This was predicated of judicial jurisdiction; but the principle is necessarily as applicable to jurisdiction for purposes of legislation. I cite the passage, however, to show that after a successful resistance to the introduction of evidence of the fact, it lies not with the relators to allege the want of it.

If then the Synods in question were constitutionally dissolved, the Presbyteries of which they had been composed, were, at least for purposes of representation, dissolved along with them; for no Presbytery can be in connexion with the General Assembly, unless it be at the same time subordinate to a Synod also in connexion with it, because an appeal from its judgment can reach the tribunal of the last resort only through that channel. It is immaterial that the Presbyteries are the electors: a Synod is a part of the machinery, which is indispensable to the existence of every branch of the church. It appears, therefore, that the commissioners from the excinded Synods were not entitled to seats in the Assembly, and that their names were properly excluded from the roll.

The inquiry might be rested here; for if there were no colour of right in them, there was no colour of right in the adversary proceedings which were founded on their exclusion. But even if their title were clear, the refusal of an appeal from the decision of the Moderator, would be no ground for the degradation of the officer at the call of a minority; nor could it impose on the majority an obligation to vote on a question put unofficially, and out of the usual course. To all questions put by the established organ, it is the duty of every member to respond, or be counted with the greater number, because he is supposed to have assented beforehand to the result of the process pre-established to ascertain the general will; but the rule of implied assent is certainly inapplicable to a measure which, when justifiable, even by extreme necessity, is essentially revolutionary, and based on no pre-established process of ascertainment whatever.

To apply it to an extreme case of inorganic action, as was done here, might work the degradation of any presiding officer in our legislative halls, by the motion and actual vote of a single member, sustained by the constructive votes of all the rest; and though such an enterprise may never be attempted, it shows the danger of resorting to a conventional rule, when the body is to be resolved into its original elements, and its rules and conventions to be superseded by the very motion. For this reason, the choice of a moderator to supplant the officer in the chair, even if he were removable at the

pleasure of the commissioners, would seem to have been unconstitutional.

But he was not removable by them, because he had not derived his office from them; nor was he answerable to them for the use of his power. He was not *their* moderator. He was the mechanical instrument of their organization; and till that was accomplished, they were subject to his rule—not he to theirs. They were chosen by the authority of his mandate, and with the power of self-organization, only in the event of his absence at the opening of the session. Corporeally present, but refusing to perform his function, he might be deemed constructively absent, for constitutional purposes, inasmuch that the commissioners might proceed to the choice of a substitute without him; but not if he had entered on the performance of his task; and the reason is that the decision of such questions as were prematurely pressed here, is proper for the decision of the body when prepared for organic action, which it cannot be before it is fully constituted and under the presidency of its own moderator, the moderator of the preceding session being *functus officio*. There can be no occasion for its action sooner; for though the commissioners are necessarily called upon to vote for their moderator, their action is not organic, but individual. Dr. Mason's motion and appeal, though the clerks had reported the roll, were premature; for though it is declared in the twelfth chapter of the Form of Government, that no commissioner shall deliberate or vote before his name shall have been enrolled, it follows not that the capacity, consummated by enrolment was expected to be exercised during any part of the process of organization, but the choice of a moderator; and, moreover, the provision may have been intended for the case of a commissioner appearing for the first time, when the house was constituted.

Many instances may doubtless be found among the minutes, of motions entertained previously, for our public bodies, whether legislative or judicial, secular or ecclesiastical, are too prone to forget the golden precept.—“Let all things be done decently and in order.” But these are merely instances of irregularity which have passed, *sub silentio*, and which cannot change a rule of positive enactment. It seems then that an appeal from the decision of the moderator did not lie; and that he incurred no penalty by the disallowance of it. The title of the excised commissioners could be determined only by the action of the house, which could not be had before its organization were complete; and in the mean time he was bound, as the executive instrument of the preceding assembly, to put its ordinance into execution: for to the actual assembly, and not to the moderator of the preceding one, it belonged to repeal it.

It would be decisive, however, that the motion, as it was proposed, purported not to be in fact a question of degradation for the disallowance of an appeal, but one of new and independent organization. It was, ostensibly as well as actually, a measure of transcendental power, whose purpose was to treat the ordinance of the preceding assembly as a nullity, and its moderator as a nonentity. It had been prepared for the event avowedly before the meeting. The witnesses concur that it was propounded as a measure of original organization transcending the customary order; and not

as a recourse to the *ultima ratio* for a specific violation of it. The ground of the motion, as it was opened by the mover, was not the disallowance of an appeal, which alone could afford a pretext of forfeiture, but the fact of exclusion. To affect silent members with an implication of assent, however, the ground of the motion and nature of the question must be so explicitly put before them as to prevent misconception or mistake; and the remarks that heralded the question in this instance, pointed at, not a removal of the presiding incumbent, but a separate organization to be accomplished with the least practicable interruption of the business in hand; and if they indicated any thing else, they were deceptive. The measure was proposed, not as that of the body, but as the measure of a party; and the cause assigned for not having proposed it elsewhere, was that individuals of the party had been instructed by counsel that the purpose of it could not be legally accomplished in any other place. No witness speaks of a motion to degrade; and the rapidity of the process by which the choice of a substitute, not a successor, was affected, left no space for reflection or debate. Now before the passive commissioners could be affected by acquiescence implied from their silence, it ought to have appeared that they were apprized of what was going on; but it appears that even an attentive ear-witness was unable to understand what was done. The whole scene was one of unprecedented haste, insomuch that it is still a matter of doubt how the questions were put. Now, though these facts were fairly put to the jury, it is impossible not to see, that the verdict is, in this respect, manifestly against the current of the evidence.

Other corroborative views have been suggested; but it is difficult to compress a decision of the leading points in this case into the old-fashioned limits of a judicial opinion. The preceding observations, however, are deemed enough to show the grounds on which we hold that the assembly which met in the First Presbyterian Church, was not the legitimate successor of the Assembly of 1837; and that the defendants are not guilty of the usurpation with which they are charged.

Rule for a new trial made absolute.

ROGERS, J.

After the patient and impartial investigation, by me, of this cause, at Nisi Prius, and in bank, I have nothing at this time to add, except that my opinion remains unchanged in all the points ruled at the trial. This explanation is deemed requisite, in justice to myself, and because it has become necessary (in a case, in some respects, without precedent, and presenting some extraordinary features,) to prevent misapprehension, and misrepresentation.

ART. V.—*The Sabbath.*

BY THE HON. THEODORE FRELINGHUYSEN.

IN no view of our native depravity, is the blinding influence of sin more painfully exhibited, than in the estimates we form of the laws of God. We are prone to regard them, as the severe require-

ments of a hard master—intended to restrain our enjoyments, and abridge our means of happiness. Whereas the truth is, that all his precepts are designed and calculated to promote our welfare, our true and best interests for this world and for eternity. The law of God “is beneficence acting by rule.” It seeks our highest happiness, and by the best and wisest means. Obedience to its dictates is not only the way to peace, but is itself peace. “In the keeping of God’s commandments there is great reward.” The means and end are alike blessed, and nothing but a vision, perverted by a heart that is alienated from God, can fail to perceive these benignant tendencies in the divine commandments. Bring any one of them to this test. The Lord has said, “Thou shalt not kill;” take this precept in its broad extent—as it reaches to the state of our affections, as well as the course of our conduct; and do murder, hatred, wrath, or malice contribute to our peace? Do not all of them as surely destroy it, as love, meekness, and gentleness promote and preserve it?

Submit the whole decalogue to this simple process, and the goodness of God, in giving us a law, will be manifestly illustrated by every result. It is proposed in the following article to give a more particular application of these suggestions, to the command which requires the sanctification of the Sabbath. “Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.” This is the precept—plain, precise, and full to its object—I am no theologian, and pretend to no critical acumen, but I have often marvelled how any mind desirous to know the truth, could mistake the meaning; and wondered more, how any dared to impair or explain away the authority of a precept so intelligible and so positive.

1. *It is of perpetual and universal obligation.* It existed before the introduction of the Jewish economy. It is destined to bless the world for ages after it—even until there shall be time no longer. It was the day that crowned the work of creation, when the morning stars sang together. The first week of time was blessed with a Sabbath. Let Him who ordained it be reverently heard and obeyed. “Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them, and on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh from all his works which he had made, and God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because that in it, he had rested from all his work, which God created and made.” And when, after the lapse of more than two thousand years, God proclaimed his laws from Mount Sinai, in that, respecting the Sabbath, the same reason is given and urged for its remembrance, that was given for its original institution. Indeed, the very form of the precept evinces that the subject matter had then a well known existence. “Remember the Sabbath day.” “For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the seventh day and hallowed it.” Here we perceive that the foundation of the Sabbath is broadly laid, in the example of God himself—his work of creation, and the rest of the seventh day. What stronger proof could be given of its being a universal law? God connects it with creation—and hence it bound Adam in Paradise, and before he fell. It shed its pure and holy radiance upon the innocence and peace of Eden.

It was a day, then, sanctified, set apart, and hallowed of God, from the beginning of the world, and for reasons that reach to all ages and apply to all people. It began with time. It is coeval with Adam. The first morning that beamed upon the father of our race was a Sabbath morning. How full of meaning is the intimate association of this sacred day with events of such universal interest! But this may be farther shown by other and weighty considerations.

2. *The rest of the Sabbath is necessary for the moral and physical constitution of man.* The body and mind both require repose and refreshment after six days of labour. It is a law of our being, and has never been violated without injury to ourselves. That it was purposely adapted to our physical condition is seen in the terms of the command, "Thou shalt not do *any work*; thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man servant, nor thy maid servant, nor *thine ox*, nor *thine ass*, nor any of *thy cattle*, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; that thy man servant and thy maid servant may *rest* as well as thou." All are to rest. All are to cease from work. Both man and beast are to enjoy this healthful respite from the toils of the week.

Who should so well understand the nature and the needs of the body as he who formed it and gave it all its functions, and who perfectly knows the strength and capacity of every muscle? and when the wise and gracious Creator has ordained rest for his creatures, how perversely impious is it in man to counteract this law of kindness. Could the history of our race be carefully investigated, it would be found that no man, nor people, nor age, had ever gained, but always lost, by robbing God of his time. His curse attends, or will certainly follow, the enterprise, industry, and labour, that profanes his sacred day. It is not only injustice to ourselves—it is cruelty to the beasts that serve us, to deny this portion of time which God has allotted to rest. That poor, patient sufferer, the lashed and overdriven stage horse, would number double his present years, could he enjoy the Sabbath to refresh his weariness and recruit his strength. And there can be no doubt, upon the soundest principles of physical ability, that with this time reserved for rest, to the drivers and the driven of the mail coach, to the carriers, clerks, and all the agents of the post office, that the transmission of the mail would, in the end, be more certainly, safely, and expeditiously effected. The six days devoted to labour would be employed with more spirit, and to a better purpose. The mind, recruited as well as the body, could more effectually apply the energies under its control, be more ingenious in husbanding its resources, and so arranging and methodizing its plans and operations as to produce the largest amount of fruitful industry in the shortest time; and what is worth far more than all, this *work* would be clear of the wo that stands against the Sabbath breaker. There would be no burden on the mind, no misgivings of heart, on account of this sin. And however infidelity may affect to despise it, it remains true, and will for ever, that a good conscience is of inestimable service in all the prosecutions of labour and the developments of genius and skill.

As a nation, we not only affront the majesty of Heaven, but inflict real and serious injury upon our own energies, by our

guilty participation in the sin of Sabbath-breaking. These considerations, however, are far the least important. It is in its great moral bearings that the Sabbath rises in its claims.

3. *It is the palladium and preserver of all purity in morals and decency of manners.* Its place in the decalogue seems to have a meaning—between the first and second tables of the law; as if both were to receive its hallowed influence and be cherished by its presence; and there can be no doubt of the mighty energy of the Sabbath in sustaining the whole moral code, in imparting life and authority to the laws of God. And here again we shall find that the divine commandments harmonize with the philosophy of the human mind, and that the Sabbath is an essential auxiliary to virtue, not only because God has so ordained, but because man is so constituted that he cannot prosper without it.

Religion is a grave subject. It respects the relations which man holds with his Maker and his fellow men. It has regard to his origin and his destiny, his fall, recovery, and final redemption. A theme embracing such extensive interests, and grasping concerns of such vast moment, claims our profoundest consideration and study.

Let us approach this subject with the dispassionate seriousness of rational and immortal beings. Let us take it up with the sober interest that it justly claims from us. To all those who admit, and we trust there are few who deny, the existence of God and his over-ruling providence, the obligations of his intelligent creatures to seek his favour and obey his laws must be fundamental principles. Now we all know in our experience, that the pursuits, perplexities, and vexations, of active life are unfriendly to the disposition, and allow not the requisite time for the cultivation of these principles. The mind, harassed by the thousand cares of the week, ardently thirsts for a season when it may fly from the tumults of business, retire within itself, and calmly think of the things that pertain to its duty and its everlasting destiny. To secure such a privilege, there must be a stated season, that all will regard. In other words, there must be a Sabbath day, a *consecrated part of time*, generally acknowledged. Else those who love it most are equally exposed with the thoughtless and the profane, to the deprivation of rest, and time for reflection. It was, therefore, in infinite wisdom, as well as mercy, that God, by his high and holy authority, put his seal upon the Sabbath, and solemnly devoted it to the duties of religion. Therefore it was that he connected the prosperity of nations and the blessing of individuals with its faithful observance. God has on no subject been more explicit in his word.

4. *The richest of his favours are associated with the devout remembrance of the Sabbath.* To hold it in honour, he recognises an honour done to himself. Let a few selections from the Bible suffice. "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable; and shalt honour him; not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord, and I will cause thee to ride on the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father; for the mouth of the Lord hath

spoken it." Hear the pious Nehemiah rebuking the sin of Sabbath-breaking in his day. When he saw them "treading wine-presses on the Sabbath, and bringing in sheaves, and lading asses, as also wine, with grapes and figs, and all manner of burdens, which they brought into Jerusalem on the Sabbath day;" then, said he, "I contended with the nobles of Judah, and said unto them, What evil thing is this that ye do, and profane the Sabbath day? Did not your fathers thus, and did not our God bring all this evil upon us, and upon this city? yet ye bring more wrath upon Israel by profaning the Sabbath." Again, in Jeremiah, the Lord addresses the kings of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and by the most solemn assurances, makes their national blessings, even the existence of their city, to depend on their hallowing the Sabbath. "Hear ye the word of the Lord, ye kings of Judah, and all Judea, and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, that enter in by these gates; thus saith the Lord: Take heed to yourselves, and *bear no burden* on the Sabbath day, nor bring it in by the gates of Jerusalem. Neither *carry forth a burden* out of your houses on the Sabbath day, *neither do ye any work*; but hallow ye the Sabbath day, as I commanded your fathers. But they obeyed not, neither inclined their ear, but made their neck stiff, that they might not hear nor receive instruction. And it shall come to pass, if ye diligently hearken unto me, saith the Lord, to *bring in no burden* through the gates of this city on the Sabbath day, but hallow the Sabbath day, *to do no work therein*, then there shall enter into the gates of this city kings and princes, sitting upon the throne of David, riding in chariots and on horses, they and their princes, the men of Judah, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem; and this city shall remain for ever."

We know from sacred history, that the people of Israel turned away from the commandment, and profaned the Sabbath day: and God, by awful judgments upon that nation and their city, vindicated the insulted majesty of his laws, and especially his Sabbaths, which they had despised.

[From the *N. Y. Observer*.]

ART. VI.—*Account of the memorable affair of Doctor Strauss in the Canton of Zurich.*

MONTAUBAN, (Tarn-and-Garonne,) April 9, 1832.

THE religious commotion in Zurich is one of the most remarkable facts in the history of the Christian church in Europe since the time of the Reformation. The smallness of the country where this event took place, does not at all diminish the weight and interest of the question. We must look at the thing itself, and every pious mind will be filled with admiration, joy and gratitude to the Lord, while contemplating the spectacle of a whole people rising, like one man, to maintain the cause of Jesus Christ. I confess, for my part, that my eyes are often moist with tears of joy, when I read the account of that great national contest in behalf of the gospel of salvation.

Imagine, Mr. Editor, *forty thousand* citizens lifting their voice, and saying: "We are Christians! we will live and die Christians! we reject all infidel, rationalist opinions, as contrary to the Word of God! we ask for ourselves and our children the pure truth which is in Christ!" The canton of Zurich contains but 200,000 inhabitants, so that these 40,000 citizens form nearly the whole male adult population. Take away, indeed, the women, children, old people, and others not capacitated for civil and political duties, and these 40,000 signers of petitions against Strauss are the vast majority of the people. It is as if in France, containing nearly 34,000,000 of inhabitants, we should hear *six millions eight hundred thousand* voices lifted to vindicate the rights of God and the doctrine of the Saviour. Ah! had such an event occurred in France; had nearly seven millions of Frenchmen publicly maintained the cause of Christianity, the world would have looked on with surprise and delight! The remotest countries of America and Africa would have seen in this unanimous movement of seven millions of citizens, the greatest spectacle witnessed upon earth since the coming of Jesus Christ! Yet this is just what has taken place in the canton of Zurich! and so weighty is the instruction which this people have given to the world! It is a sign of the times worthy of remark among all Christian nations!

The soul of the Christian is refreshed, encouraged and consoled, when the Lord shows thus that his arm is not shortened, and that he still reigns uncontrolled over the nations. Too often, alas! very different scenes have afflicted our sight. We have seen impiety triumphant, skepticism walking with bold front. Not long ago we saw the churches of Christ shut in France, his worship abolished, the ministers of the Lord banished or dragged to the scaffold, the Gospel blasphemed, and trampled under foot by the ferocious disciples of Voltaire and Diderot. We see still in our unhappy country literature, theatres, circles of the polite world, and even our legislative assemblies tainted with a ruinous infidelity. How delightful, in such an age, amidst so many enemies of Christianity, to behold a people exhibiting so strongly their love for God the Saviour! Honour and gratitude to the old country of William Tell! The Swiss gave, in the fourteenth century, the first example of a nation struggling for liberty, and enjoying republican institutions. Now, they offer another example equally memorable of sacred jealousy for religious truth.

And observe that the people of Zurich are not a collection of ignorant, coarse, uneducated men. On the contrary, they are *more enlightened, more civilized*, in the true sense of the word, than the French people. Say not, then, ye infidels, that this Christian exhibition is the effect of ignorance and fanaticism. Do not exclaim at the superstition, the want of light, the influence of the bigoted clergy over the unlettered peasantry. No, you have no right to hold this language. The children spend several years at school; most of the inhabitants can read; they are a reading people, and are industrious, active, rich, elevated in the scale of society in every respect; and these are the men, remember, who, to the number of 40,000, have rejected a rationalist professor, and petitioned for the maintenance of a pure faith.

I do not mean to say that these 40,000 petitioners are all real

Christians, truly converted souls. This would be an exaggeration. Probably some of them do not cordially embrace the gospel. But they were constrained by the national will; they felt it necessary to defend Christianity; they joined with others in protesting against the shocking system of Doctor Strauss; declaring that they would continue to worship Jesus Christ; would be faithful to Him, and bear his banner openly. This fact cannot be concealed. The Christian church, which rationalists and infidels believed they could overturn, has shown once more that it has life and power to resist all their attacks.

But these general reflections will hardly satisfy the curiosity of your readers. I will add some particulars, derived either from my private correspondence, or from the religious journals of Switzerland and France.

A political revolution broke out in 1831 in the canton of Zurich, and placed the radical party at the head of the government. These radicals flattered the people with fair promises, and boasted that their entrance upon office would open a new era of prosperity. Being active and industrious, plausible speakers, well organized, having clubs and journals in all the principal communes in the country, they gained the ascendancy. But most of them were, in reality, men without religious principle, destitute of honour and honesty, dissolute in their manners, cherishing tyrannical dispositions under the mask of democracy, and desiring office only to promote their own personal interests. They attacked Christianity underhandedly, placing in colleges and schools professors imbued with rationalist opinions. For a long time, the people, deceived by their religious and liberal protestations, let them go on without interruption. The radicals fancied they could do every thing, because they had succeeded thus far, and boldly called Doctor Strauss, an infidel, who denies in his writings all the truths of Christianity, and even of natural religion. The people now opened their eyes, and were frightened to see the deep abyss in which the government were about to plunge them. This general alarm was not foreseen by the radicals; they perceived their error, yet tried still to deceive the people by professions of attachment to liberty, the progress of science, the necessity of keeping pace with the age, &c.; but it was too late.

In this crisis, what course was taken by the pious and respectable men of the country? They united peaceably under the protection of the laws, formed committees always in obedience to the constitution, appointed men of prudence and firmness as delegates, to oppose vigorously, but in a strictly legal manner, the attempts of the infidel magistrates. Appealing to an article of their constitution, which declares that *the evangelical reformed religion is the religion of the state*, and relying upon this law, they ask that the appointment of Doctor Strauss be revoked. In vain the radicals intrigued, and threatened, and tried to provoke the people to act illegally; in vain they distributed money in the country to stir up disorders, which might afford them a pretext for resorting to an armed force; the people remained peaceable, moderate, trusting in the justice of their cause, and pursuing their object with unshaken constancy.

The following fact I derive from a letter written to me from

Lausanne; you can judge from it of all the rest. Sixteen villages of the canton sent deputies to the landamman *Hesse* to protest against the appointment of Strauss. Mr. Hesse summoned two members of the Council of State to his aid in this conference. The deputies opened their errand nearly in these words:

“ Gentlemen, we come in the name of sixteen communes to vindicate the claims of the gospel. If you do not listen to our request, we shall soon come again in the name of two hundred villages. We had never heard of Dr. Strauss, until his appointment. We then received strange intelligence about his opinions, and we wished to obtain correct information respecting him. For this purpose, each commune purchased a copy of Doctor Strauss’s book, and instead of quitting work at evening, we retired at three o’clock in the afternoon, in order to read this book together. With pain we read half through the book, but could proceed no farther with such blasphemies. It grieves us greatly to see that our magistrates, in whom we have unbounded confidence, are not Christians, since they have appointed as instructor of our youth so gross an infidel. We come then to ask that this appointment may be revoked. If you do not do it, we shall apply to the Grand Council. If the Grand Council also refuse our request, we shall appeal to the Helvetic Diet, relying on the article in the constitution which requires that the evangelical reformed religion be maintained in the canton. Lastly, if the Diet refuse also to hear us, we will return quietly to our homes, to labour in our fields and shops. We will make no insurrection; we will remain submissive to our magistrates till next year; but at the next elections, we will appoint men who will be better Christians, though they may not perhaps be as skilful politicians as you. Mean while, we shall do three things: 1st. We shall pay no more imposts nor taxes, because you have violated the constitution; you must get your money by selling the furniture from our houses. 2dly. We shall take away all our sons from your University. 3dly. If the city of Zurich wishes to raise troops, no soldier nor officer shall leave our villages. Such, Mr. Landamman and Messrs. Counsellors, is the request we are commissioned to make to you.”

Noble and firm language! these citizens know their rights, and the limit where they must stop. No boasting nor angry words; they speak coolly, clearly, and courageously, as becomes the inhabitants of a free country. They calculated all the consequences of their step, and measured the greatness of the obstacles they must encounter. Yet they were not frightened; their conscience was at ease, their soul tranquil, their resolution unshaken; they were ready to make the most painful sacrifices for the sake of the truth.

But the radicals had not the prudence to submit at once to this striking manifestation of public opinion. Blinded by pride, puffed up with self-conceit, they persuaded themselves that they could with impunity resist the wishes of the great majority of the people. Most persons in power, radicals as well as others, err in thinking it derogatory to yield to the wishes of the people, and that they have only to be a little obstinate and the people will submit to the yoke. The expectation of the magistrates of Zurich was not realized. All the cities and villages, and every parish held simulta-

neously meetings in the churches, at which the most worthy citizens presided. In the city of Zurich itself, a large meeting of citizens was convened to obtain the recall of Strauss's appointment. Every where perfect order reigned, great harmony of feeling, and a fixed determination to attain the end by lawful means. Twenty-two deputies were appointed by the eleven districts of the canton, in the name of all the communes. These twenty-two citizens formed a committee called *the committee of the faith*. They were commissioned to petition for the maintenance of the reformed religion. After several fruitless attempts with the government, they published an address to the parishes of the canton of Zurich. This is a valuable document in the history of the Christian church; I will make some extracts from it.

"Our hearts were filled with joy during all our deliberations. It was affecting to witness the unanimity among the people in things relating to faith in Jesus Christ, the Son of God. This faith is deeply rooted in the public mind, and now appears to be a national feeling, in a manner not seen for ages.

"In all the communications made to us, political considerations have been carefully excluded. The fears and calumnies of those who falsely attribute to you bad motives have thus been completely disappointed. We solemnly avow before the Christian world, that if we have lifted our voice and appealed to our constitutional rights, it is because the spirit of the age threatened to make inroads upon our faith, and thus ruin us and our descendants. We say to all our brethren of Switzerland, our dear country, and all our Christian brethren far and near, that this step is not taken by us from worldly motives, but that the Lord himself has directed us by his wonderful power.

"While the main object we wish to attain is the recall of Dr. Strauss, we have also asked of the government securities that hereafter such appointments should not be made again. The best of all securities, doubtless, is that the people will take a lively interest in matters of faith, and keep up the zeal they now display. But it is well to give to our zeal a lawful organ, and this organ will be found in a *free representation* allowed to the church, that is to say in a *Synod*, composed of pastors and laymen freely chosen.

"Every district has expressed the wish that religion should predominate in schools more than heretofore. All instruction should be given as under the eye of God and should refer to Him. Hence the necessity that the teacher himself be imbued with a religious spirit.

"We add that the people, or at least the majority, desire also a reformation of morals, and to prevent by law those who are not restrained by the Spirit of the Lord from pursuing openly sinful courses. Hence you have petitioned for a stricter observance of the holy Sabbath, and a severe punishment of sins of impurity, being well persuaded that you will thus oppose a barrier to the progress of demoralization.

"We present a petition upon these various objects to the Grand Council, looking to God and to our Saviour."

For several weeks, the contest was warmly kept up between the two parties. All the journals of Switzerland were full of this

important subject. The radicals at Zurich made desperate efforts to gain the day. They would have abandoned Doctor Strauss without much difficulty; but this appointment had become a political question, a personal question. They were afraid, if they yielded this point, they would lose their preponderance and be lowered in public estimation. But, on the other hand, they feared also that, by resisting too obstinately the unanimous wish of the people, they would provoke a new revolution. They vacillated between the two extremes, and adopted alternately the rashest and most extravagant plans. Sometimes they proposed to remove the seat of government from the city of Zurich; sometimes they wished to call in the aid of other states of Switzerland, and to have the canton occupied by soldiers of the confederation; and sometimes they spoke of maintaining their rights by violence. But they were irresolute, and executed nothing, because their plans were only the suggestions of anger and fear.

The friends of the gospel were not so full of plans. They adhered faithfully to the only course proper for them to take. The churches were more frequented than they had been for many years. In all the communes, multitudes flocked to the feet of the Lord, to implore the light and aid of his Spirit in these trying circumstances. The pastors preached with more fervour the great truths of the gospel, and the hearers listened with more fixed attention. Often their eyes were suffused with tears, when thinking of the dangers which threatened evangelical faith in their country. How many prayers, how many sighs ascended to Heaven during the struggle! How many persons, who before showed little interest in religion, now felt themselves animated with new life, and confessed publicly the name of the Redeemer!

At last came the day for the discussion in the Grand Council. The radicals contended obstinately for the appointment of Doctor Strauss. They pretended that if this appointment should be revoked, the science of theology would be prostrated in the canton of Zurich, and nothing would remain but gross and stupid fanaticism. This is the usual language of rationalists and infidels, who try constantly to connect with their opinions the fate of theology, as if orthodoxy and learning could not exist together. But these conceits obtained little favour in the legislature of Zurich. The majority perceived that it was dangerous to resist the wishes of the people, and that the wisest course was to go back. There were 149 votes against 38, for the recall of Strauss. But he was allowed an annual pension of about \$300. We shall see if Dr. Strauss will dare to accept this pension, given him by a people whose generous indignation he has excited. A noble-minded man would not accept such alms; but rationalists are not so *scrupulous*, and it is possible that Strauss will meanly reach out his hand to take money for which he has rendered no service.

Thus was the victory gained. But Christians in Zurich will not stop here in their pious efforts. They ask for important reforms in the university of their canton; and among others, for the dismissal of professor *Scheer*, a friend of Strauss and an avowed rationalist, who has infected with his corrupt doctrines a portion of the students and instructors. The impulse is given, and the Spirit of the Lord operates upon the minds of the people. Now is the

time to secure the religious prosperity of Zurich. The *committee of the faith*, after performing its mission wrote to the parishes a final address concluding with these words:

“Dear fellow-citizens, you have saved the church of our country by your unanimous protestations; you have preserved the nation from a great misfortune, and you have done it in a strictly legal manner. You will find the reward of this conduct in the feeling that you have done your duty as citizens and Christians. Continue to watch with the same zeal and the same moderation over your most precious treasures, your church and your schools, and do not suffer yourselves to be turned from your noble aim by the artifices and intrigues of your adversaries. And now, let us celebrate with a glad heart the approaching festival of Easter! May our faith in the Lord and Saviour be more and more strengthened! May we perform perseveringly the solemn engagements we have taken upon us in our petitions, namely, to revive piety in the church, and to bring up our children in a more religious manner. Our efforts will thus be blessed to ourselves, our descendants, and the whole country.”

We might make many reflections upon this striking triumph of the gospel in the canton of Zurich; but this letter is already too long, and we leave them to be made by your readers. One important lesson to be learnt from this fact is, that, when a nation sincerely and earnestly desires to preserve the truth in its churches and seminaries of learning, it can do so, in spite of the resistance of infidel magistrates. Nations are responsible for the decline of piety in their theological and scientific institutions; for it is always their own fault. If public opinion is expressed strongly in favour of Christianity, all will yield and submit to its voice. But there are, unhappily, too many lukewarm persons who are not aware of this, and who allow evils to exist which they might prevent.

I am, &c.

G. DE F.

ART. VII.—*The Synod of 1839.*

ON a careful review of the Minutes, only one material error has been discovered. The late meeting was the *Thirty-eighth* annual meeting, and not the “*Thirty-sixth*” as given in the title. In the Obituary of Rev. R. Lang, sixth line from the end, for “*prayers*” read papers.

The statistical tables are exceedingly defective, owing to the neglect of several presbyteries to furnish corrected reports. Many of the corrections have been made from the casual information obtained by the editor during the meeting of Synod, or from reading the minutes. The publication of the tables seems an almost useless expenditure, unless more attention is given to their correction.

But on the whole, it is believed the minutes of the late Synod will be read with unfeigned satisfaction, by such as have laboured, and prayed, and suffered reproach for that cause, which we as a public body have espoused, and which we are under the highest possible moral obligation to maintain, in all places, and in every re-

lation. It is not expected that all will concur in every thing that has been done. Difference of views will prevail, and in some things, it is probable the Synod has not been led to the wisest possible decisions; for we are protestants, and maintain that imperfection attaches to all the works of man. Consequently, difference of views respecting the *application* of rules of discipline may exist to a certain extent, not only without injury, but become productive of great good; yet no ecclesiastical body can enjoy the smiles of Zion's King, nor retain the confidence of a Christian people for any considerable length of time without a strict application of those constitutional principles, which form the basis of Church government, to all cases in which they are clearly and wilfully violated, or deliberately and perseveringly opposed. Because a different course is a violation of that honourable and candid dealing obligatory upon all men, and more especially upon men professing godliness. To decline the application of adopted rules of discipline, when there is an obvious call to this duty, is not only treachery towards God, but towards our brethren. For the adoption of specific rules of government by any society of men, much more by the Christian church, is to be regarded in the light of a solemn and mutual compact, for the mutual regulation of the conduct of all the parties to their adoption, of which a constitutional majority are to be the judges. Such, therefore, as honestly make a public profession with us, do so in the confident belief, that the Synod means what she has professed in her subordinate standards, and that she is resolved to maintain her profession, whatever expense or trouble it may cost. If a different course were pursued, how sad would be the condition of those who have broken through early associations, and surmounted many obstacles, and made many sacrifices, in the expectation of finding a secure asylum from the delusions of a corrupt age, in a communion long distinguished for good order, not only for a pure dispensation of gospel ordinances, but for good government! On these self-evident principles the Synod at its late meeting appears to have acted; and when we take into view the unusual amount of business, the haste with which a number of documents of great public importance were necessarily prepared, it is matter of gratulation, that the minutes contain so little that is calculated to furnish just ground for cavil. It will doubtless take rank in the history of the church as a **REFORMING SYNOD**.

A new edition of the Testimony has been ordered—farther steps have been taken to perfect the Book of Discipline,—a foundation has been laid for sending the gospel to the heathen as speedily and as extensively as the means and suitable instruments can be procured—steps have been taken to provide the church with a more liberal supply of gospel ministers—and many perplexing questions, which have long agitated the church courts, and disturbed the minds of our people, have been definitively settled. May we not therefore hope for the entire pacification of the church; so that both ministers and people may be permitted, without molestation, to pursue the legitimate end of their association? “God is in the midst” of his church; “She shall not be moved; God shall help her, and that right early. The heathen raged, the kingdoms were moved, he uttered his voice, the earth melted. The Lord of hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge.”

ART. VIII.—*The Law of Libel in Ireland.*

A CASE of libel of considerable interest was recently tried before Judge Crampton, one of the most eminent Irish judges. The charge of the judge, inasmuch as it gives an outline of the law of libel, as understood in that country, is not without interest in this. It was contended by Mr. Gray, the plaintiff, that his character was injured by the publication in question. The defence, made with great ability, was twofold—first, that the words were not libellous; and secondly, that if they were, they were only the legitimate exercise of the power of the press on the competency or incompetency of any person appointed to a particular office. He defined a libel to be an injury to a man's character by exposing it to public hatred, ridicule, or contempt. A publication was libellous which tended to expose a man's character to public hatred, ridicule, or contempt. It was not necessary that they should believe that there was malice on the part of the defendant against the plaintiff, to find a verdict for the latter. It was not necessary that they should believe that the defendant intended to injure the plaintiff's character when writing. It was sufficient to justify them in finding a verdict for him, if they thought the publication calculated to injure him, even though it actually conferred a benefit upon him. They need not, therefore, believe that the plaintiff's character was really injured before they could give him a verdict. He told them that the press had no privileges which every individual did not possess, in writing on matters regarding the public interest, or in giving an opinion on public characters, and that they were equally bound with all to abstain from the invasion of private life.

The law of libel as here laid down by the Irish judge is regarded by many as a restraint upon the natural rights of men, injurious to the existence of liberty. But we look upon it as good law and sound divinity. "Speak evil of no man" is a divine injunction of universal obligation. Consequently the circulation of tales by the press, or writing, or oral communication, whether true or false, calculated to hold up any human being "to public hatred, contempt, or ridicule," is not only an offence against God, but is productive of the most pernicious consequences. It is a favourite and potent weapon of the prince of darkness, by means of which human life is embittered and often greatly abridged, the peace of families, churches, and whole communities, disturbed, and the efforts of the wise and good to improve the moral condition of our race, and bring men to a saving knowledge of divine truth, are rendered in a great measure abortive. Dr. South, if memory be correct, says, "the tale-bearer and the listener ought to be hung up back to back, the latter by the ear, and the former by the tongue." Indeed, the general prevalence of tale-bearing among us furnishes the saddest kind of evidence of apostacy from God, and an unwillingness to return to him. Nor can we expect any radical improvement, till men will learn to discuss important topics of general interest without adverting to the private character of their opponents. How lamentable is the consideration that so much of modern controversy consists in personal crimination and recrimination!

ART. IX.—*Anniversary Statistics, May, 1839.**American Bible Society.*

The receipts during the year, were \$95,126 62, and the expenditures \$98,205 31. The issues during the past year have been 134,937 copies, and the total number 2,588,235. These copies were in 17 different languages.

American Tract Society.

The number of new tracts published is 33. The whole number of the society's publications is 944, of which 58 are volumes. 100,000 of each tract has been published during the past year. Total printed during the year, 356,000, 3,657,000 publications; 124,744,000 pages. The circulation has been, since the formation of the society, 1,153,390 volumes, 51,039,678 publications; 917,983,578 pages. The number of volumes circulated exceeds that of any preceding year by 65,000, number of pages, 22,000,000.

Receipts during the year, \$131,295 40, exceeding those of the year ending April, 1837, \$25,000; donations, \$16,000 less than two years since; proceeds of sales are \$16,000 greater.

American Seaman's Friend Society.

The receipts the past year amounted to \$12,653 11. The society have seamen's chaplains at Havre, France, at Honolulu, Sandwich Islands, and at New Orleans, besides affording aid to several others. They have succeeded in establishing sailor's boarding-houses in Charleston, S. C., in Portland, Maine, in Boston, Mass., in Providence, R. I., in Baltimore, Md., and in Philadelphia, Penn. In the city of New York the experiment has been most triumphantly tested. One house was established here in November, 1837, and a second in November, 1838. These two houses will accommodate about 120 men at one time, and since their establishment they have proved the temporary home of 2300 men. Of these, 120 have deposited their earnings in the Savings Bank, and the total amount of such deposits is at this time \$8,300.

A Sailor's Home is proposed to be erected in New York, for a place of business for the benefit of sailors. A lot has been purchased, and one-third of the purchase money paid.

American Sunday School Union.

Receipts from sales, over \$80,000; donations, about \$10,000. The number of distinct publications issued by the Society from its organization is eighteen millions. The number published the last year, is 51.

A very low estimate of the number of schools established by the Society in the Valley of the Mississippi, shows that the whole expenditure for bringing them under the influence of moral and religious instruction, is less than twenty-five cents per annum for each child.

Baptist Societies.

The S. School Journal gives the following particulars:

The American Baptist Board of Foreign Missions have two stations in Africa, thirty-three in India, sixteen in Greece, Germany and France, and fifteen among the American Indians. The missionaries are 43 preachers, 5 preachers and printers, 1 printer, 3 school teachers, 1 farmer, and 53 female assistants. There are also 85 native preachers and assistants. The number of churches is 45, embracing 2000 members; 570 were added last year. In 68 schools there are from 1200 to 1500 pupils. Printing has been executed in 14 languages. The receipts of the year ending in April were \$88,240, expenditures \$110,190. The receipts were \$25,000 more than the preceding year.

The Baptist General Tract Society issued three millions of tracts last year, in this and other countries. Receipts about \$10,000.

The American and Foreign Bible Society received \$43,800, and expended \$25,000 in publishing the Scriptures abroad, chiefly in India, and \$10,000 in this country.

Methodist Missionary Society.

The N. Y. Commercial Advertiser gives an abstract of the Annual Report:—

It details the operations of the society during the year. 1st, the Wyandot mission has one missionary, one school teacher, two hundred church members, and thirty scholars. 2d, Oneida mission, in Oneida county. There are in this mission about one hundred and forty church members, and about the same number attached to the

schools, under the care of a missionary and school teacher; 3d, The Oneida mission, near Green Bay. This mission is in a prosperous condition. The 4th mission is at the Sault St. Marie.—Here are fifteen native converts, and a school of twenty-three children, under the care of a missionary. 5th, Kewawenon mission, of which a native missionary is in charge. During the past year nine or ten of the natives have renounced their heathenism, and with former converts now make a little Christian society of about forty. 6th, The Sioux mission. 7th, Ottawa Lake mission. These have not increased much the past year, but the prospects are highly encouraging. 8th is a new mission, on the east shore of Winnebago Lake, among a settlement of the Brothertown Indians. 9th, The Choctaw mission, now in a very prosperous condition, and numbering seven hundred and thirty-three church members, with a school consisting of one hundred and fifty scholars. 10th, The Cherokee mission; three hundred church members, having one missionary, assisted by the local preachers. 11th is the Seneca mission. 12th. The Cherokee mission, which has four hundred and eighty members, one white and two native missionaries. 13th, Includes the Indians within the bounds of the Missouri Conference, and is very extensive.

The superintendent of this mission, Mr. Johnson, was in this city a few months ago, when it was determined to establish a manual labour school among them, on an extensive scale. The Federal Government has agreed to aid in the support of this school by a liberal annual appropriation. Within this district there are twelve missionaries, five school teachers, and about four hundred church members. 14th, Oregon mission. This is the most extensive establishment under the care of the board, and is under the general superintendence of the Rev. Jason Lee, assisted by three missionaries, a physician, a blacksmith, and a carpenter. Mr. Lee is now in this city, having arrived a few months since. He is expected to sail again for the Oregon, *via* the Sandwich Islands, in September next, and will then carry with him a large re-enforcement—to wit, five missionaries, one physician, a blacksmith, millwright, farmers, a missionary steward, teacher, &c. Already the use of intoxicating liquor has been abandoned in the settlement where the mission is located—a school is in operation—a large farm has been brought under cultivation, well stocked with cattle, &c. 15th, is the Liberia mission, under the superintendence of the Rev. John Seys. The last accounts from this mission were highly satisfactory. Mr. Seys sailed in December last, with a re-enforcement. There are now employed on this mission seventeen missionaries and ten teachers, a printer, a physician, and a steward; the latter having the charge of the temporal affairs of the mission. 16th, is the mission at Rio de Janeiro. Although the accounts from that part of the world are not as satisfactory as could be wished, yet hopes are entertained that the missionary labour will not be lost in that country. 17th, is the Buenos Ayres mission, under the charge of the Rev. Mr. Dempster. Here the prospects of success are more favourable, although the mission suffers from the political state of the country, the long embargo, &c. A chapel is to be immediately built, at an expense of \$10,000, which will be of important benefit to the mission. Monte Video has been visited by Mr. Dempster, and the board has determined to send a missionary forthwith to that place. 18th, is the new and very prosperous mission in Texas. There are now eight missionaries, twenty-five local preachers, and about four hundred church members within the bounds of that mission. 19th, is the German mission in Ohio. 20th, is the French mission in this city.

In the missions above enumerated there are employed sixty-six missionaries, twenty-six school teachers, two physicians, three mechanics, one missionary steward, and one printer. These have charge of three thousand one hundred and thirty-eight church members, and eight hundred and thirty-eight children in the schools.

Besides the foregoing, there are many domestic missions, chiefly among the coloured population of the South, mostly slaves. The whole number of missionaries is one hundred and sixty-four, with eighteen thousand seven hundred church members.

The Funds.—The whole amount collected the past year is \$135,521.94, and expended, \$103,664.58,—leaving a balance of \$31,860.36, and showing an increase of \$39,434.50 over the receipts of the preceding year. \$30,000 of the balance are pledged for the Oregon mission, having been mostly raised for that special purpose, and will soon be called for.

“A COMPETENCY BETTER THAN ABUNDANCE.”—I am not far from my home, therefore, I need not make much provision for my way; food and raiment will be sufficient for my journey; superfluity will but prove a burden. While Jacob had only his staff, he went on freely in his way; but when he had his flocks and herds, he drives but slowly. I am well enough, if I have but enough to carry me well to heaven. I will, therefore, desire no more than what will mend my pace and serve me in my journey.—*Divine Breathings.*

ART. X.—*Annual Mela at Allahabad.—Description of the place.—Idols.—Barbers; from a Letter by Rev. J. Wilson.*

The Hindu books make it necessary to bathe precisely at the point where the two rivers, the Ganges and the Jumna, meet. At present, when the rivers are low, the point of junction is more than a mile below the fort, and has to be reached by traversing that distance over a soft, slimy beach, from which the Ganges has recently retired. In many places the water is still standing on it, and in all places it is very damp. On this sandy beach, native merchants from Benares, Mirzapur, Allahabad, Cawnpur, Futteghur, and other places, build huts and open shops of all sorts of native merchandise and trinkets, which are sold in great quantities; and thus the purposes of trade are quite as amply served as those of religion. Two large streets are formed, each lined with shops on both sides. Many thousands take up their abode on this low ground during the whole Mela, which continues a whole month.

Quite down near the point of junction of the rivers, both sides of the sand beach are lined with square platforms; these are the seats of *Pandits*, who have each a platform about three feet high, on which he sits to lecture the people from their sacred books. Their auditors sit around them on the ground, and hear with the profoundest attention. None dispute, for no one seems to doubt the entire truth of what his chosen religious teacher says. Immediately behind them, as you proceed from the point, both sides of the way are lined with images of "gods and goddesses," of all forms and materials,—marble, brass, stone, wood, clay—nearly all of hideous features and unnatural shapes. These are attended generally by women, who very gratefully, at least very greedily, receive all the piec, and the rice and other grains which the passers-by offer to their respective images. And the area between these ranges of manufactured gods is occupied by a large number of barbers, all seated on their haunches, shaving the heads of those who come to bathe. It is said by some of the barbers themselves that there are more than thirteen hundred licensed barbers for these occasions. The people generally suffer their hair to grow quite like Samson's, so as to have a large quantity to shave off when they come to the Mela. The ground, for a long distance back, is literally covered and black with hair; so that you feel yourself walking on a soft mat.

As you proceed out from the point, you cross a little inlet from the Ganges, across which a highway of sand is thrown up. Then you pass a kind of balustrade, or picket, set up by the seapoys, or native sailors, a company of whom are stationed there to aid the police in keeping things orderly near the point.

Faquirs.

On the right, as you pass the picket, is a piece of rather high ground occupied by the Jogis or Faquirs of different orders. They each dig for himself a hole or platform of a few feet square in the sand, where they sit with only their head above the level of the ground. Each keeps a little fire smoking by his side. There ap-

pear to be several hundreds of them. They daub their bodies and faces with ashes combined with various-coloured paints, and fill their long, shaggy hair with the same, so as to give themselves the most unearthly appearance. Some of them wear very large, hard grass ropes around their waist, so tightly drawn as almost to cover itself in their flesh; others wear large chains, about as large as an American "log chain," passing round the neck and under their arms, so as to give evident pain. As you cast your eye over their district, and see them sitting naked, idle, listless, covered over with different colours, ashes, and powders, seeming to vie with each other in giving themselves a hideous, unearthly aspect, you find your mind struggling with the inquiry to what order of beings do they belong?—Are they men, or are they other beings, whom Satan has in his alliance, and by whom he is represented at such carnivals?

If you go amongst them, and attempt to speak to them, here and there one will reply, and perhaps defend himself with much energy and even fierceness of manner. But the greater part will hear all you have to say with a supercilious silence, while the ignorant mass around are loud in their praise. I stood by one who occupied a rather conspicuous place, and had a sort of hut erected, in which he had a bench of gods arrayed in their respective costumes and grades. The worshippers decked these images according to their fancy, with large strings of flowers, strung like beads around their necks. He had two young-looking females, who seemed partners in the concern, who stood waiting on the images, adjusting their flowers; and as one string of flowers began to look wilted, took it off and put on a fresh one. A large plate sat on the bench in front, on which the worshippers who paid their respects there each laid a pice, [nearly a cent,] then came to the Faquir himself, who sat in dignified silence, and held a pot of water which he had consecrated, from which he dipped about a teaspoonful of water, and put it into the two hands of each one who had paid his pice. Each person held his hands devoutly together to receive the water, which he immediately drank off, wiped his hands on the top of his own head, and walked away apparently happy in the thought that their divinity was pleased, and they absolved from sin.

A few of the Faquirs were perfectly naked. One in particular sat upon an eminence in this state. He was rather a corpulent man, about middle age. He sat proudly erect, and perfectly exposed. And the passers-by turned aside in numbers to pay a certain kind of worship to him. They had various strings of flowers suspended around his neck, his ears, &c. Women seemed particularly sedulous in changing the flowers as they became wilted around his neck!

This class of Faquirs claim to have arrived at such a state, from retirement, bodily chastisement, and contemplation on God, that they are perfectly free from all the lingerings of earthly and sensual affections; that they are holy as God is holy; that they have no need any longer to worship any object, and that it is right for others to worship and pay divine honours to them! This climax of human folly and arrogance must be witnessed before its force can be fully felt!

I observed not one among all these pretenders to bodily mortification, and to merit earned in this way, who do not look plump and fresh, as if he lived well.

Disadvantages of public preaching at Melas.

I think the influence of oral or public preaching to a crowd at a mela or any large concourse of people in this country, as a means of *conversion*, is generally overrated. There is commonly such a noise, confusion, and changing of the audience, that it is too much like attempting to make a noisy, bustling people, utterly unacquainted with political subjects, understand the deep and remote bearings of an intricate political question by throwing to them, as they pass along, little scraps torn from the corner of a newspaper in which the subject is discussed. From such scraps of paper, where some sentences are complete and some incomplete, they might pick up a few ideas; but they are not very likely to comprehend much of the subject. I would not for a moment advocate the abandonment of these opportunities. I would have them used with all diligence as means appointed by God for proclaiming a Saviour crucified, and calling men to repentance and faith in him. But we should not be disappointed or disheartened when we find it not productive of such fruits as we could wish. For conversation with individuals, and especially for distributing religious publications, these melas offer much more available occasions for the public proclamation of the gospel.

Among the crowds that stop, like the Athenians, to hear what "these babblers would say," some start frivolous and silly objections, which have no relevancy and no importance when answered, but which still serve to interrupt the speaker. Some dive into the deep and intricate mazes of Brahmanical philosophy by asking such questions as these, "Where is God?—what account do you give of God? is he possessed of attributes—or is he without attributes?"—"What is knowledge?"—and many others which at first sight appear to be easily answered, and are so: but they will pay no attention to your answer, aiming merely to press on into the intricate and vain, though beaten mazes of their scholastic philosophy. Others, again, who are men of some discernment, and not Brahmins, frankly admit that "our books and our preaching are superior to theirs, but that so long as their books remain current, ours will not be read; if we could only get our books to supersede their books and instructions of the Brahmins, our religion would spread mightily," &c.

We could distribute a far greater amount of tracts and portions of the Scripture than we do, if we would give to all who seem willing to take them. But the "Pragwalas," as the natives call them, a class of Brahmins who, to the number of several thousands, are supported entirely by those who come to visit this sacred place, use all their efforts sometimes to hinder people from taking tracts, and at other times to induce them to take tracts, and afterwards tear them in pieces, or sell them in the shops for wrapping paper. They know well, that if this thing in which we are engaged succeed, their bread and their reputation both are gone.

Pilgrim Tax repealed—Brahmanical Deception.

The "Pilgrim Tax," which has heretofore been the reproach of the British government, was this year for the first time struck off by the order of the E. I. Company at home. Of this act of generosity on the part of the government, by which they sustain an annual loss at this place alone of perhaps 100,000 Rupees, and much more at some other places, the wily Brahmans made a potent use. They were very busy in circulating, during the whole mela, "that the Company did not exercise any generosity in the matter; a wealthy and philanthropic Hindu at Calcutta having given to the government an enormous sum, more than a krore (10,000,000) of Rupees, to purchase this exemption for his countrymen, only for three years!—and that after three years the tax will be imposed as usual again. So they had better thank this Hindu, and they and their friends all come to the sacred waters during these three years while the way is free!" Multitudes have gone home with this impression. I suppose the devil will have some other story ready by the end of the three years, to help the Brahmans out of the dilemma which their present story involves.

A number of persons came to us to inquire "if it is true, as the Brahmans report, that the Company received such a bribe to suspend the tax for three years?" When assured by us that no Hindu Babu had any thing to do with it, but that it was the moral sense of the religious community at home, which led people to petition parliament to that effect, and on that the order was sent out to abolish the pilgrim tax not merely for three years, but for ever, they generally went away, exclaiming "good," "noble," "it was a royal act," &c. &c.

Many of the poor, ignorant people, who came from a distance, would hear the preaching of "the word" with much interest were they not intimidated by the Brahmans. Sometimes I have seen them weep as their character as sinners, and the love of God to sinners, have been portrayed before them; but when a supercilious Brahman has ordered them all away, declaring it to be "sin, to hear such stuff," the greater part of them have submissively gone away like a flock of sheep before their "driver."

Sometimes I have seen a congregation of fifty or one hundred persons mute and answerless, all seemingly convinced in their hearts that "these things were so;" afterwards, when a noisy, blustering Pandit came in and began to rail and oppose, the most of them have gone away not to return.

Distressing Scenes at the Mela.

Many among the Faquirs or Jogis have imposed on themselves the penance of standing for a number of years in one position, holding one or both of their hands above their head until it has become shrivelled and stiff, and the finger nails have grown so long, and interlock each other in such a way as to resemble a bird's claws of enormous length and unnatural shape. One poor fellow has been standing for several days in a verandah just beside us in a very conspicuous place, with one of his hands bandaged up so as to stand at full stretch above his head, intending to keep it in that position until

it becomes stiff and motionless. He has a rope fastened by the two ends to a rafter, and passing under his arms, which supports him when he is weary of standing alone. He has remained in this position for four years, and purposes to stand twelve years more; and imagines that by these sixteen years of stupid idleness and self-torture he will have acquired a large amount of merit, and seems to be certain of living a long time in heaven as a reward. He affects to be too holy and too much exalted to condescend to speak a reply to us. If we incidentally happen to come too near him, so that he is in danger of touching us, he shows all signs of anxiety, and keeps his lips going like a child that is unable to speak. The ignorant multitude around are loud and fulsome in his praise. He has four or five of his own class around him, who seem to watch and dwell upon his every motion, and look on with as much interest as if their eternal all were suspended on his nod.

ART. XI.—*Conversion of Hindoos by Christian Publications.*

The Rev. J. G. Pike, Secretary of the General Baptist Missionary Society, Derby, England, acknowledging a grant of \$500, received from the American Tract Society, gives the following highly interesting statement of the effect of religious publications in villages in India, received by the over-land despatch.

“Last November (he says) our brethren at Cuttack were pleasingly excited by a visit from two Hindoos, who went as a deputation from a number in some villages between thirty and forty miles from that city. Some Christian publications, it appeared, had reached them. The effect was, that they left off the worship of idols, and sought instruction, by reading the Christian books, and the best part of their own shastres. They next gave up their own shastres, and confined themselves to reading the Christian books. By degrees they *renounced Hindooism*. Persecution now broke out against them. Some of the timid gave way, but others continued firm, and they sent two men as a deputation to seek out the missionaries and ask their advice. After two days' search they found the missionaries.

The men were soon sent back to their native village, accompanied by *Rama Chundra* (a native preacher) and other brethren, to investigate the state of things, and to return with a report to the missionaries. Rama soon returned delighted, and his feet blistered with haste, stating that they were not inquirers, but *confirmed Christians*; that they had offered to burn their own shastres in his presence, but he advised them to wait till one of the missionaries could visit them.

Rev. Mr. Lacey immediately went, and was to be followed by Rev. Mr. Sutton. Sebo, their leader, wished to be baptized; but, alive to the sacrifices he was making, trembled from head to foot while talking with our brother. A time was fixed for his baptism, and that of two others, in the first instance. As they were moving to the water one of his brothers laid hold on him, and a crowd collected. His wife, almost frantic, now rushed forth, and laid hold of his outer garment. He let it go, and she sat down and

wept over it, as over the last relic of a friend from whom she was about to be separated for ever.

They now brought his little girl, an interesting child about seven years old, and asked him if he would make his wife a widow and his child fatherless. But he was unmoved. A younger brother now came up, prostrated himself on the ground, clasped Sebo's feet, and bathed them with his tears, and besought him not to go forward to disgrace them and ruin himself. Sebo seemed to feel deeply, but his resolution was unshaken; he said, "Christ is more to me than all, and I have given up all for him." The Zemendar came and talked with him, but was unsuccessful. An aged brahman came, but was soon put to silence.

The idolaters now changed their mode of attack. They besought brother Lacey to delay the baptism of the converts till next day. He of course declined, unless the converts wished for delay. They applied then to Sebo, and he nobly answered, "No; I have recorded my vow in heaven for to-day." Still they held him forcibly; a police officer was sent for, and after various interruptions, they got to the water side and went down into it. The crowd rushed also, and hardly left room for the administration of the sacred rite. The candidates tore off and threw away their poitas and their strings of beads. And the missionary said:

"Do you acknowledge one God?"—"Yes." "Do you believe in Christ for pardon and eternal salvation?"—"Yes." "Do you see and feel that idols are vain and foolish?"—"Yes." "Will you till death love and serve God?"—"Yes."

All this the multitude heard and distinctly understood. The ordinance was administered. They came out of the water. The crowd mostly dispersed. The native converts, who were present, took hold of the hands of the new Christians, and walked, singing hymns together, towards the missionaries' tent, about two and a half miles distant. Our brother says, "Our hearts were filled with joy, and our eyes with tears. Thus they walked, the wild jungle echoing with the songs of Zion." Some of the heathen followed, and even their hearts seemed softened. A number more appeared under religious impressions.

Adieu, esteemed brother!

Yours in the gospel,
J. G. PIKE.

ART. XII.—*Convention of Presbyterian ministers and elders held at Oxford, Ohio, on the 30th and 31st of June.*

The Committee on the subject of an organization, report the following resolutions: namely,

Resolved, 1. That this Convention, on a calm and full deliberation, feel still further confirmed in the opinion expressed at its last meeting, that neither of the bodies at present claiming to be the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, in these United States, is a true and constitutional Assembly; and that they cannot, therefore, recognise either of them as such.

2. That, although they do not feel called upon, at the present meeting, to enter upon a definite and permanent organization, on constitutional principles, yet we consider ourselves *pledged* to form such an organization, whenever Providence shall seem to render it necessary.

3. That, for this purpose, as well as for the time being, to keep up the bond of ministerial and Christian fellowship between the brethren, and to help each other to keep the churches under their care together, in the peace and order of the gospel, until such organization is completed, they will meet together, stately, from time to time, on their own adjournment.

4. That, should any of the brethren be compelled, by oppression, to take a decided stand, this Convention will sustain such brethren in immediately forming themselves into a Presbytery.

5. That a Committee of Correspondence be appointed at the present meeting; whose duty it shall be to confer, by letter, and otherwise, with other brethren and churches who may sympathize with us in general views: and that said Committee shall prepare a short circular, to be published in the *Peace Maker*, and also in a hand-bill form, expressive of the views of this Convention on the present state of the Church.

6. That this Convention highly disapprove of all efforts to divide any of our already too feeble churches in the west, on the score of elective affinities; and that they will use their combined influence to resist and counteract any such disorganizing efforts; endeavouring to keep the churches together in the unity of the Spirit, and the bond of peace.

7. That all the brethren in other parts of this and the adjoining States, who concur with us in general views, be cordially invited to attend at the next meeting of the Convention, to be held at Hamilton, Butler county, Ohio, on the first Thursday in November next.

ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.—At a meeting of the Associate Presbytery of Philadelphia, held at Octorara on the 10th of July, Mr. William Smith was licensed to preach the everlasting gospel, and is now actively employed in supplying the vacancies of the church.

ART. XIII.—*A Return to the Path of Duty.*

We have received information which may be relied upon, that one entire congregation which had been led astray by the separatists from the church, have petitioned the Presbytery for restoration to their former standing. They acknowledge their fault in the most unqualified manner, profess sorrow for it, and a willingness to submit to such censure as the Presbytery may judge suitable. This must be gratifying to all the brethren. To ourselves it is matter of unfeigned joy. We are personally acquainted with many of the individuals composing the congregation in question, and we give them a cordial welcome back into the church; and trust their truly Christian example may be followed by many others in like circumstances. Those who have led them out of the church have demanded a great sacrifice at their hands—a sacrifice, at thought of which, in their sober moments, the most elevated moral principles, and the finest feelings of the heart cannot but revolt. Is it not, indeed, a great sacrifice to violate the force of moral principles taught us from our youth upward—to turn the back on the religion of our fathers, whose piety we dare not question—and to prove recreant to solemn oaths, by breaking covenant with God, merely to gratify the pride and self-will of “man that is a worm, and the son of man which is a worm?” May God give to all concerned grace to do likewise.

We are not ignorant of the difficulties with which the people alluded to have had to contend, and can, therefore, sympathize with them. Among these difficulties, the reconsideration by the Synod of 1837, without sufficient cause, through means of untrue statements made by certain interested persons, of a case which had been

legally settled by the preceding Synod; and the *reversal* without examination of a case which had been judicially and solemnly investigated and determined, were not the least. These proceedings staggered, for a time, the confidence of the most unwavering friends of the Secession cause; therefore it ought not to excite surprise that it led many astray. But all this, through the mercy of God, and a disposition on our part to profit by his rebukes may redound to our greater good. One good effect is already seen in the increased firmness of many in the good cause. And it is confidently believed, the present generation will never witness another reconsideration of important questions in the Associate Synod, without valid reasons. In the supreme court of the church, important decisions should never be made without good cause, and when once made, should never be abandoned without a discovery of new and good evidence going directly to the merits of the question.

ART. XIV.—*General Assembly.*

AFTER a careful perusal of the proceedings of the late General Assembly, we find but little that could interest our readers. The Old School Assembly again proffered to their New School brethren an amicable settlement of the question of property at issue between them. But it is certainly much to be lamented that this respectable ecclesiastical body has extended the hand of fellowship to the sin of slavery. In avoiding one rock, they have struck upon another equally dangerous.

The New School Assembly make high pretensions to be the true Presbyterian church, but entertained a motion to alter the subordinate standards of that church. They were greatly agitated by the abolition question. They make loud professions of brotherly love, yet threaten their former brethren with another vexatious and disgraceful law-suit.

ART. XV.—*To Correspondents.*

“REMARKS on the treatment of our coloured population” may be looked for in the next number. The “Remarks on Malachi iii. 8—12” are seasonable and worthy of attention. It may disarm prejudice to state that the author is not a clergyman. We solicit a continuance of similar favours from the same source. We have no disposition to interfere with “Logan” and “A. R.,” the former of whom is unknown to us, but we think he is under obligation to throw a little more light upon some of the points at issue between him and his opponent, A. R.

In the mean time, lest our own views on the momentous question of slavery, so much agitated at present, should be suspected, and as we intend to treat our readers with candor on all subjects, it is deemed necessary to make the following statements:

1. We hold the moral law to be the only and universal rule of man's obedience since the closing of the canon of revelation, including of course the few positive precepts connected with the New Testament worship.

2. That this law condemns slavery in every modification and under all possible circumstances.

3. That the judicial laws of the Jewish nation referred to by Logan and A. R. were not exceptions, that is, not repugnant to the moral law, but were founded in justice and proceeded from the sovereignty of God, who has the right to dispose of his own creatures "according to the good pleasure of his will," and are now no more a rule of duty than the decrees of God, or the Levitical institutions.

4. The cases which are so frequently adduced as examples of justifiable slavery are not slavery at all in the common acceptation of the term, as understood throughout the United States.

5. That God has created no physical impossibilities, nor *actively* produced any combination of circumstances, which lie in the way of man's obedience to his law. If men have produced such obstacles, let men remove them, or answer to the Lawgiver.

These views we hold ourselves obligated to prove true in due time, if Providence permit, with all due deference and respect towards such as may differ from us; upon the subject, as we hope, Logan, or some other correspondent, has written from the burden. And if these positions be correct, it will be plain at a glance, they leave neither shred nor patch wherewith slavery may cover itself. Immediate emancipation becomes an imperious duty, without regard to the concurrence of "a mighty nation," or any real or imaginary consequences that may follow. Consequences of obedience to God's law belong to God; duty to us. And when God arises, as he most certainly will arise, to break the yoke of the oppressor, he will not ask the consent of this or any other "mighty nation."

But while we maintain these views, we have no sympathy of feeling in common with those who would drive a crusade against this sin only in others, or adopt unlawful measures for the liberation of the slave. It is a national sin, which the nation can only remove. In this view of the subject, it appears that a refusal of Christian fellowship with slaveholders, a withdrawal of political support from the advocates and apologists of slavery, properly so called, in any shape, and a faithful warning of their countrymen to avoid the impending danger, is about the ultimate length to which judicious Christians should proceed.

Since the foregoing remarks were in type we have received some Strictures on the articles of A. R. which will appear in the next number. We are looking to A. R. for his remaining papers on the treatment of our coloured population.

At the recent semi-annual meeting of the Presbytery of Rochester, the following resolution was passed unanimously.

Resolved, "As an expression of the opinion of this Presbytery, that in view of all existing circumstances, it is not desirable that we be connected with either body claiming to be the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America."

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,
AND
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

AUGUST, 1839.

ART. I.—*Farther Remarks on the Treatment of our coloured Population.*

MR. EDITOR.—There is no point in the discussion in which I have embarked, where one is more likely to come in direct contact with honest prejudices and self-calculating interest, than that of separating the black from the white population. Many who advocate such separation appear to regard themselves as the exclusive friends of the coloured race, and are hardly willing to concede that any person who differs from them in opinion, can be either a philanthropist or a Christian. However far I may differ from such an opinion, I shall not imitate them by hurling back the charge, but shall say to them in all meekness, "Come, let us reason together." I must, however, notwithstanding the respectability of the advocates of this scheme, be permitted to express astonishment that such a visionary project should ever win as its admirers such a host of pious and enlightened men. It has been said, there is but one step betwixt the sublime and the ridiculous—so there is but one step betwixt the capacious calculating mind, that is fraught with blessings to unnumbered millions, and the visionary enthusiast who raises splendid bubbles, which reflect with more than nature's splendour, the gorgeous pictures drawn by fancy's pencil. Men of tender sympathizing minds, viewing the degradation and suffering of one part of the community, and the implacable and deep-rooted hatred of the other, are fain to find repose in the contemplation of any scheme which will separate the parties to such distance that their peculiar antipathies will never come in contact; and by a strange perversion of the law of love, they would bestow more labour and expend more treasure in sending the people of colour to the remotest corner of the earth, than would secure to them the blessings of the gospel and the comforts of life at home.

We often hear it said, "This is an age of wonders." I question whether there has ever been an age since the time Adam was placed in the garden of Eden, (which was doubtless a *wonderful* age,) but this was the language with which self-gratulation fed its morbid appetite. It is, however, *painful*, if not *wonderful*, to hear the ambassadors of the Most High, the messengers of meekness, peace, and

love, proclaiming from the high places in the land, that the question whether two distant branches of the human family can live amicably together, has been already adjudicated in the high court of morals, and determined in the negative. The law and the testimony on which such a decision is based, these dignitaries are not condescending enough to point out; but there is one thing certain, that if such be the true exposition of the law, these casuists will find ample employment for themselves and their latest descendants, in unravelling the knots and snarls into which the brotherhood of mankind have already been twisted by unfortunate and adverse providences. If a Voltaire or a Hume had dared to maintain such a sentiment in opposition to the whole tenor and direct testimony of the sacred oracles, the whole Christian community would have uttered its unanimous voice, not of condemnation, but of abhorrence. It is not only a fearful token of the corruption of public sentiment, but it is ominous of disastrous consequences, when such infidel tenets are loudly proclaimed by the ambassadors of the Prince of Peace, and are greedily swallowed by those who ostensibly follow in his footsteps.

In taking a cursory survey of the proposed project (for plan we cannot call it, as a plan has never yet been adopted, nor, so far as the writer knows, has there ever been one proposed.) I shall contemplate it in three aspects. First, as to its practicability. Second, as to its justice. Third, as to its policy. If it is found wanting in any of these points, every candid, conscientious person must, of course, abandon it.

But before entering on the argument, I would beg leave to make one preliminary remark, and that is, that the community has no ground to complain of the friends of the project for not laying before the public, in some tangible, definite shape, at least the outlines of the scheme by which they propose to effect the proposed separation. When vast public enterprises are undertaken, in which the interest and happiness of millions are involved, and in which the concurrence of public opinion is absolutely necessary to carry them into effect, it would seem strangely unaccountable that such an important and obvious consideration should escape the notice of those who profess to be deeply interested in its success. In the present case, what less might we expect, than to see set forth, with some degree of minuteness and detail, the authority by which it is to be done, the means by which it is to be accomplished, the mode of operation, the length of time which may be requisite, and whatever else of importance may be involved in a project so vast. Without such an exhibition it is utterly unreasonable to expect the countenance and support of a prudent calculating people. Indeed, such a course as has hitherto been pursued by the friends of the measure, is well calculated to cast upon it gloom and darkness, and to fill with distrust and suspicion every person disposed to form his opinions impartially. What reason or motive can possibly prevent men from coming out boldly before the world, with a full exposition of their plans, unless there be those acting with them who are at heart inimical to their views? On this subject, it is high time that all parties and all men should show their colours, and I venture to affirm, that should this be honestly done, none could stand more at dagger points, than would those who are now so strenuously advo-

cating the colonizing of the people of colour on the continent of Africa.

Men could not, in ordinary cases, be more interested in any scheme of selfishness, than are masters who are in love with slavery, in sending out of the country all free persons of colour. It would, I dare say, still farther promote their interest to offer on this altar of patriotism, as they would doubtless call it, at least the tithe of their increase in slaves. However questionable this proposition may appear at the present moment, the time is doubtless fast approaching, when there will be an immense surplus of slave labour in the southern states, and to countenance and sustain measures which will rid them of useless hands and dangerous enemies, is not only perfectly natural, but is a dictate of self-preservation. If I were a slave holder, if I desired to see the system firmly established, and hoped to fix it on a basis that would perpetuate it through coming generations, I would, with all the energy I possess, urge the deportation of the people of colour to some distant region. Zealous enthusiasts may present in glowing colours, the now despoiled and half brutified black population, as renovated in nature and in the enjoyment of substantial freedom in a foreign land; but the master cares not for these things. He knows well the tenure by which he holds his slaves; he knows well that the efforts of individuals, or even the public authorities, can never transport more than he is desirous of seeing removed.

That such reasoning is correct, I think few will venture to dispute; and is it not strange that men should come to the conclusion, that the surest way to persuade the slave holder to relinquish his tyrannical grasp, is to increase the value of the slave, and render his possession still more secure! Owing to various causes, the number of whites in the southern states is destined, in the course of a few years, to become relatively small. Among these causes may be enumerated the circumscribed boundary of country in which slavery is tolerated, the untrammelled powers of production of the slave population, the debilitating effects of luxury and vice on the whites, the increasing abhorrence with which the system is regarded, which, together with apprehended danger, operate as a strong incentive, even with slave holders themselves, to seek an abode elsewhere. That the masters, in many parts of the country, regard their own situation as insecure, we have abundant evidence in their horrid immoral legislative enactments, and that ceaseless vigilance which sleeps not nor slumbers. That the free people of colour are regarded by them as the most prominent cause of danger, we are sure from their complaints against them, long before colonization schemes were ever dreamed of. No evidence, then, short of mathematical demonstration, could more conclusively prove that it is the direct and positive interest of the master, who is desirous of perpetuating the system, both as it respects his security of person and increase of wealth, to urge the deportation of as many as possible of those whom he regards as dangerous to his peace.

But how is this mighty work to be effected? Was ever such a thing done, either by the efforts of man, or by the exertion of Almighty power? Small remnants of nations have been led captive at the heels of mighty conquerors, whose armies desolated whole countries in their devastating career, and planted in provinces thus

desolated. When the Israelites were to be transported a few miles over land, we find, as if it had been intended to rebuke the visionary projects of our day, a display of a series of miracles the most stupendous and enduring which have ever been witnessed. Vast hordes of barbarians have, at times, traversed interminable plains, and like a deluge overwhelmed entire states, or mighty empires with destruction; but in their predatory warfare, their habits and manner of life differed little from that of profound repose. What then, I ask, has ever been done, that will compare with transporting three million men, women, and children, with their rapidly increasing numbers, through inhospitable climes, and over tempestuous oceans, a distance equal to one-fourth the circumference of the globe?

Individuals can never do it. They lack union, they lack system, and above all, they lack the funds. The states separately cannot do it, for they, too, lack the means; and besides, the burden would fall upon them, not according to the strength requisite, but in the exact ratio of their weakness would the work be great, and the burden oppressive. If the federal government had the means, the authority has not been conferred upon it, and it is morally certain, that it never will be. Indeed, if it were, who can, for one moment, flatter himself, that a system of policy, so certainly calculated to waste the resources of the nation, could or would be persevered in for a sufficient length of time to effect such a tedious, embarrassing, and expensive undertaking? Short as our national history is, how many and how great have been the fluctuations of our state policy? That man must have studied our political somersets to little purpose, who will still indulge the flattering hope that such an undertaking could be long sustained, where the government is so directly under the control of popular sentiment as it is in these United States.

There is another view in which the impracticability of the scheme may be contemplated, and one which is seldom adverted to. Will the colonists be, at all times, willing to receive transported slaves from this country? It ought to be kept in mind, that if they flourish, they will form a united independent sovereign people, enact their own municipal laws, and pursue such system of national policy, as their interest or their caprice may dictate. Should success crown the present efforts for establishing civilized and polished communities on the coast of barbarous Africa, will they, when secure in their independence, when arts and sciences have been cultivated, when polish in manners and elegance of life, have succeeded to rudeness and rusticity, when pride, and luxury, and selfishness have banished a sense of their humble origin—when these things take place, will they receive, at our hands, the filth and off-scouring of our slave population? We are here in our own country, not without our fears, that our morals will be corrupted, and our political institutions overthrown, and the very fountains of justice contaminated by vagabonds cast upon our shores, from the dens of vice on the European continent and British Isles. If such be our fears, when we regard ourselves not only one of the powerful nations of the earth, but one of the most enlightened, and one whose institutions are most firmly fixed in the affections of the citizens, what might we not anticipate from a people, situated as the colonists must necessarily be?

Would it be *just*, thus to transport them to a foreign land? In

the course of the remarks which I have already made, I have had occasion, several times, to notice the severity of our treatment of the unoffending free people of colour. Are we really serious in believing that the God of justice, of peace, and of love, will approve our conduct in banishing from their country millions of our coloured brethren, whose only crime is, that their Creator enveloped them in a coloured skin, and defended their upper extremity with a curly woolly cap, instead of lank and flowing hair like our own? To visit upon their guiltless heads, a punishment due only to atrocious crimes, after having wantonly and piratically stolen their ancestors from the land of their birth, and chained them down in bondage, is a refinement of cruelty which hardly finds a parallel in the records of the heathen world, when most under the control of the prince of darkness himself. The plea that we force them not, that we only propose to do it with their expressed consent, will not avail. The criminal will walk to the gallows rather than be dragged; but who says he offers his neck freely to the halter a *willing* victim to atone for crimes committed in violation of the law? Is it not a contemplation of the most melancholy character, to suppose that a cold, deliberate, systematic course of policy is to be pursued through all future time, of such an unjust, unfeeling, diabolical nature, as will present to these ignorant innocent creatures banishment to a distant unknown land, as a desirable alternative to escape intolerable bondage in the country in which they first drew their breath?

We are told we banish them not to a foreign country, but—

We will in kindness take them by the hand,
And gently lead them to their father land.

Let us test the validity of this argument by bringing it in contact with a rule of infallible rectitude and acknowledged authority. "Do to others as you would have others do to you." Suppose these Christian philanthropists would take it into their heads to banish the descendants of the English, the Scotch, or the Irish, to the land of their forefathers, what would be the verdict of an enlightened Christian public? But would this be more cruel than transporting the coloured people to the shores of Africa? What associations of head or heart bind the poor negro to the desert, desolate wilds of his ancestors. Amidst the dreary burning interminable wastes of sand, or pestilential, inhospitable climes, can he point to you where the tribe from which he sprang roamed through ceaseless ages without leaving one monument to recall a solitary incident on which the mind delights to dwell? What were his ancestral language, religion, manners, laws, and customs? What the trials, the defeats, or the triumphs which embalm his father land in the tenderest recollections of his heart? In truth he has no father land. The region in which his ancestors have lived ages of ceaseless inglorious oblivion, presents no associations to the contemplative mind, but that of squalid wretchedness and ruthless cruelty. Not such would be our condition, if we were banished to the British Isles. There we would find the tombs of those who are dear to us as ~~those~~ who slumber in the dust of the land of our adoption. There, too, we would hear a language familiar to us from our infancy. Laws, manners, customs, every incident around us would declare, that though

we had crossed a wide expanse of ocean, we were surrounded by our friends, and were dwelling in the midst of our kindred. There, likewise, we would read our own national history on monuments which distance and time had only rendered more dear to us, and above all, there we would bow at altars consecrated by the dearest blood that ever flowed from human hearts.

The injustice of such measures to the coloured people of our country, is written in lines so plain, that he who runs may read, nor does it appear they would be more just to the native Africans themselves. That no barbarous people can prosper in the neighbourhood of a civilized one, is a proposition that admits not of controversy. That such is the fact, the whole history of the human race may be referred to as proof positive and conclusive. Indeed, the causes are so numerous and powerful, all tending to this result, that it is scarcely worth spending one moment's reflection on them. An acquaintance with the arts and sciences places the civilized man at such an immeasurable distance above the untutored barbarian, that the latter is oppressed with a sense of inferiority and helplessness, which renders him utterly listless and careless about acquiring a knowledge of things so far above his comprehension. In commercial transactions he is ever destined to be the loser, and against the vices and diseases of polished life he is altogether defenceless. The consequence is, he must either fall an easy prey or place himself beyond the reach of what he deems a pestilential influence.

Judicious measures may, for a time, preserve an apparent good understanding with the native tribes. The deep designs and calculating forecast of intelligent minds, is quite beyond the grasp of an illiterate savage, and the petty rivalships of neighbouring chiefs may, for the present, keep up a show of friendship; but let it be made evident, as it ere long must be, that the purpose of the colonists is to occupy the whole country, to change manners, customs, and laws, to overthrow every vestige of government existing among the natives, to demolish their altars, and cast their idols to the moles and to the bats,—in short, to obliterate their very name from off the face of the earth, and if there is any faith to be reposed in the deductions of reason, or the lessons of experience, a state of peace cannot possibly long endure. What will be the final event of such a contest? For an answer to this inquiry, I will refer the reader to the fifty million human beings butchered to satiate the cruel rapacity and boundless ambition of the Spaniards, on this continent and adjacent islands, and to an equal number sacrificed in a similar manner, and for reasons equally abhorrent, by the British on the opposite side of the globe.

It is futile to plead that this is a semi-missionary enterprise, and that the influence of the unhallowed passions of the human breast will, of course, be excluded from it. The good intentions of its promoters is not called in question; but granting that nothing but the most pure and holy motives actuate the bosoms of all who are in any way connected with it at this time, have we any assurance that they can impart an impulse to it, that will preserve it from contamination in all time to come? Are those, whom it is proposed to transport, and who are to constitute the body politic of this Christian republic, composed of materials of such unalloyed purity, as to forbid the suspicion that injustice and rapacity may one day characterize its

conduct toward the friendless Africans? If their character be indeed such, it would certainly prove a master stroke of policy to preserve them as the salt of our own republic; for it is notorious, that in circumstances precisely similar to that in which the colonists will shortly be placed, we have not, at all times, manifested the utmost tenderness in our treatment of the weak and helpless. Jestings aside, however, the reflection irresistibly forces itself upon the considerate mind, that notwithstanding the studied effort to throw the halo of religion around the colonization scheme, it is nevertheless one of an earthly mould, and of course must, and will be governed by worldly principles and maxims; nor are we warranted to conclude that its line of policy will be more generous, or even more just than that of other civilized communities.

In spreading the gospel of peace, it would be well to study the example set by those who acted under the immediate influence of inspiration. What is the command? "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations." It may be the purpose of Heaven, on account of the wickedness of the children of Ham, to blot their name from the records of time; but let us not flatter ourselves, that by acting instrumentally in fulfilling the design of Jehovah, we must necessarily be acting in conformity to the requisitions of his law. The gospel plan of Christianizing and civilizing a people, is not by planting colonies amongst them, and consequently subverting and trampling under foot every vestige of existing forms of government, every distinction of cast or order in society, every mode of custom which regulates the intercourse of a people with each other. Christ's kingdom is not of this world. When on earth, he refused to act as a civil ruler, nor has he commissioned his ambassadors, as such, to disturb the secular institutions of mankind; and, if the nations of the earth cannot be converted to the faith without an external instrumentality, which evidently violates the precepts of the divine law, it is a plain indication that we are not called upon to send them the messages of peace and love. It is vain to urge that these obstinate sinners have long enjoyed the advantages of missionary labour at many stations, and that hitherto little has been effected, nor is more promised, unless we change the mode of operation. Perhaps there has been hitherto something in the conduct of Christian nations, toward this unhappy people, which has prevented the egress of the divine blessing? While we have been sending them Bibles and missionaries, and all the machinery for saving their souls; we have been hunting them for sport, and shooting them as we do the monkeys and jackalls, or what is little better, have been buying them as we do cattle for a distant market. In their estimation, this must all be the work of *Christians*; and, certainly, we have little reason to wonder that they are slow to receive at our hands the precepts of our faith, or trust those to guide them to heaven, who act the part of demons on earth. Nor will the proposed plan of operation, when its effects are properly developed, impress upon their minds a more favourable conception of the Christian character. It will, in fact, prove only another chapter of wrongs, and more fully convince them of the hollowness of our professions and the wickedness of our designs.

Would it be sound policy? for I feel the necessity of being brief. This is a fruitful topic; but a few suggestions must suffice. The

labour of the southern states is now nearly altogether performed by people of colour, and it is a current opinion that, in many parts, white labourers could not be substituted in their place. To send off the blacks, then, would be in effect to convert fruitful plantations into deserts, or pestilential, dreary, fenny wastes, which would spread far and wide the seeds of disease and death. Nothing can prove more fatal to the prosperity of a nation, than the banishment of that part of the community who are the efficient instruments of productive industry, and fatal would it be for the south if such banishment should take place within any reasonable length of time, such as would satisfy the calls of humanity. The banishment of labouring innocent members of society, for reasons at least as valid as those we every day hear advanced for ridding us of this obnoxious class, has often been resorted to by tyrannical rulers, but has ever met the indignant reprobation of enlightened men, not only for its cruelty, but for its folly also.

If the mere sending away of the labouring class without incurring any expense, would be marked by the characteristics of extreme folly, what shall we think of that madness which would connect with it the exhausting of the nation's treasures? What amount of treasure would be requisite to carry this part of our population to the continent of Africa? It is an easy process for the ingenious mind, by an adroit use of figures, to swell it to any indefinite amount, or to diminish it to any convenient size. Some such efforts most of us have seen, nor have I witnessed any thing in connexion with the whole subject, more calculated to mislead the public mind. The number to be transported has been estimated as little more than the number now in existence; the price has been reduced to a mere pittance, and that to be defrayed in a great measure by the negro himself! For many years even, their increase could not be sensibly diminished, and the probability is, that if the effort should be seriously made, and persevered in, their amount would be doubled before we could overtake their rapidly increasing numbers; and successful and fortunate would we be when they began to diminish, if we could rid our country of the last of them, by transporting twice their number at its highest point. Supposing there are in the United States three million people of colour, the data laid down would give over twelve million to be sent abroad; but for the sake of a round number, and to be certainly within the bounds of reason, we will put them down at ten million. What would the cost of each soul be? It would be surely low to estimate it at two hundred dollars. A fair estimate of cost must embrace outfit, transit, and what we may call infit, or that preparation which is necessary for entering on business in a strange country, where a kind of apprenticeship must be served before persons are qualified to work efficiently. Many live at a great distance from the place of embarkation, and many would have to travel far from the place of debarkation, before they could find a suitable place of settlement. Time, too, to the amount of many months, perhaps, years would be wasted. These various items, together with disease and unforeseen accidents, would doubtless, in a majority of cases, occasion a loss vastly greater than that assumed. Ten million to be removed, at two hundred dollars each, gives us the sum of two thousand million dollars, the interest of which, at six per

cent., would amount annually to one hundred and twenty million dollars. The expenditure of this sum, much of which would necessarily leave the country, and this viewed in connexion with sending such a number of efficient labourers abroad, would sink the most wealthy and powerful nation on earth.

But, say the friends of the measure, the blacks could, and doubtless would, bear much of the burden. And is it come to this, that men who arrogate to themselves the character of special friends to the oppressed, who are men of piety, and followers of Him who said, "Blessed are the merciful; for they shall obtain mercy,"—will plead with all the fervour of inspired zeal, that after we have torn our unoffending brethren from their native land, bound them in cruel bondage, and reaped the fruits of their toil through centuries of incessant labour, we must order them, as a precious boon, to leave the country that has so long oppressed them, and go, too, at their own charges, go to a distant and strange land, which they have never seen, and of which it is morally and physically impossible that they can form a just conception.

Whether or not the masters ought to be compensated for their slaves, when removed, I shall express no opinion; but one remark I will make, which is, that if they should be, the expenditure of money would be at least double that set down:—if they should not be, their condition would be comfortless and forlorn in the extreme. Stripped of their wealth, not only unused to labour, but unable to do it, habits of liberality, if not extravagance, formed which it would be almost impossible at once to restrain, and which they would not have the means to gratify, a total revolution in society to be brought about in a few years, and that, too, to many of them of an humbling character, would, with innumerable other considerations, prostrate their buoyant spirits. Upon a fair impartial investigation of the whole matter, I presume it will be found more to the advantage of all parties concerned—to the master, to the slave, to the African, to our own country at large, to free them at home rather than send them to Liberia.

I might here very properly close my remarks, for the present, as this article is already somewhat lengthy; but I cannot consent to dismiss the subject without directing the reader's attention to a point, which I have not seen noticed. If the coloured people be ever transported to a foreign country, I think it is admitted on all hands, that it must be done through the instrumentality of national authorities and national means. Now what will be the mode of operation? Doubtless by public contractors, on bids accepted by government, as the lowest possible amount for which the work can be done, and offered with the known, if not with the avowed, intention of making them as profitable, as by hook and by crook it is possible to make them. If one were to point to a scene of disgusting loathing, of torturing suffering, of hungering wretchedness, of scorching thirst, of burning heat, of breathless agony, in short, of all the horrors to which the human form is subject this side the regions of the damned, would it not be to a prison ship, or to a slaver? Would such contractors be more humane, than those who brought the Africans to our shores? We ought to recollect there would be one *very material* difference in the two cases, one which would unfortunately operate against ourselves. Self-interest must

necessarily prompt the one, not only to preserve the lives of those whom he is carrying to market, but to preserve their health also. Could we even hope to make the responsibility of the other such that he would not find it to his interest to destroy those whom he had in charge? To such as are acquainted with the irresponsibility of public agents in remote barbarous countries, and the facility with which they combine to aid each other in promoting their nefarious schemes, I have said enough. Such as form their opinions on mere abstract considerations, without reference to the realities of life, would not believe, if one rose from the dead.

A. R.

ART. II.—*Remarks on Malachi III. 8—12.*

[Concluded from page 87.]

Fourth. Would a faithful performance of this duty result in regarding our advancement in earthly prosperity, or a curtailment of our creature enjoyments? Unbelief says it would, but faith says it would not, but rather enhance them. To which shall we listen, to the suggestions of unbelief, or to the language of faith? The man of God will inquire what is his duty, and assay to perform it. It is a truth not to be called in question, that every scriptural requirement is calculated to promote not only our spiritual welfare, but our temporal prosperity also. On this subject, I fear, many of us practically make a most mischievous mistake. Until we can view our duties in the light of privileges, we must expect that, however prosperous we may be in our outward circumstances, our souls will be visited with the leanness of Pharaoh's kine. We are required to give as the Lord prospers us; but is it not evident that when we are called upon to make contributions, instead of estimating what we have been enabled to give, we set about calculating what is the smallest possible amount which will ease the conscience and preserve a fair standing in the opinion of those around us? We are willing enough to acknowledge that the pouring out the desires of the soul at a throne of mercy, that the reading of the word, and the hearing of the word preached, are privileges, as well as duties; but I apprehend there are many of us not prepared to acknowledge with heart-felt satisfaction, that the bestowal of our goods for the advancement of religious objects is a privilege of no ordinary magnitude, and one for which we ought to be as thankful as for any other. I know of no way in which this can be more satisfactorily brought home to the conscience, than by again referring to our language when on our bended knees before the throne of the Eternal. If men can ever be supposed to be sincere, it is when they approach with peculiar nearness the presence of a heart-searching God. What is our language in such circumstances? "Search us; try us; set our affections on things above; wean our hearts from the perishing things of this world." There is no one vicious propensity which is more universal, or that lays a more death-like grasp upon us, than the love of riches. Does it not then most deeply concern us to know in what condition our hearts are in reference to them? "Ye cannot serve God and mammon." This is a point which, it seems, is

emphatically fundamental; but how shall we know in what estimation we hold earthly treasure, unless we should be called to part with it? We often are not aware of the deep hold that an earthly friend has upon our hearts, until we are called upon to yield him up. So it is with our riches. Amidst our abundance and increasing abundance we perhaps think little about them; but when a call is made upon us to part with them, or a share of them, we find ourselves utterly unprepared to make the sacrifice. If we cannot part with earthly goods at the call of God, or at the pleadings of humanity, is it possible that we can still delude ourselves into the belief that we are faithful stewards in God's house? Hence the inference is irresistible, that we ought to regard these calls as promissory parts of the covenant, and the performance of duty in respect to them, as a privilege of the highest order. In satisfying these calls, we ought to be careful not only not to do it grudgingly, but to be particular that we do it to the full extent of the requisition—to do it with hearts of thankfulness, as for a benefit received.

In what way are we most likely to enjoy to the utmost perfection the good things of this life? Is it by placing our affections supremely upon them? Certainly not. If we wish riches to corrode our hearts and imbitter our lives, let us worship them. The higher we value them, the more certain will be our disappointment, and the deeper will be our chagrin. Let it not, however, be imagined that we are apt really to set too high a value on these things. This we cannot do. Our error consists in not subordinating them, in not using them as not abusing them, in not using them in the way of promoting the glory of God and our own immortal interests, by building up the Redeemer's kingdom here on earth. In what way are we most likely to wean our affections from things below? Is it not by placing them on things above? On something they will, and, by a law of absolute necessity, they *must*, rest. If the love of wealth, the love of honour, and the love of pleasure, were banished from our hearts, from what a load of anxiety, from what a world of care, from what an immense expense of treasure, would it not relieve us. Nor would the advantages thence resulting be altogether of a negative character. How much purer would be our enjoyments, how much more heart-felt would be our peace, how much more firm would be the establishment of our health; in a word, *how great would be our gain!* It is said that the life of a Friend (Quaker) is, on an average, ten or twelve years longer than that of the citizens of the United States generally. This is equal to one-third of the age to which we usually attain. Now this can be accounted for on no other principle than the simplicity of their mode of living, and the government which they exercise over their passions. "Godliness with contentment is great gain."

It would be no easy task to make an estimate approximating to truth, of the amount, even in point of earthly treasure alone, which the gratification of our unhallowed passions costs us. Our apparel, our tables, our drink, (shame to the Christian name!) our splendid dwellings, our equipages, and an innumerable list of items into which extravagance largely enters, swell the amount into a sum which is incalculably great. One item of extravagance calls for

a second; the first and second unite in calling for a third, a fourth, a fifth; until our whole living is thrown into their greedy but unsatisfied mouths, and we find ourselves, in the midst of abundance, poor and penniless, perhaps racked with disease and tortured with insatiable desires, which the wealth of either Indies would not allay. No wonder, while pursuing such a course, we are oppressed with poverty; no wonder we cannot obey the calls which God is making upon us, that his treasury may be supplied. Now the cure for all this is to engage heartily in the service of the Lord; to endeavour to find our enjoyments, our pleasure, in doing that which is agreeable to his will; to banish luxury from our tables; to discard extravagance from our dress; to put our establishments upon the footing of utility, and not that of show; in a word, to employ our time and talents, and all that we possess, in such a way as to promote our own happiness and the good of mankind. Let this be but faithfully done, and I will say—no, I will not say *my word for it*, but I will say, THE WORD OF HIM *who cannot lie for it*, we will be blessed with health, we will be blessed with enjoyments of the purest, most substantial and enduring kind; yes, we will be blessed even with overflowing coffers, though we should make a sacrifice to the Lord of one-tenth of all that he gives us.

In the view which has been presented on this part of the subject, I have spoken of effects as resulting from causes perfectly natural, and which an infidel might receive in full assurance of faith; but is there not another aspect in which the Christian ought to contemplate it? We are not to expect miracles; yet, at the same time, it requires but a small remove from absolute skepticism to recognise in the Divine Being the exercise of a providential care over the works of his hands; and unquestionably the promises which he has made come in fully to sustain the sentiments here advanced. It would, perhaps, be regarded as a work of supererogation, to refer to all that might be adduced; but, as a sample, I will notice some of them. The text cited at the head of this article is fully in point. Examine likewise Prov. iii. 9, 10: xi. 24, 25: xix. 17: xxii. 9: Lev. xxvi. 34: Deut. xxviii. 8: Hag. ii. 19: 2 Cor. ix. 6—11. The design of the Spirit in these and similar texts is doubtless to encourage and quicken us in the performance of duty, by holding forth temporal blessings as ready to flow upon us, *according* to good works performed. This is set forth as the general rule of the divine procedure, but obviously liable to certain exceptions. The reasons that might be assigned for these exceptions are numerous, but two only shall be noticed. 1st. If the rule were universal, it would defeat its own purpose. We would then be liberal on the clear and incontestable ground of selfish sordidness. Every dollar that we might expend we would expect to receive again, loaded with heavy usury. 2nd. Such a plain, palpable interposition would be inconsistent with the idea of man's being governed as a rational, intelligent, accountable being. It would leave no room for the exercise of faith, and would consequently strike a fatal blow at the very foundation of Christianity.

If I have succeeded in showing that, in ordinary circumstances, it is a moral duty in Christians to devote one-tenth of their substance to religious and benevolent purposes, what must we think of those who scarcely manifest liberality enough even to tithe the

tenth or contribute the one-hundredth part; or, what is worse still, who refuse from year to year to cast even one mite into the sacred treasury? If this duty be of a moral nature at all, we are just as much at liberty to neglect prayer, praise, reading the word, or hearing the word preached, as to neglect it.

It remains, very briefly to say something about the happy consequences that would result to ourselves and the world, if this duty were faithfully performed. I have already noticed some of the temporal blessings that might be expected to flow from it; but, certain it is that these would not constitute the only, nor even the greatest advantages that would follow in its train. It is in acts of beneficence alone, that we can manifest our love to the brethren, and the family of mankind at large. I need not inform the most illiterate, that if we do not love our brother whom we have seen, we cannot love God whom we have not seen.—That if we see our brother have need, and shut our bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in us? From the whole tenor of revelation, we are forbidden to indulge the hope that the Spirit of God dwells in us, unless we, like him, manifest by our conduct that we are actuated by sentiments of beneficence and love.

What glorious results to a lost world might we not anticipate, if the whole Christian community would fully act up to the rule here held forth. Of this we may have some faint conception, by examining what a single congregation might effect. A congregation composed of fifty families, we consider weak, and surely they must be poor, if the aggregate of their income does not amount to twenty-five thousand dollars. Now a tenth of this would support five ministers of the gospel, allowing each a larger salary than most of ours get. It would support a pastor well, and enable us every second year to erect a convenient house for public worship. It would be amply sufficient once every year to prepare a herald of the cross—a soldier of King Immanuel, to pull down the strong holds of Satan, and hoist the colours of peace and good-will to men. It would—but what would it not do? It would put an entirely new face upon the Christian world, and with a blessing from on high, it would quickly remodel the face of the heathen world also.

At the hazard of being thought tedious, I will venture to present this subject in one other aspect. The building of mercy ought to exhibit the characteristics of order, of beauty, of equality, of efficiency. Whatever may be said in defence of the general principles on which we act, it must be plain to the most careless observer, that in two fundamental points, they are radically wrong. These points are *equality* and *efficiency*. It would be no easy task to bring to view all the evidence that goes to sustain this position. Indeed there is practically little of *equality* or *efficiency* about it. The people in congregations, separately considered, bear burdens unequally. When compared with each other, the several congregations bear burdens unequally. The ministers bear burdens unequally. What, in fact, is there in reference to the bearing of burdens in our whole system, that has the recommendation of equality, except it be that all are allowed to do pretty much as they please: a principle, or rather a want of principle, which constitutes the very essence of disorder. If a congregation pays their

pastor by subscription, the liberal pay that which is due from such as are disposed to hoard their treasure; if they assess it on the seats, it is obviously not much better, as people will be guided more or less by the room necessary to accommodate their families. Should congregations who are numerous and wealthy, who enjoy every advantage which populous neighbourhoods usually afford, pay only the name of a contribution, while those placed in widely different circumstances have to struggle on, as best they may, to provide a scanty pittance to keep their gospel candlestick from absolute extinguishment?

Is there one scriptural fundamental truth more clear than that Christians ought to contribute for such purposes, according to their means? Now plain and rational as this truth is, in our practice, we not only neglect it, but absolutely reverse it. We find in many instances the poor scattered abroad, not having the means of *choosing* where to locate themselves; they are consequently often few in number, and must of course do without ordinances, or obtain them almost gratis—or, what is a hard alternative, stint their families of necessary things. While some are waxing fat and kicking Jeshurun like, others have their spirits imbittered with what they may deem hard bondage. These truths are incontrovertible, and we sometimes hear them complained of, and not unfrequently we hear the sentiment expressed, that strong congregations ought to afford aid to the weak. How is this to be accomplished, if we continue to practise as we have hitherto done? If it be left to persons in their individual characters, or societies in their congregational capacities, what reliance can be placed upon their aid? Whatever aid may be extended to weak congregations, ought not only to be fixed as to amount, but administered with regularity. If this be not done, it will be worse than useless to attempt it. What minister of the gospel would locate himself, where his daily bread would be dependent upon the uncertain charitable supplies, furnished by such as were not under his care? and who would consider themselves perfectly at liberty either to give or withhold their donations at pleasure?

What remedy naturally presents itself as a cure for these radical, great and manifold evils. Is it not the adoption of some rule, based upon the broad foundation, which I have been here attempting to lay. Will it be objected that it would be an undue, an unauthorized extension of church authority? Surely not. It would be only a proper and well regulated application of authority, which she maintains, and doubtless exercises. No one will deny that if a member refuses to make contributions to the church, that he is a fit subject for discipline. This settles the whole question; for it is very evident, that if a nominal amount only be given, he will still stand as a delinquent. Church courts then *must* undertake to say what, in this respect, comes up to the requisitions of the divine law. It may, however, be said that this subjects a man to the tyrannical oppression of a tribunal, unknown to the constitution and laws of our country. This is denied. Church censures extend not to life, or limb, or property, nor do they touch social, civil or political rights. That something ought to be done, must be apparent to all the lovers of Zion; and to arouse ministers and people to do that which may be most effectual in building up her broken walls,

has been the sole motive and design in penning this rather laborious article. Much, much more might be added; but, for the present at least, with the exception of a few closing remarks, I shall commit the whole matter into abler hands.

This communication is, perhaps, already too long; but a sense of duty will not permit me to close it without addressing a few words to those who minister in holy things. I have heard it hinted, that some of you regard money matters as of too unhallowed a nature to mingle with your pulpit duties on the sabbath. If any of you entertain such an opinion, rest assured it is not in accordance with the sentiment or practice of your predecessors the apostles. There is no one duty of life, which is not more or less intimately connected with, or involved in the practice of religion; and, if I have been at all successful in the argument which I have presented, it has been made plainly to appear that liberal contributions for the support and extension of the Redeemer's kingdom, are not only necessary to the welfare and prosperity of the church generally, but are closely connected with personal religion,—with the growth of grace in the soul. Recollect you have solemnly declared, that you will declare the whole counsel of God. Recollect that the blood of souls may be required at your hands. I know the truths here set forth are exceedingly unwelcome to corrupt nature; but this ought to make you the more determined and vigilant. That you do neglect your duty to a certain extent, in reference to these things, I think may be asserted without fear of contradiction. I am aware that your excuse is, that it is a subject so intimately interwoven with your personal interest, that you feel an extreme delicacy in touching it. I am much inclined to compassionate the amiable weaknesses of our nature; but here you take a wrong view of the matter on hand. You have undoubtedly a right to insist on the performance, even of those obligations which the people owe to you personally; but this is not a question which exclusively concerns yourselves. The purity, the extension, the well-being of Christ's kingdom depends much on your efforts in this line, and you ought solemnly to ponder whether an amiable weakness will be received as a valid excuse, when treason to your Master's interest is the charge. It has been said that money is the sinews of war, and in a certain sense, it is the sinews of religion also. It has ever been, and perhaps ever will be, the great lever which moves the world in all the operations of mankind. Indeed we can hardly conceive, how any thing valuable could be effected without it. It is not money that is the root of all evil, but the love of it. Why then, whether in the pulpit or out of it, will you not use every proper effort to extirpate the love of it from every human breast.

A word more by way of conclusion, and I have done. There is no trait in human nature more obvious than its proneness to run into extremes. We have been so much accustomed to witness the tyranny of church and state, in exacting tithes and other dues, we have seen so much of cruelty in their collection, and corruptions in their bestowment, that the very *name* has become odious to us. We can hardly think of them without associating in our minds cardinals, bishops, deans, &c., wallowing in wealth, haughty in manners, corrupted in principles, and debauched and dissolute in all their conduct in life. It is true, indeed, that great and mani-

fold have been the evils which have grown out of the perverted doctrine, which secular tyrants and lordly priests have often maintained on this subject; but would it not be well for us to inquire whether we have not, in our furious opposition to these practices, virtually denied the moral obligation which we lie under, to contribute of our substance to support and extend the Redeemer's kingdom?
 PILGRIM.

ART. III.—*Terms of Communion.*

[Concluded from page 90.]

WE have already considered the evils attending our present manner of admitting persons to fellowship, on a superficial acquaintance with the doctrines of the profession; the evils all see and feel, but the question is, what remedy can be found for them? Shall we cease to require an adherence to the Confession of Faith and Testimony, and adopt some more general term? This is the remedy which some bodies have tried, or, I should rather say, what they have tried instead of a remedy, but which is in fact only an increase of the evil: we now complain of an insufficient acquaintance with the doctrines of the gospel, and this plan establishes it by a law.

What we believe might in a good measure be a remedy, would be, *a compend of doctrine, in a separate form, appointed to be used in the admission of persons to fellowship.* No doubt this will appear to many as a novel scheme in the secession church, and rather approaching the latitudinarian measures, against which we testify in others; but let it be rightly understood.

1. It is every way reasonable. We now act substantially on this plan, when we admit persons having but a limited acquaintance with what is strictly called the doctrines, while almost entirely ignorant of what may be termed our peculiarities. We thus find it unavoidable to make a practical division of the subject; and it would be a great benefit, both to the applicant and to those admitting him, to have these first principles, which we make indispensable to admission, in a distinct and separate form.

2. Such a compend would embrace every doctrine in our Testimony, at least, stated in a simple manner. The Testimony, as is stated in the preface, is a collection of papers, all of them important; yet, when we must make a division of the subject, it will be allowed that the doctrinal part is most necessary for a first lesson. If then we take this by itself, it would reduce the book to one-third of its present size. Again, when we consider that a greater proportion of this doctrinal part consists of illustration, which, however excellent, might, in such a compend, be curtailed, or superseded by a text or two of Scripture; the subject would thus be brought within so very small compass, without omitting any one article, that every one might thoroughly peruse it, and be examined on the whole of it, and a much greater uniformity of views and attainments would result from this method than we can now reach.

3. This compend is by no means proposed as the only standard, or as a substitute for any that we now have; but only as a measure

for those who can reach no higher. At the same time let such be instructed that they are to proceed immediately with the study of the Testimony, &c. It is a very common case, that when persons have been admitted according to our present mode, however defective, yet, having passed, they feel as if the business of studying the profession was over; and though they promised to pursue it, yet we have no distinct order for exacting the fulfilment of such promises. The method here proposed would first distinctly mark the attainments and standing of those who are admitted, and also enable us to be exact in following up the requirements of farther study, for,

4. It would be the design, by the proposed method, to establish the rule, that those who have studied only the first principles shall be again particularly examined, before another sacramental occasion, as to their farther progress in the knowledge of the Testimony, &c., and shall be admitted, or not, as the evidence of their diligence may warrant. A total neglect of this duty would be considered of the same nature with a neglect of the public preaching of the word, or the worship of God in the family. Why should it not? Such a plan is not only reasonable, but the principle of it is plainly recognised in Scripture, in many places, as 1 Cor. ii. 6—"Howbeit, we speak wisdom among them that are perfect," &c. The character of *perfect*, here, cannot signify a sinless perfection, as the apostle uniformly denounced such presumptuous pretensions; but evidently denotes those who had fully studied the profession of the faith. Accordingly, among these he spoke *wisdom*, discoursed of the more deep and abstruse parts of the system, as they were more capable of understanding them. Chap. iii. 1—"And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ. I have fed you with milk, and not with meat, for hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able." Here we have the very division that we have proposed, viz. *milk* and *meat*, that is, the first principles, and, what might be then termed, the peculiarities of the Christian profession. We have here also a corresponding division of church members, viz. spiritual and carnal, or babes in Christ. What formal distinction might have been kept between these grades or measures of attainment, we do not know, but the principle we plead for they plainly contain. Phil. iii. 12—"Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect." That is, he had not attained to that perfect conformity to Christ that believers shall have at the resurrection, (as the preceding verses show;) but yet there was a certain perfection which he and others had attained, verse 15—"Let us, therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded." Here he speaks of a certain class of professors, "as many as be perfect." The meaning is evidently the same as in the former passage, those who in Christian knowledge have arrived at manhood. But we have the point most fully and clearly in Heb. v. 12, to verse 3 of ch. vi. There we find the distinctions as to church members, *babes* and *unskilful*, and *those of full age*; as to compass of gospel truth, it is divided into *the first principles*, and also *milk*, and *perfection* or *strong meat*. Moreover, we have some of these first principles enumerated, viz. repentance from dead works, faith towards God, the doctrine of baptisms, the

laying on of hands, the resurrection, the eternal judgment. We have also the higher mysteries, called strong meat, for them of full age, viz. the offices of Christ and the shadowy nature of the old temple service, which were the peculiarities of the Christian profession at that day. Now, though these different branches may not then have been taught from separate books, yet it is plain they marked distinct grades of advancement to what was considered the full profession of the gospel, and, on the whole, fully coincide with the method we propose. Once more: John, in his first epistle, ch. i. 12, divides professors into little children, young men and fathers, which would bear out the same idea. The method we have proposed, instead of being a novelty, is the most ancient order of the church. In the first century, says Mosheim, "All who professed firmly to believe that Jesus was the only Redeemer, and who promised to live conformably to his holy religion, were received into the number of his disciples by baptism; and a more accurate instruction in the doctrines of Christianity was given them after receiving that sacrament. But when churches were gathered in almost every nation, this custom was changed, for the best of reasons; then none were admitted to baptism but such as were previously instructed in the principal points of Christianity, and who gave satisfactory evidence of real piety; hence rose the distinction between *catechumens* and *believers*." Again: "The ancient doctors divide their flocks into two classes; the one comprehending such as were thoroughly instructed; the other, those who were acquainted with little more than the first principles of religion; nor do they deny that the methods of instruction used with these two sorts of persons were very different."

ABEDNEGO.

ART. IV.—*Strictures on the Articles of A. R.*

Mr. Editor—We live in an age of investigation. Whatever may be the ultimate result of the investigations which are going on at present is difficult to determine. But mankind do not seem disposed to settle down on old received opinions without examining their foundations, whether they are firm or tottering. Amongst the many subjects which are passing the ordeal of scrutiny, slavery, that prolific source of calamity to the human family, is presented for investigation. But it is the policy of a great majority of the pro-slavery part of the community to prevent, if possible, discussion on this subject, both civil and ecclesiastical.

In looking over some of the back numbers of the *Monitor*, we see commissioners who are sent from slave-holding presbyteries, to represent them in the higher judicatories of the church, instructed to admit of no discussion on the subject of slavery; but if they should fail to prevent discussion, they were to "withdraw from the assembly with becoming dignity." There is a great deal of the wisdom of the serpent manifested in this course of proceeding. Slavery will not bear discussion. As well might we, by any process of cleansing, endeavour to wash the Ethiopian white, as to make slavery appear righteous. The profound divine, the grave moralist, or the wily politician, will all utterly fail in estab-

lishing its claim to any thing like justice, sound morality, or even good policy. This is the true reason why our brother A. R. is so inconsistent with himself, and makes so many contradictory statements, and so many incongruities in his sentiments, when he endeavours to make an apology for slavery, by attempting to justify it from the Bible.

A. R. must not consider it hard to be ranked among the aiders and abettors of slavery. Christ says, "those who are not for me are against me." He does more than merely withhold his aid for the removal of slavery, for he holds the theory, that the Scriptures do not condemn any one for holding his fellow man in slavery, provided he treats him in the manner he recommends. Now, surely, a person holding this sentiment would be doing great injustice to himself, to appear as an advocate for the abrogation of slavery. The reformation of its abuses should only be his aim.

We often feel grieved at heart to hear even ministers of the gospel, who should be the heralds of glad tidings to mankind, when trying to justify the holding of slaves from the Bible,—because God does not expressly say, You shall not hold your fellow man in a state of slavery—drawing a most appalling picture of Roman slavery, representing it as the very masterpiece of wickedness, begging all description for oppression and cruelty, and yet Christ and his apostles did not give it a word of rebuke. Now, if it was a foe that thus reproached Christ, it might be endured; but alas! he is wounded in the house of his professed friends. Now we most respectfully refer those messengers of the Lord of Hosts, whose feet are beautiful on the mountains, messengers bringing good tidings, who thus advocate the continuance of slavery from the silence of Scripture, to Romans, xiii. 8, 9, and 10th, where the apostle has filled up all omissions. Is it good tidings to mankind, to inform them that a large portion of the human family are goods and chattels in the hands of another portion, and are mere appendages of humanity? that God has relinquished all claim to their services, and merged all in obedience to their masters; thus, although they may be "bought with a price," yet are they servants of men. There are great principles laid down in God's word, by which our whole conduct is to be regulated. We are convinced, that if slavery is weighed in the balance of the sanctuary, on it **TEKEL** must be written.

As A. R. has not directed his words against us, we might be supposed to have been excused for making a reply. We are convinced, there are others, if they would take up their pen on this subject, would do it more justice. Yet God can work by very feeble instruments; therefore we said we will do our part; we will also show our opinion. If any thing we may be enabled to say will be the means of leading any person to a more diligent and prayerful search of the Scriptures, concerning the decision of this important question, our object will be gained.

With these preliminary observations, we will proceed to make a few remarks on the sentiments advanced by A. R. in his last communication. He says he does not feel disposed to controvert the proposition made by the editor of the Monitor, (Mr. Martin,) that he was still in the dark on the subject of slavery, and entreated others, more enlightened, to dispel the gloom. We do not

expect any thing we can say will be so lucid as to dispel the darkness which we think envelops him on this subject. But we would recommend him to a more careful and prayerful investigation of the word of God than heretofore; this, and this alone, can make our darkness light. We have great anxiety that our friend A. R. should have correct views on this subject. We consider that he has qualifications sufficient to become an able advocate for the cause of truth and righteousness, and we also take interest in him on his own account. We have no personal acquaintance with him, yet we give him full credit for the integrity of his purpose, or uprightness of his intention. He must be very unfortunate in the proper use of language, as he says of himself, or our mental vision is so obtuse that we cannot see what his theory is, or what he wishes to effect—he says it never was his purpose to speak of slavery as an institution of God, unless a tolerated evil may be so regarded: in other places he seems to make it equivalent to a recognised institution of God.

A tolerated evil: what! tolerate a man to rob his neighbour of an ox, or sheep? O no, Christianity could not tolerate that. The eighth precept of the decalogue says, "Thou shalt not steal;" and when it forbids us from stealing an ox, or a sheep, will it permit us to steal a man—rob him of his natural and inalienable rights? and that he has natural and inalienable rights is a self-evident truth. Notwithstanding A. R. professes to deny this, and calls it an infidel principle, he acknowledges what is equivalent, namely: he says, in page 436 of the 14th volume of the Monitor, in speaking of the sentiment in the declaration, "all men are created free and equal," &c.—"If it be intended to convey the idea that all mankind are born equally impotent, defenceless, and dependent, that none can exhibit a valid charter from the King of kings to tyrannise over and oppress others, the truth of such assertions need not be questioned." Now does not this hold out the idea, that "all mankind are created equal," and that "none has a valid charter from the King of kings" to rob his fellow man of whatever rights God has endowed him? Christianity does not enter into a country, and bow to any of its evils. "Where there is the word of a king, there is power." All kings of the earth must leave their crowns at the feet of King Jesus, if they enlist under his banner; and enlist they must, or they are for ever undone; they must take up their cross and follow him. Why should slavery be tolerated more than polygamy, and many other inventions which mankind have sought out? There is more said in the Scriptures against slavery, than what is said against polygamy. But avarice and dominion appear to be man's predominant vices. Christianity tolerates no evil. The instructions to the soldiers of the cross, under the Captain of their salvation, the New Testament Joshua, are no less explicit for the removal of all evil, than was given to Joshua, the captain of the host of Israel. Their weapons, indeed, are not, like Joshua's, carnal; but they are no less mighty, through God, to the pulling down of strong holds. The instructions to Joshua, in entering the land of Canaan, were, to make no covenant with the sinful inhabitants of the land; if they should cleave to the remnant of those nations, on whatever pretence, "know for certain, the Lord your God will no more drive them out; they shall

be snares and traps to you, scourges in your sides, and thorns in your eyes." Now, such grieving thorns would be any tolerated evil, as the *toleration of slavery* in the church of God amply demonstrates; it is a root of bitterness springing up, that mightily troubles her. The church must "purge out all the old leaven, that she may be a new lump." Nothing less than perfection must be the standard of morality. "Be ye perfect, as your Father in heaven is perfect," is the Scripture injunction: that we come far short of it is a lamentable truth; but to say we have a toleration from God's word to commit any evil, is wicked and absurd.

A. R. illustrates his sentiments respecting the institution of slavery by a simile: "Suppose a person were 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?" We say to this diseased person, Immediately stop your licentious course, or death will be the inevitable consequence; for, as long as the cause is kept up, the effect will be produced—we say, It is sinful that you are thus writhing under this disease, as you are the sole agent of procuring your own misery. By this simile A. R. designs to illustrate the moral condition of slavery. We will now give a case from the great Physician of souls, directly in point: "Why should ye be stricken any more? ye will revolt more and more; the whole head is sick, and the whole heart is faint; from the sole of the foot even unto the head, there is no soundness in it, but wounds, bruises, and putrefying sores." Now, here are people morally diseased; and what is the prescription of the Physician of souls for people thus diseased? Is it to go through all the routine of sanctuary services, when, at the same time, they roll their iniquity as a sweet morsel under their tongue, which was the procuring cause of their calamity. No; God will have no such vain oblations: they must "cease to do evil, and learn to do well, seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow," or, as the margin reads, "righten the oppressed." The application of this to the case of slave-holders is easy, and directly in point: "righten the oppressed." Here is a community (slaves) where every wife is a widow, and every child fatherless; not only individuals interspersed through a community, but the whole community; and thus reduced to this wretched condition by the cruel hand of man. We say, Restore those widows their husbands; restore those fatherless children their fathers; thus evidence your faith and repentance by your works.

We are amazed to hear A. R. assert, that slavery is not oppression. Now we may assert, without fear of contradiction, that there is but one sentiment among mankind on this subject; if they were themselves to be the victims of slavery, they would consider themselves grievously oppressed. Liberty is a boon which is highly valued. What privations and perils have mankind encountered to obtain this inestimable right, with which God has endowed the whole human family, except it is forfeited by crime. Scripture represents slavery, or a state of bondage, to be a very great calamity; and the worst characters of our spiritual maladies are represented by temporal bondage. Nehemiah, ix. 37, speaking of the calamities of the Jews under the Persian kings, says, "They have

dominion over our *bodies* and over our cattle at their pleasure, and we are in great distress." The prophet Isaiah, lviii. 6, expressly calls those who were held in bondage, the oppressed, without any particular reference to their treatment; and God calls it oppression when the fugitive servant would be prevented from dwelling with him, and delivered to his master. A. R. says the Jews were permitted to buy persons; these persons were declared to be their money, and subject to their control; and farther says, long before this permission, the slave trade was regularly carried on. Murder was of still higher antiquity than slavery. And men in those days bought their wives, and they were subject to their control. Did that constitute them their slaves? We think not. Jacob claimed his wives and children on the ground that he had paid for them, and David also urges his claim to his wife for the same reason. Now we call for the proof from God's word, where any person is said to hold his fellow man as property, but quite the reverse. When Pharaoh was commanded to let Israel go, is there any intimation that he must be paid for his property? but directly the contrary; the servants were to be paid for their labour, as the Israelites, by their borrowing, spoiled the Egyptians. Were not the Jews forbidden to deliver unto the master, the servant who had escaped? Does not this language emphatically say, that man is not lawful property? They were commanded to restore all kinds of property, as cattle, or raiment, to their brother, or even were he an enemy; and the sweeping clause is, that whatever was the property of another was to be immediately restored, whenever demanded. Now does not this clearly show that the servant was not property? for he was not to be restored; nor is there any instance of a servant being sold, or levied on to liquidate debt. A. R. says, "We may buy a man in the exercise of the kindest feelings and noblest sentiments of our nature; but if we sell him, the promptings must come from the very fountain of mischief itself: prohibition to sell would soon put a stop to slavery, as it would become so ponderous, it would crush under its own weight." Now, from the evidence of the contending party, or from this acknowledgment, we might rest the case. If a person has no right to sell, we certainly have no right to buy. The purchaser has no better claim to the property than what the seller can give. If his right to sell "came from the fountain of mischief itself," our right to *hold* him can come from no other source. Our good intention of buying him will not alter the case, as we do not believe in the Popish doctrine of the end justifying the means. We might also suppose a case, if the end would justify the means; that we might sell a man in the exercise of "the kindest feelings and noblest sentiments of our nature;" we might sell him to a person who had it in his power of making his condition more comfortable than we could possibly do; or, by our selling him, it would give him an opportunity of being with his wife and family.

As to the acts of mercy and benevolence of a chieftain that would commute the punishment of his captives, which were to be killed, to slavery, we think his tender mercies would be cruelty indeed. It would lead us to believe that his avarice predominated over his revenge. A person, by his bad conduct, might forfeit his right to liberty; and it might be an act of mercy, to commute the

punishment of one who had been guilty of crime; except it was of such a nature that nothing less than the death of the culprit would expiate. But, for people to be reduced to interminable bondage, with their posterity, we think death, naturally speaking, would be more desirable. There is many an enslaved parent that rejoices when his child hath found that house which is appointed for all living; and where it is not the least of its privileges, that "the servant is free from his master."

We surely cannot bring in the Jews, in their warfare against the Canaanites, as any precedent for us, as they were a devoted people; the Jews were appointed God's executioners, and they had no alternative, nor had they it in their power to commute the punishment of those whom God had devoted to death; nor have we any right to avail ourselves of any permit which was exclusively given to the Jews. A. R. farther says, "that 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 suppose one essential benefit would be to endeavour to enlighten the mind of the slave, in some degree suitable to his rank in creation, as a moral and intelligent being, destined for a never-ending eternity. We endeavoured to show, in a former communication, that it would be the death of slavery to instruct the slaves. If slavery is right in itself, it is also right that we should adopt a course of conduct that is absolutely necessary for its existence. It is a system of coercion; it is only kept in existence by the strong hand of power, as might gives them all their right; and knowledge being power, the slave-holder is under the necessity of *removing the key of knowledge*.

Now, we are convinced, from the conduct of slave-holders and their apologists, that, although they profess to believe that the Scriptures sanction slavery, they have at least great doubts of it themselves; for, if they believed that slavery was sanctioned by the Bible, they would be anxious that their slaves should be instructed in its doctrines. If it is an institution of God, or tolerated by him, they need not be afraid to trust him with its protection. If it is an ordinance of God, man cannot prevail against it. Slave-holders seem to lack *faith* very much, as to the *perpetuity of their peculiar institution*.

The writer under consideration asks, "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." We are no doctors of divinity, nor have we any pretensions to profundity in clerical lore; but we think we can extricate ourselves from both of the horns of this dilemma without justifying slavery. God did not neglect this class of mankind, as they have always been more or less in that situation, since the days of Nim-

rod. 'The poor and the needy are the special objects of God's care. He addresses them as the crying poor and the sighing needy; the oppressed, shedding tears without a comforter; the suffering dumb; the stranger; the fatherless, and the widow.' Does that justify those who hold them in this distressed situation? By no means. We do not say that these passages, above cited, exclusively mean slaves; but they certainly literally embrace their case.

As to the rule of duty, in that situation, until God opened a door for their redemption, they had a bright and illustrious example in Joseph's conduct, when he was unnaturally sold as a slave,—with many other places of scripture. It is probable the apostle had reference to a person in involuntary servitude, when he exhorts to Christian patience; but if they could "be made free, to use it rather." Neither were the masters forgotten: they are denominated oppressor, the proud oppressor, "He that oppresseth the poor to increase his riches,"—"the covetous extortioner;"—"He that buildeth his house by unrighteousness, and his chambers by wrong, that used his neighbour's service without wages, and gave him naught for his work." "He that kept back, by fraud, the hire of the labourers," &c. "Man stealers." "He that stealeth a man, or selleth him, or if he is found in his hands, shall surely be put to death." It is quite unnecessary to multiply more examples:—so we see God did not overlook those that were held in involuntary servitude, or those who held them; and, yet it is no justification of slavery. Now we will present to A. R. a dilemma, from the horns of which he may find as much difficulty to extricate himself, as his supposed doctors would have from the horns of his dilemma. On his supposition, all the directions that are given to master and servant in the scripture, are intended for those who are holding persons in involuntary servitude, or are held in it. How do the ministers of the gospel, for example, in England, make it appear that those portions of scripture, (in taking one of them for their text,) which are exclusively intended for master and slave, are profitable to their hearers? as "all scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness," &c. There are no such persons in the kingdom, as slave holder, or slave, as the good old Puritan fathers would not admit of a slave setting his foot on English soil, ("that moment he touches English soil, his shackles fall, and he becomes a free man,") even though it was represented as being from the "kindest feeling, and noblest sentiments of their nature," that they were engaged in the traffic of slavery, no less a benevolent design, than to convert them to a state of Christianity, from the most barbarous state of ignorance.

But supposing those texts of scripture were intended for voluntary servants, how profitable would they be to the auditory? as there were always characters of that kind, the employer and the employed, or, if you please, master and servant. Here is a man in an honourable station, he voluntarily contracts to execute a piece of service for another, for which he is to receive an equivalent. He is benefited, and his employer is benefited. He stands up in all the dignity of his manhood, there is no violence done to any attribute of his nature, he can be faithful to his employer, or master,

without infracting his duty to his God. He can discharge all the relative duties which are incumbent upon him. God is supreme, he cannot serve two, God and mammon supremely,—the employer has every thing he could reasonably desire,—this voluntary servitude practically works well, which shows God has given it his sanction. There is no insecurity, nor dread of persons standing in this character, no need of patrols, no alarm at the rustling of a leaf.

[To be concluded in next number.]

ART. V.—*Reflections on a sick Bed.* No. I.

THE hour of sickness and death is the time to test the reality of religion. It is then that its supporting and comforting influences are most needed; and it is then, when all other sources of happiness fail, that the renewed heart realizes the secret cheering visits of the promised Comforter, who discovers “the things of Christ,” and the prospects of a glorious immortality. At this time, afflictions come as love letters from our Well Beloved, and we are called into retirement to read there, to ponder their contents, and to meditate on their nature and design, as expressions of love calculated to withdraw our affections from other lovers, and centre them upon the God of love. One might almost desire to be sick, so that the great Physician might have occasion to display his skill and tenderness, and come to the bed of languishing with the expressions of a sympathizing friend, saying, “How is it with you now, sick man? I am God that healeth thee. Fear not, I will help thee.” It is then he enters into familiar soothing converse with the soul, and by giving sweet communion, and love tokens, he feasts the contemplative mind, and affords a rich theme for meditation. To note the train of thought excited in the mind on such occasions, when the grim visage of death, and the dark unknown future are the only prospects, is calculated to interest and instruct, at least, the subject of affliction. A few such reflections are contained in the sequel. They were not designed to appear before the public, when noted down: they are not unique in order, or connexion, as their nature and the peculiar circumstances under which they were composed, when subjected to the painful rack of sore disease, forbade this. When hourly expecting the advent of death, the mind is so trammelled by sympathy, and so amazed in the wilderness of strange thought, that it can fix only on some prominent objects. Like the drowning man who looks around, not on the beauty and grandeur of the ocean, but on some floating spar, the life boat, and the distant harbour; he views with fixed eye the ark of safety, and the haven of rest; he grasps the extended rope, or floating spar of the divine promises; the means, the prospect, the certainty of landing safely in heaven’s port alone occupy his thoughts. And if the experience of the writer could avail any thing, its attest would be given to the importance of noting the feelings and mental operations at such a time. Though there be nothing in the sequel new, or of merit claiming attention, yet, as sometimes a history of the peculiar impressions, and ideas excited in the mind of a foreign traveller by

witnessing strange interesting scenes, is read with interest and profit, a perusal of the subsequent disconnected observations may, perhaps, prove in some degree, interesting, if the reader can, in the moral exercise of his imagination, feel himself standing with the writer, on the banks of Jordan, viewing its "swellings," and feeling the dash of its overwhelming billows.

HONESTAS.

I am, indeed, sore afflicted, but not in hell, cast down, but not in despair. Disease has long been preying on my constitution, and death seems now fast pulling down my clay house, and entering by a wide breach. Sin is a cruel tyrant which first wears out our bodies in its miserable service, and then gives us death as its "wages,"—truly poor pay! But, alas! that Satan finds us all such willing fools as to love his galling yoke, with the gloomy prospects of hell torments, as our only remuneration. But, blessed be God, he pulls some as brands out of the burning;—"he hath, in love to my soul, delivered it from the lowest hell." Yet, alas! "my leanness." How unthankful! how erring! Though digged about, yet still a barren fig tree. Oh! how dried up my roots and branches! Fit fuel for the flames, yet favoured with refreshing dews and showers.

God has his pruning knife, and his branches must be purged. Though the operation be severe, yet the healthy growth and fruitfulness of the tree are thereby promoted. God now deals with me, not as an enemy, not as "a bastard, but as a son." "Fools for their sins do sore affliction bear;" therefore, I am now subjected to this fiery ordeal. But the Son of God still walks through the furnace with his children, and suffers them to lose nothing but their dross. True gold cannot be injured by the action of fire; but its beauty and utility are increased by such a process.

Christ lays his cross upon us, but himself gets under it with us, and takes the greater weight on his own shoulders. His kind sympathizing voice is heard saying, "Cast thou thy burden on the Lord, and he shall sustain thee." This cross is, indeed, a "burden," but it "is light," is pleasant, is advantageous, such as wings are to an eagle, or sails to a ship, though their weight, in some measure, presses the vessel down, yet it is the means by which it is propelled, and landed safely in port. The traveller does not object to the weight of his staff; the warrior willingly bears with him his allowance of provision; the birds of flight are not oppressed by the weight of their wings, since by these they ascend and traverse their aerial path. Afflictions, like friction, impart a magnetic influence to the soul, so that it is drawn to Christ, the source of attraction. Sufferings and grace are the King's highway to heaven. Christ went from a cross to glory, and we must thus follow him. Since he, the Beloved, the Bridegroom, was "a man of sorrows," his spouse should not appear, or desire to be, a wife of pleasures. How comforting the thought that he is *one* with her in all her joys and sorrows, is afflicted, and fully sympathizes with all her members in their sufferings!

God is with his people "in trouble to deliver them." Death, like many apparitions, loses its dread horrors and ghostly shadows, as we approximate and calmly view it. Like the "brazen serpent,"

it still has the hideous appearance of something dangerous; but the eye of faith discovers it to be the means, the beginning of certain cure. It has, indeed, the appearance of a devouring lion; its roaring voice of human sighs, its rending paw excite dread alarm. But when approached by the Christian, it is found dead. Its carcass is full of honey; hence we by faith draw sweet comforts, most nourishing to the soul. Thus Samson's riddle is explained to the happy experience of believers in near prospect of death.

The hour of trial is the season in which love visits are paid. The proverb that "Man's extremity is God's opportunity" is often thus verified to the Christian's experience. It is his opportunity of "perfecting his strength in our weakness," and of pouring in the balm of spiritual consolation to the wounded spirit. His soothing words, "I am thy God—I am with thee—fear not," united, make a pillar more firm than the everlasting hills; upon which we can stand and defy the raging powers of hell, can look unmoved on the direful tempests of sin and sorrow, which convulse the world beneath, and with a happy composure can view the swellings of Jordan, with all its threatening billows dash, and lose their strength against this unshaken rock. Elevated, fixed on this, we welcome death's approach as the usher which introduces us into the celestial society of the blessed. Who would not welcome the visit of death, which, as a key, opens the prison of our clay tenements, and unlocks the portals of life? Welcome that day when we cease dying, and spring into life. Welcome that hour when we sleep in Jesus, enjoy sweet repose in his arms. "The day of one's death is better than the day of one's birth." It is the day when we cease dying. It is the day of jubilee, of freedom from sin's vile slavery, and the oppression of sorrows. After being long in exile among strangers on earth, we are this day called home to our Father's house. Having been long courted by Christ, and favoured with many love tokens, and being betrothed to him by espousals, we are called by death to sit down as his bride, at his marriage feast in the sanctuary above. Oh! happy wedding day! Disease, roll on Time's sluggish car; let the wheels of life, aided by grace, move swiftly; let the tide of human woes swell, and dash my shattered bark against the shore, some dashing wave will soon receding leave me safe on land.

When afflictions, heaven's visitors, Christ's suitors, steal our hearts from the world, and drive us from the puddles, the broken cisterns of earthly pleasures,—when this wind from the Almighty blows down all our carnal refuges, and leaves us a wreck on the troubled sea of life, then, to hear a loving father with a soothing and comforting voice declare, "I am with thee in trouble to deliver thee," converts sorrows into joy, and makes the hour of trial a season of the signal manifestations of divine love." Alas! that sin has made so many holes in my clay vessel, that it can contain but little of the ocean of Christ's love. Oh! how many pipes are used by God to convey this to my soul. Thanks to his name for his blessed cross, which should no more be esteemed burdensome, or an ugly object of terror, but a great conduit pipe through which is communicated to my soul the fulness and sweetness of this love. It is like Jonathan's staff, the end of which drops honey, or like some walking canes filled with refreshing liquids, and precious treasures. One

end of this is laid on our shoulders, and we must not throw it down, for at the other end is the glory of heaven.

Tosses and crosses are the wheels of Christ's chariot of love, in which his own person ascended to glory, and in which he rides with us, as with Elijah, to glory. Let the flood of sorrow roll on, soon all shall be swallowed up in the ocean of eternity. Oh! for faith to climb upon these crosses, as so many steps in that ladder which reaches up to heaven. Oh! for a draught of those pure refreshing waters of spiritual consolations which issue from the blessed fountain of the Lord's house. We now sow in tears; now is our winter time; but hope points to a happy spring, to a rich harvest of joy.

Though long journeying in this wilderness of wo, drinking of Marah's streams, yet pools of refreshing water have been filled for the supply of spiritual comfort; so I "go from strength to strength." And though there be giant difficulties in this wilderness, which make the hearts of most faint, and induce them to give it a bad name, yet there grows the vine of God; its "Eschol," pleasant grapes, when pressed in this bruising painful wine press of Fatherly anger, give joyful cheer to the heart of man. I must bring up a good report of the king of this country, and of its fertility. In its gloomy vales flows the river of life, on each side of which grows that tree, the branch of renown whose leaves heal all maladies, and whose fruit is sweet to the taste. When God by his rod strikes this rock, our hard hearts of stone, he can make streams of penitential tears, and of soul-exulting joys, flow out thence. Oh! to feast on the honey treasured in the rock Christ, and to drink and be satisfied with the waters issuing from this rock smitten for us.

One who has often mingled with the worshippers of God in the courts of his holiness, especially if he ever had the honour and happiness of leading in the heavenly exercises of the sanctuary, when through sickness or otherwise deprived of this source of felicity, will, with David, mourn over his privation, and esteem a day spent in God's house, better than a thousand spent elsewhere; he feels a willingness to be a door-keeper, to perform the most menial offices of the sanctuary. He weeps with a pained heart over the ambition and emulation of many professing to be ministers of the meek and lowly Jesus, who evidently use a carnal policy to obtain a more eligible situation of honour or emolument in the Israel of God. How many of them love to feast on popular applause, and to have their ears delighted with the music of fame's sweet voice? Oh! how almost omnipotent is the power of adulation! The human heart is strung on such a key, that the plaudits of men give sweet-toned music, the charms of which but few can resist. "Old Adam is still too strong for the young Malancthons" of this age. To labour in an obscure part in God's vineyard, to be associated with a despised few, to be unhonoured and unsung, to receive no tribute of flattery for a display of talent, is too humbling for many who esteem themselves gifted pulpit orators. To take up the cross of reproach, and shame, and persecution, for Christ's despised truth, is an arduous post, which, but few are qualified to fill in such a way as shall put glory on the cause of Christ. Down with Christ, and exalt the creature, is the motto of the age. Oh! for more voices to cry up crosses, to exalt Christ, to sing love songs to this fair well beloved.

Oh! if ministers, who on entering their sacred office, renounced all carnal motives, were for awhile held in the giant grasp of death, if a full view of eternity would demonstrate the worth of immortal souls, how great an estimate would they put upon the privilege of lifting up their pleading voice in the house of God even for one day, and of officiating as an ambassador of Heaven to perishing sinners! Would they not increase their devotedness and zeal? Privation gives a sweetness and value to enjoyment. Happily persecutions, or sickness, or the agonies of death, or the grave cannot deprive the believing soul of the enjoyment of happy communion with God. Disease, pains, and death, become the ministers of God to preach comfort to him. Preachers have great need of such sermons, that being instructed in these trying scenes, they may be able to teach others.

ART. VI.—*A Letter from the late Rev. Robert Laing.*

The following letter was written a few years since by the late Rev. Robert Laing, to Mrs. Hoy, late of Cambridge, N. Y., on the occasion of the death of her husband. Mr. and Mrs. Hoy both lived to a very advanced age, they were both eminent for their religious intelligence, and in every respect highly adorned through the whole of their long Christian course, that religious profession they had made in early life. The latter departed this life about two years before Mr. Laing. It is sufficient to add, that it is credible to the author; and rebukes the uncharitable treatment which at times Mr. Laing received.

“*Bovina, Oct. 7th, 1834.*”

“Dear Madam,

Permit me to express my sympathy and compassion to you in your infirmities, old age and widowhood, by writing you a few lines for your direction and comfort. The Lord has been pleased to remove your aged, pious, and beloved husband, and I trust you have been enabled to submit to his will, saying with Job, “The Lord giveth, and the Lord taketh away; blessed be the name of the Lord;” and with David, “I was dumb, I opened not my mouth, because thou didst it.” Be thankful that you enjoyed his presence so long, as your head and companion in all the vicissitudes of life, rejoicing with you in prosperity, and comforting you in adversity. But, his race is run, his course is finished:—and I trust he has entered into his rest, to be “ever with the Lord.” “To depart and be with Christ,” is far better than to continue here. Bless God that you have yet a Husband who lives, and will live; for thy Maker is thy husband, and the relation is eternal. “I will betroth myself to thee for ever.” And he saith, “Leave thy fatherless children with me, and let your widows trust in me.” You know, that though you are yet spared, but for a very short time, you may say with Job, “My breath is corrupt, my days are extinct, and the graves are ready for me.” And again, “If I wait, the grave is mine house.” You must go to him; but he cannot return to you. Therefore, claim a full and particular interest in Christ for you in all your infirmities, and afflictions, and love to save you. “He is a present help in time of trouble.” He hath said, “I have made

and I will bear, and even to hoar hairs I will carry you." Say, "I will go in the strength of the Lord God: I will make mention of thy righteousness, even of thine only. O God, thou hast taught me from my youth; now also when I am gray-headed, O God, forsake me not." And with the pious poet,

"My God, my father, and my friend,
Do not forsake me in mine end."

As you know that when a very few years are gone, you must go to the house appointed for all living; so it is of the last importance to be ready for that important event. Dying is work enough of itself; we need not to have any more to do than give "up the ghost." That I may give you a little assistance in the useful preparation for dying, let me mention a few particulars; and though I trust you know them, yet your faith may need to be strengthened. Who could bear up under this great change, if there were not everlasting arms to support him, and these will do: "Though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; for thou art with me, thy rod and thy staff, they comfort me." That this may be your privilege, claim a particular interest in the atonement that Christ has made for the sins of his people, that you may go off in the character of a pardoned sinner, justified freely by the grace of God, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. This is the foundation of all. Though you have obtained this privilege, yet you ought to be renewing the particular acts of faith daily. Though the great apostle could say, "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he will keep that which I have committed to him against that day," yet he has a great concern about his safety in the moment of dying. He desires to win Christ, to be united to him here, and also to be found in him. This is in allusion either to the nation of the Jews, who kept within the doors in Egypt, at the time the angel killed the first-born, where he did not see the blood of sprinkling, or to those persons who fled to the city of refuge, which was the only condition of saving their lives. And thus solicitous was the apostle to be found in Christ, having on the righteousness that comes by faith. You must also be conformed to the image of God. Be sanctified throughout, in your whole frame, soul, and body; for "without holiness, no man shall see the Lord." You must be made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light. You must improve Christ by faith for both these blessings. He is made of God unto us righteousness, that he may be just, and the justifier of all who believe in Jesus: sanctification, as he washeth us from our sins in his own blood; and complete redemption, that he may "present us spotless and blameless before the throne of his own glory with exceeding joy." It is also necessary to continue in all the duties of religion, following the Lord fully, and to grow in grace, even in the knowledge of Jesus Christ. Proceeding from glory to glory, by the Lord the Spirit. In prospect of dying, you ought to be frequently putting yourself in the Lord's hand, saying with David, "Into thy hand, I commend my spirit, O Jehovah, God of truth, for thou hast redeemed me. And at last in the act of dying, say with Stephen, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Them that sleep in Jesus, God will bring with him. "Blessed are the dead that die

in the Lord; they shall rest from their labours, and their works do follow them." If you consider no more of it than the groans of a gasping nature, pain and sickness, strong convulsions, that shake the whole frame at once, we cannot be too well laid in for it. But, besides that there may be fears within, there is an adversary that is taking his last pull at you; and who can bear up under such a double weight?" But Christ has said, Fear not, for I will bruise Satan under your feet shortly. And saith Asaph, "My flesh and my heart fail; but God is the strength" (rock) "of my heart, and my portion for ever." Let all your dependence be upon Christ, and be wholly devoted to him. "Whether you live, you live to the Lord, to the Lord's honour, to the Lord's glory; and whether you die, you die to the Lord, to the Lord's order, to the Lord's appointment, and whether living or dying, be concerned to be the Lord's, the Lord's subject, the Lord's servant; for unto this end, Christ both died and revived, that he might be the Lord both of the dead and of the living." That you may be enabled to proceed in this manner, pray earnestly for the assistance of the Spirit, particularly as the Spirit of faith, that you may "believe to the saving of the soul." "Through faith the elders obtained a good report." In this they had their testimony, they were noted down as believers. And they all died in the faith, according to the faith in which they lived; that is, in the profession of faith as a doctrine. And in the exercise of faith resting on the promises, looking to Jesus, as one that is able to save to the uttermost. This was the meaning of that cry, with which the martyr Stephen breathed out his soul, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." When we die in faith, it is carrying a promise to heaven, as the *earnest* of it; it is bringing down heaven to the promise, as the *substance* of it, pleading from the one for the other; using the one as *argument*, and the other as our *aim*: thus, when we "receive the end of our faith, it is the salvation of our souls." The last thing the believer doth on earth, is by faith, to look through the promise up to the Lamb in the midst of the throne, the first thing he enjoys above, is the possession of all his hopes. Thus faith is swallowed up in vision, and hope in fruition. Nay, faith doth not sometimes wait for the possession of heaven, but takes the sweetness without the enjoyment: as saith the apostle, "Whom having not seen ye love, in whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory." (Glorious.) How refreshing is this on a death-bed! especially when you consider that nature is *then* in its last agonies. No relief can be obtained from friends and physicians, food and medicine. Nay, conversation becomes impossible. What pity they take to themselves, takes nothing from us. "Every one must bear his own burden." Again; you cannot attend to the means of grace. Reading and hearing become impossible; and even prayer, is often like the chattering of a crane or a swallow. So it is difficult for the person at last, to groan out his desires to the Lord. Of what importance then is it to have an interest in Christ! and to hear him saying, as he did to Peter, "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not." Satan is then ending his trial; but, as was observed, Christ saith, "Fear not, I will bruise Satan under thy feet." [*Here a few sentences are illegible.*] Thus you see the necessity and advantage of being truly religious. They that live without God in

this world, it may be said of them, that they have "no hope." And if there be not a thorough change in their state, they are undone for ever. Thus dying under the guilt of sin, is tumbling into flames. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God, who, to sinners, is a consuming fire. "The wicked is driven away in his wickedness; but the righteous hath hope in his death." While you have any degree of health, strength, and capacity, search the scriptures. In them you have eternal life, and these are they that testify of Christ, as your alone, and all-sufficient Saviour. Make prayer your hope, and Christ your hold. Stick to the one for business, and to the other for refuge. Plead in his name, and leave your petitions in his hands. He presents the prayers of all his saints, perfumed with his incense. He is no common pleader. His interest is well grounded. The Father denies him nothing. Therefore, make room for joy and peace in believing. Praise God for the health, strength, and capacities you enjoy in your old age; and, in prospect of these failing you, solace yourself in the faith of a future happiness. When this earthly house of our tabernacle is dissolved, we have a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. When pain and agony have done their worst and last, believers shall enter into peace, rest in their beds, each one walking in his uprightness, with all security and composure. The days of their mourning shall be ended. All tears shall be wiped away from their eyes. And then nothing but pure gladness shall be left. I put this letter into your hands, and you into God's. Claiming a share in your prayers.

I remain, dear Madam, yours sincerely,

ROBERT LAING.

ART. VII.—LONDON ANNIVERSARIES.

British and Foreign Bible Society.

THE thirty-fifth anniversary of this institution was held May 1st, in Exeter Hall. The Rev. A. Brandram read the report. It noticed the general activity of popery, the spread of infidelity, the power of superstition, and the pertinacity of heathenism and false systems of religion; but notwithstanding all, there was a growing and almost universal desire among the people of all climes for the possession of the Scriptures. In reference to domestic matters, it stated that a ladies' association had been formed at Windsor, of which her majesty had consented to become the patroness; 125 new societies had been formed; making the number of affiliated institutions, 352 auxiliary societies, 327 branch societies, and 1,730 Bible associations—a total of 2,409. The issue of Bibles and Testaments was 648,068, being an increase of 63,670. The receipts of the society during the past year were 105,225*l.* 2*s.* 11*d.*, being an increase of 8,018*l.* 1*s.* The payments were 106,509*l.* 6*s.* 4*d.*, being an increase of 15,329*l.* 11*s.* 5*d.* Of that sum, 15,788*l.* 3*s.* accrued under the head of legacies. At the head of the list stood the name of George Hammond, Esq., who bequeathed to the society a legacy of 10,000*l.*, duty free; in addition to which, he had also left a fourth part of the residue of his property, which would, it was believed, amount to something very considerable.

The Church Missionary Society.

The thirty-ninth annual meeting was held, April 30th, in Exeter Hall. The Earl of Chichester occupied the chair, and the Rev. W. Jowett, the secretary, read the report. After detailing the condition of the different missions of the society, it stated that the expenditure of the last year had very far exceeded its income. Income, 71,306*l.* 19*s.* 8*d.*; expenditure 91,453*l.* 9*s.* 1*d.*, exceeding the income by no less a sum than 20,146*l.* 9*s.* 5*d.* The income of the preceding year had been 82,701*l.* 11*s.* 8*d.* The mission's expenditure exceeded its estimated amount by 9,465*l.* 19*s.* A very serious amount of expenditure in the West Indies had been occasioned by the solicitude of the committee to render the agency of the Society as effective as possible in the great crisis of the transition from a state of slavery to a state of freedom. No fewer than forty individuals, including females, had been sent out from the Society to the West Indies within the last five years.

The Baptist Missionary Society.

The forty-seventh anniversary meeting was held May 2d, in Finsbury chapel. W. B. Gurney, Esq., in the chair. The Rev. J. Dyer read the report. It stated that the dispensations of Divine Providence had continued to retard that increase of agency at Calcutta which the varied and extending operations in progress in and around that city so much required. The translation of the Scriptures into various languages was steadily advancing. The labours of the missionaries in other parts of the East Indies had been greatly blessed. The schools were well attended. In the West Indies, amidst all the scenes of secular excitement which had recently occurred, the work of God continued to advance in a very encouraging degree. A nett increase of 2,617 had taken place in the number of members, which is now 21,337. The inquirers were scarcely less numerous, amounting to 20,919. A large increase was also reported in the number of pupils receiving instruction in the schools in connexion with the mission. The day schools contained 5,413, the evening schools 577, and 10,127 were taught on the Sabbath, making a total of 16,117, being 5,214 beyond the number last reported. The missionaries had also solemnized 1,942 marriages among the negroes during the last year. Since the last annual meeting four missionaries had embarked for the East.

The receipts applicable to the general purposes of the mission, which formed the actual criterion of its financial progress, had been 16,223*l.* 10*s.* 11*d.*, being an advance of about 4,000*l.* on the amount reported at the last anniversary. If to this sum were added what has been received for translations, schools, and other minor objects, including contributions for sending new missionaries to India, and towards the removal of the debt, it would form an aggregate of 22,411*l.* 4*s.* 6*d.*, an amount considerably beyond the income of any previous year. At the commencement of the year the Society was burdened with a debt of nearly 4,000*l.*; that amount was subsequently lessened by donations for that especial purpose, to 2,673*l.*

The Wesleyan Missionary Society.

The annual meeting of this Society was held in Exeter Hall, April 29th, J. P. Plumptre, Esq., M. P., in the chair. The Rev. John Beecham read an abstract of the committee's report, presenting a view of the Society's operations in every part of the globe. In Ireland there are twenty-three missionaries and thirty-four schools. In the capital of Sweden the labours of the Rev. Mr. Scott continue to be crowned with success. The royal sanction had at length been obtained for the proposed chapel now in course of erection. The successful operations of the society in Ceylon and Continental India, were next adverted to; and the committee expressed their gratitude to the friends of the society, for their efforts to effect the withdrawal of the government sanction to East Indian idolatry. A new mission, under favourable auspices, had been established among the aborigines of Australia. The committee adverted, with thankfulness, to the failure of the attempts made in parliament to reduce New Zealand "to the condition of a British colony, on the plans and principles of the New Zealand Association." In the Friendly Islands there are 7,716 members in society, 7,555 children in schools, and upwards of 1,200 converted natives, teachers in schools, chiefly gratuitous. In Fejee there are already 213 converted natives, members in society, besides 84 on trial. The report then gave, in succession, interesting accounts of the missions in Southern and Western Africa, and in the West Indies. The following is a general summary:

The principal or central stations occupied by the society, in the various parts of the world, are about 215. The missionaries are 341, besides catechists, local preachers, assistants, superintendents of schools, schoolmasters and mistresses, artisans, &c., of whom about 300 are employed at a moderate salary, and 3,336 afford their services gratuitously. The total number of communicants on the mission stations, according to the last return, is 66,808, being an increase of 801 on the number reported last year. This total does not include the number under the care of the missionaries in Ireland. The number of the scholars in the mission schools is upwards of 50,000. Forty-three persons have been sent out since the last anniversary, and twelve have returned. Six missionaries have died, and eleven wives. The total income of the year, including that which was casual and occasional, may be stated at 84,218*l.*, and the total expenditure at 100,077*l.*

The Religious Tract Society.

The fortieth annual meeting of this institution was held, May 3d, in Exeter Hall. The Chairman, Samuel Hoare, Esq., in introducing the business of the evening, stated that the society had already been the means of circulating 288,000,000 publications. The Report referred to the operations of the institution in Japan, China, Penang, Singapore, Java, Burmah, India, Australia, Africa, America, the West Indies, and various countries in Europe. In the West Indies, as education increases among the negroes, the publications of the society are eagerly purchased and attentively

read: "The Pilgrim's Progress" is an especial favourite. The grants made during the year to missionaries of all Protestant denominations, to clergymen and others in the islands, amounted to upwards of 120,000 tracts and children's books, and several libraries. The reduction of one-sixth in the price of the Society's tracts has been an acceptable measure to its numerous friends, and has led to an increase in the sales during the past year of 1,333,787. Thirty-two circulating libraries, and 367,347 tracts had been granted to Ireland. Grants of tracts to the extent of upwards of 1,800,000 had been made for British emigrants, soldiers, sailors, foreigners in England, prisons, hospitals, railwaymen, Sabbath day circulation, fairs, races, &c. The publications circulated during the year amount to 18,042,539, being an increase on the preceding year of 2,102,972. The total benevolent income of the year was 5,482*l.* 6*s.* 2*d.*; the grants of publications, paper, and money, amounted to 7,740*l.* 4*s.* 3*d.*, being 2,257*l.* 18*s.* 1*d.* beyond such benevolent income. The sales had been 50,447*l.* 1*s.* 4*d.*, and the total income of the institution 62,219*l.* 7*s.* 3*d.*, being an increase of 164*l.* 18*s.* 1*d.*

Sunday School Union.

The thirty-sixth annual meeting of this important institution was held in Exeter Hall, May 2d, Mr. Sheriff Wood in the chair. The report stated, that from the West Indies the most gratifying accounts had been received. The coming of freedom had been welcomed with holy joy by the negro population. Their conduct, notwithstanding the provocations they had received, was beyond all praise. The negro desired and was striving to attain to the full height of man—morally, intellectually, and spiritually. The demand for books, for schools, for religious instruction, was beyond all precedent. The domestic proceedings of the committee during the past year had been numerous and varied in their character. Sixteen grants had been made in aid of the expense of erecting school-rooms, making the total number of grants up to the present time 152, amounting to 3,389*l.* The number of Sunday School lending libraries granted this year, had been 106, making a total of 471. The sales at the depository during the past year amounted to 8,914*l.* 12*s.* 7½*d.* The donations had fallen short of the preceding year. The report then referred to the efforts of the committee in preventing the desecration of the Lord's day by petitioning Parliament against the opening of the Post Office on the Sabbath. The total receipts of the society were 2,018*l.* 3*s.* 2*d.*; the expenditure 1,319*l.* 10*s.* 4*d.*, leaving a balance in hand of 698*l.* 12*s.* 10*d.*

British and Foreign School Society.

The thirty-fifth anniversary meeting was held in Exeter Hall, May 6th, Viscount Morpeth in the chair. The receipts were 5,234*l.*, and the payments 5,205*l.*

Christian Instruction Society.

The fourteenth annual meeting was held in Finsbury chapel, April 30th. C. Hindley, Esq., M. P., presided, and powerfully

advocated its claims. The Rev. J. Blackburn read the report, from which it appears that there were in London and the vicinity 97 associations, 2,028 visitors, 116 preaching and prayer stations, and 53,370 families visited; being an increase, during the past year, of 10 associations, 128 visitors, 2,731 families, or 11,655 individuals. Closely connected with this system of visitation was the establishment of cottage lectures and prayer meetings in the immediate neighbourhoods of the poor; 116 such stations were at present occupied, at which more than 10,000 religious services were held during the past year. Besides the voluntary services of more than 2,000 visitors, the society had twelve missionaries employed in connexion with associations.

The expenditure of the society during the past year had been 1,444*l.* 0*s.* 6*d.*, and the receipts were 1,358*l.* 10*s.* 10*d.*, leaving a balance due the treasurer of 85*l.* 9*s.* 8*d.*

British and Foreign Sailor's Society.

The sixth annual meeting of this institution was held May 6th, in Finsbury chapel. Lord Mountstandford occupied the chair. The Rev. R. Ferguson read the Report, which stated that every department of the Society's operations had succeeded beyond their most sanguine expectations. A powerful feeling had been extensively awakened, both in the metropolis, and throughout the country, in favour of the sailor's cause. That might be inferred from the improved state of the financial account. Last year the receipts, including the sale of 300*l.* stock, were 1,835*l.* 19*s.* 8*d.*; this year, including the sale of 450*l.* stock, they amounted to 2,596*l.* 15*s.* 6*d.*; exhibiting an actual increase of nearly 600*l.* It appeared that in the prosecution of their duties the two Thames missionaries had boarded 7,915 vessels in the river, and 1,100 in the docks and canals. They had conducted nearly 350 services afloat, and had obtained 791 ships for agents—visited the shipping at Gravesend, Northfleet, and Greenhithe—had circulated about 150,000 tracts and books.

Colonial Missionary Society.

The third annual meeting was held May 10th. J. R. Mills, Esq., the treasurer of the society, occupied the chair. The Rev. A. Wells, the secretary, read the Report, from which it appeared that five brethren had been sent out during the past year to labour in Canada and South Australia. The total number of missionaries employed by the society was sixteen in Canada, and three in Australia.

The receipts of the society for the year were 2,356*l.* 6*s.* 6½*d.*; the expenditure amounted to 3,170*l.* 11*s.* ½*d.*; thus leaving a balance against the society of 760*l.* 17*s.* The society would require, in order to meet its present engagements, an income of from 3,500*l.* to 4,000*l.* per annum.

Baptist Union.

The twenty-seventh anniversary meeting was held May 1. The Rev. T. Swan, of Birmingham, in the chair. The Rev. S. Belcher

read the Report, from which it appeared, that there are somewhat more than 1,500 Baptist churches in Great Britain, of which 935 are united in 37 local associations; that in the twelve months preceding the date of the last returns there were baptized in 804 of these churches 5,400 persons; that 937 were received from other churches; and that 625 had been restored. It farther appeared, that 1,359 had died; that 1077 had been dismissed, that 178 had withdrawn; and that 1,066 had been excluded. The clear increase of members in 786 churches during the past year was 3,206; and the number of members in 681 of the associated churches is 69,864. Seventeen ministers had been removed by death; and 113 had been reported as newly ordained, or recognised as pastors of different churches. There had also been 25 new churches formed during the year.

Home Missionary Society.

The twentieth anniversary meeting was held May 14. The chair was occupied by Thomas Thompson, Esq., the treasurer of the society. An abstract of the Report was read by the Rev. E. A. Dunn. It stated that the society had at present under its patronage one hundred and ten agents, including ministers who were assisted with grants, to enable them to extend their labours among the villages in their several districts. These agents had above sixty thousand hearers, and were labouring among a population of 600,000, many of whom were yet unprovided with evangelical instruction. There were also connected with the stations 230 Sunday-schools, containing nearly 8,500 children, supplied by 540 gratuitous teachers.

The receipts of the society during the past year amounted to 7,909*l.*; the expenditure to 6,605*l.*; leaving a balance in hand of 1,304*l.*

London City Mission.

This society held their fourth anniversary meeting in Exeter Hall May 13. The chair was filled by Mr. Sheriff Wood. The Rev. R. Ainslie read the Report. The number of houses now accessible to the visiters was 121,000, which calculating two families to each house, and four persons to each family, made a gross accessible population of about a million persons, an immense portion of which mass was either totally neglected, or very inadequately visited. In the north-west of London were 4,423 visitable houses, with but two missionaries; in the north, 8,884 houses, and five missionaries; in the north-east, 20,994 houses, and nine missionaries; in the west, 16,577 houses, and six missionaries; in the central division north of the river, 19,416 houses, and sixteen missionaries; in that south of the river, 14,718 houses, and only two missionaries; in the east, 18,036 houses, and only four missionaries; in the south-west, the south, and south-east, chiefly suburban districts, and therefore more thinly inhabited, there were 18,032 houses, and four missionaries. The totals were fifty missionaries, including the two superintendents, to 121,000 accessible houses, containing about 1,000,000 of persons, or half the population of

the metropolis. The state of the funds had enabled the Committee to add eight new missionaries. When the Committee advertised lately for three missionaries, they had not less than forty applicants; yet their agents were not men who had entered on the work merely for a morsel of bread, many of them having been in the habit of receiving larger incomes from their former avocations. 186,515 visits had been paid during the year, of which 23,896 were to the sick and dying, making a total from the beginning of 658,133 visits, 82,099 being to the afflicted and dying. 223,656 tracts were distributed in the past year, making 815,210 since the establishment of the mission. 5,080 prayer-meetings had been held in lodging-houses, houses of refuge for the destitute, work-houses, and other places, situated in the most wretched and neglected neighbourhoods, making a total of 16,079 prayer-meetings from the first. Through the aid of the Bible Society, 36,964 copies of the New Testament and Psalter had been distributed amongst the poor, making a total of 39,038 copies of the Scriptures from the commencement. The receipts for the year were 4,820*l.* 8*s.* 5*d.*, being an increase over the former year of 932*l.* 12*s.* ½*d.* The Report, in conclusion, noticed the extraordinary efforts of Popery and Infidelity to establish themselves in the present day, as calling for renewed exertion from Christians.

London Hibernian Society.

This society held its thirty-third anniversary meeting in Exeter Hall, May 4th. The Marquis of Cholmondeley presided. The Rev. S. Ramsey read the Report. It stated that the Society was now in a more flourishing condition than it had ever been before. The total receipts for the year were 11,702*l.* 8*s.* 8½*d.*, an increase of upwards of 1,700*l.* The increase of schools since last year had been only from 1,143 to 1,157; but there were 5,539 more scholars this year than last, the total number being 91,074; the average attendance in each school was greater, and of the additional number more than half were Roman Catholics, 2,715 being Protestants, and 2,786 Roman Catholics. The schools opened on Sundays during the past year were 816, containing 45,000 scholars; 550 were exclusively Sunday-schools, and 18,224 exclusively Sunday-scholars. There are 511 adult schools; 7,779 Irish schools. The grand totals are, of day-schools, 1,157; of scholars, 91,074; of Roman Catholics, 34,068; of Protestants, 57,006; of Sunday and adult schools, 1,084; of scholars in them, 26,048. Total number of schools, 2,241; of scholars, 117,122. During the past year 49 Scripture-readers had been employed, 30 of whom were also teachers of schools.

Naval and Military Bible Society.

The fifty-ninth anniversary meeting was held May 7th. The Marquis of Cholmondeley in the chair. The Report was read by Lieut. Colonel Le Blanc. 12,553 Bibles and Testaments had been distributed during the past year; and 344,186 from the formation of the Society. The receipts had amounted to 2,804*l.* 0*s.* 3*d.*, the expenditure to 2,822*l.* 15*s.* 6*d.*

Prayer Book and Homily Society.

The twenty-seventh anniversary meeting was held May 2d. The Right Hon. Lord Bexley, President of the Society, in the chair. The grand total of the issue of books by the Society was 365,972 copies, besides 2,226,337 tracts. The total revenue for the past year was 2,532*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.*, and the expenditure 2,538*l.* 11*s.* 3*d.*; leaving a balance due to the treasurer.

Home and Colonial Infant School Society.

The third anniversary meeting of this society was held on Friday, March 23, at the Hanover Square rooms; the Earl of Chichester in the chair.

Receipts of the year, 1,750*l.* Payments, 1,730*l.* The institution has accommodation for 32 teachers: 260 have been trained and sent out, from the beginning; of whom, 140 were members of the Established Church. About 200 children are now in the Model School.

Newfoundland, &c. School Society.

The sixteenth anniversary meeting was held on Friday, April 26, in the lower room, Exeter Hall; Lord Bexley, president, in the chair.

Receipts, 3,103*l.* 13*s.* 2*d.*; of which the sum of 1,055*l.* 6*s.* was contributed in Newfoundland. Payments, 3,475*l.* 1*s.* 11*d.* Schools: 39 daily, 41 Sunday, and 15 adult evening—scholars, 3,061.

In connexion with most of the schools, the society has established a Loan Library. It has put into circulation, through the liberal grants of the Bible, Prayer-Book, and Homily, and Religious Tract Societies, many thousands of Bible and Prayer-Books, and hundreds of thousands of other religious publications. Its teachers, besides their primary duty in the school, have acted as catechists—visiting the sick, distributing tracts, and conducting, under ecclesiastical authority, public service in settlements where there would otherwise have been no means of grace on the Lord's day.

The society has now extended its operations to the Canadas. It has commenced one school at Sherbrook, in Lower Canada; and is about to send out more teachers.

Church of Scotland Missions.

The sixth London anniversary meeting was held on Wednesday, May 1, in Exeter Hall; Hon. Fox Maule, M. P., in the chair.

Receipts of the year by the London Association, about 560*l.* The income of the General Assembly's committee is nearly 6000*l.* per annum.

British Reformation Society.

The meeting of this society was held on Thursday, May 2, in Exeter Hall; George Finch, Esq., chairman.

Receipts, 1,293*l.* 0*s.* 4*d.* Payments, 1,163*l.* 6*s.* 7*d.* Among the speakers at the meeting was the Bishop of Vermont.

Jews' Society.

The thirty-first anniversary meeting was held on Friday, May 3, in Exeter Hall; the president, Sir Thomas Baring, Bart., in the chair.

The receipts of the year were 16,720*l.*, and the payments, 17,264*l.*

London Missionary Society.

Sir Culling Eardley Smith took the chair at the annual meeting of this society, on the 9th of May, in Exeter Hall.

The following is the number of missionary stations and out-stations belonging to the society in different parts of the world, missionaries labouring at the same, &c. &c.

	Stations and Out-stations.	Missrs.	Assistants, Natives, &c.
South Seas	138	30	130
Ultra Ganges	5	9	4
East Indies	316	63	219
Russia	2	2	2
Mediterranean	1	1	—
South Africa, and African Islands	50	31	33
West Indies	41	19	20
	553	155	408

The Directors had sent forth, during the past year, to various parts of the world, missionaries with their families, amounting, exclusive of their children, to 30 individuals.

The number of churches was 101, communicants 6,287, and scholars 41,792; being an increase on the year 1838, of 8 churches, 940 communicants, 4,818 scholars.

In relation to the funds, the directors had to report, that the amount of legacies received during the year had been 6,455*l.* 2*s.*; the contributions for the ordinary and special objects of the society had been 59,045*l.* 8*s.* 5*d.*; making, with the legacies, a total of 65,490*l.* 10*s.* 5*d.* The expenditure of the year had been 75,855*l.* 17*s.* 11*d.*, being an excess beyond the income of the past year of 10,365*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Lord's Day Observance Society.

The eighth anniversary meeting was held on Monday, May 6th, in Freemason's Hall; Bishop of London, president, in the chair.

Among the resolutions adopted at the meeting was the following:

That this society, with reference to the recent proposal of commencing business at the London Post Office on the Lord's day, records its thankfulness to Almighty God, that not only the proposal should have been rejected by the inhabitants of London, but that it should have proved a means of exciting in many places a strong desire that the national desecration of the Lord's day by the running of the mail, and the receiving and delivering of letters on this day

throughout the country, should be wholly discontinued; and this meeting, considering it to be the duty of a Christian government to promote the glory of God and the best interests of the community by providing for the due observance of the Lord's day, commends the adoption of such measures as shall be best calculated to suppress the above, as well as every other public and outward desecration of the Lord's day.

The receipts of the society for the year were 522*l.*, and the expenditures for paper, printing, salaries, advertising, use of Exeter Hall, &c., 471*l.*

Trinitarian Bible Society.

The eighth anniversary meeting was held on Monday, May 6, in the lower room, Exeter Hall; Hon. Capt. F. V. Harcourt, R. N., in the chair.

The income of the society from sale of the Scriptures was 1,731*l.* and from subscriptions, &c., 1,328*l.*; total receipts, 3,059*l.*; the issues of the year were, Bibles, 7,264; Testaments, 4,902; Hebrew Old Testaments, 9.

Church Pastoral Aid Society.

The fourth anniversary meeting was held on Tuesday, May 7, in Exeter Hall; Rt. Hon. Lord Ashley, M. P., president, in the chair.

The receipts of the society for the year were 10,423*l.*, and the expenditures, 9,727*l.* From the date of its institution, on the 3d of February, 1836, it has voted, in all, 267 grants to the incumbents of 219 parishes or districts, having a population of 1,588,468 souls.

The new grants, during the past year, amount to 8,039*l.*; and have been made for the maintenance of 80 additional curates and 8 lay-assistants, and 8 for miscellaneous aid, and to 87 incumbents of parishes having a population of 557,773 under their charge. The total existing grants of the society amount to 16,712*l.* per annum, to 194 incumbents of parishes and districts with a population of 1,460,113; in whose spiritual care, before the aid of this society, only 212 clergymen were engaged. The average income of the incumbents is 155*l.*; and 96 have not parsonage houses. The average population to each is nearly 8,000 souls, varying from 1,500 to 30,000. Besides the amount of the society's aid, the incumbents have themselves, chiefly from personal resources, guaranteed the sum of 3,483*l.*, to meet the grants; so that when all are in operation, a sum of 20,045*l.*, will be made available, for the maintenance of 188 more clergymen, and 29 lay-assistants for this population of 1,460,113. There are now engaged in their important labours, 115 curates and 26 lay-assistants, and the grants on their account amount to 10,337*l.* per annum.

Besides the above mentioned grants for curates, &c., 18, amounting to 1,001*l.*, have been made toward the finishing or fitting up as many new chapels or school rooms, to be licensed for public worship, in hamlets or townships distant from the parish churches, containing a population of 79,000 souls.

European Missionary Society.

The twenty-first anniversary meeting was held Saturday, May 11, in the lower-room Exeter Hall; Hon. Captain F. V. Harcourt, R. N., in the chair. The receipts for the year were 1,390*l.*, and the payments, 1,753*l.*

This is the *ONLY* Society in England which considers the religious state of the entire continent to be the object of its labours; any other Society which exists, being but of a local character. The society has at present twenty-one agents employed. Three of these agents are in Belgium, a new sphere of the Society's labours, from which the most gratifying accounts of the increasing influence of the gospel are frequently received. Through the instrumentality of the ministers and colporteurs engaged by this Society, numberless copies of the Scriptures have been put into circulation; and many congregations have been collected, principally from among the lower classes of society; and hundreds of persons, formerly in communion with the Church of Rome, are found among them.

Sailors' Home, Sailors' Asylum, and Episcopal Floating Church Society.

The conjoint anniversary meeting of these societies was held on Tuesday, May 14, at Hanover Square rooms; Admiral Hawker in the chair.

From the report it appeared that 1,342 men passed through the institution called the *Sailors' Home*, in the course of the year; making a total, in four years, of 4,135. The receipts, including 1,691*l.*, paid by the seamen, amounted to 3,968*l.* 8*s.* 9*d.*; and the payments to 4,225*l.* 8*s.* 10*d.*

The sailors relieved at the *Sailors' Asylum* in the year amounted to 1,151; making a total since the opening, of 13,820; besides whom, many shipwrecked sailors had been relieved, clothed, and sent home, at the expense of the asylum. The receipts amounted to 1,024*l.* 7*s.* 2*d.*; and the payments to 1,084*l.* 2*s.* 4*d.*

To the *Floating Church*, the Queen has not only renewed the annual subscription of 50*l.*, granted during the last two reigns, but has commanded that her Majesty's name shall be used as patroness of the society. The receipts were 240*l.* 4*s.* 3*d.*, and the payments 269*l.* 3*s.* 3*d.*

Irish Society of London.

This is a branch of the Irish Society of Dublin, and its seventeenth anniversary meeting was held on Wednesday, May 15, at Hanover Square rooms; the Earl of Galloway, president, in the chair. The receipts of the year were 5,020*l.*

British and Foreign Temperance Society.

The eighth anniversary meeting was held on Tuesday, May, 21, at Hanover Square rooms; the Lord Bishop of London, president, in the chair.

From the report we derive the following statements:

During the year ending 5th January, 1838, duty was paid on 28,943,103 gallons of distilled spirits at proof, for home consumption, for England, Scotland and Ireland. Upwards of 57,000 public houses and 47,000 beer and cider shops were licensed in England and Wales; which, together with a multitude of other incitements to intemperance, were in active operation. The levy for poor rate amounted 4,044,741*l.*; 26,885 prisoners were charged with criminal offences; and upwards of 290,000 persons were relieved by the Hospitals, Infirmaries, and Dispensaries of London, a very large proportion of whom required this aid in consequence of their use of distilled spirits.

ART. VIII.—*Letter from Messrs. Strang and Russell.*

WE cheerfully give place to the following letter. If, as appears from the letter, the accuracy of which we have no reason to doubt, the Synod entertained the complaint in question, without sufficient evidence of the complainant's legal right to be heard, it certainly was a remarkable oversight, and a palpable violation of order, which is properly characterized in the letter, and which no doubt will be promptly corrected at the next meeting. The Synod at its recent meeting took several commendable steps to protect itself from the informal complaints and petitions of persons having no claim to be heard; but it appears from this letter, that the work of reform was not sufficiently thorough. Were the disorderly permitted to treat with contempt the inferior judicatories, or come over their heads into the supreme judicature of the church, it would effectually destroy the exercise of discipline. And we are not without apprehension that the Synod has in some way been imposed upon in this matter. The investigation will, no doubt, bring the whole truth to light. And in the mean time, as our readers have now heard both the complaint and reply, the matter must rest, so far as the Monitor is concerned, till investigated by the Synod.

Reverend Sir—You have been pleased to lay open your pages to the “lovers of truth and good order.” We sincerely avow ourselves of the number of such lovers, and therefore beg that you will allow us to state, on a page of the Monitor, that it appears to us, from the MINUTES OF SYNOD, that truth has been violated and good order lost sight of, if not trampled under foot, at last meeting of Synod, in relation to the Presbytery of Stamford. We declare, most solemnly, that no person in communion with the Associate church within the bounds of Presbytery, no person free from gross scandal known to us, no person not well known to the Presbytery and to others as a malicious person, has ever attempted to lay any charge against the Associate Session of Dumfries, or against any session under the inspection of Stamford Presbytery. Whether, then, gross imposition has not been practised, whether there has not been treachery in the camp, and leprosy admitted, our brethren who know us will judge. Synod will no doubt be sufficiently able, and willing as able, to find out those, and to deal with them as they deserve, who have sought, as it appears, to involve the dignity of

Synod and the reputation of Stamford Presbytery in the same common ruin. Saying so, we wait our time, and are most respectfully yours,

JAMES STRANG,
JOHN RUSSELL.

ART. IX.—*Remarkable Religious Movement in Bengal.*

THE London Missionary Register for June, 1839, contains an interesting account of a remarkable religious movement among the Hindoos in the vicinity of Kishnaghur, one of the stations of the Church Missionary Society, on the Jelingha, a branch of the Hoogly, about seventy miles north of Calcutta.

February 8, 1839, I left Calcutta, in company with a native friend, the Rev. K. M. Banerjea, for Kishnaghur. We arrived there on Saturday morning, the 9th. I was most kindly received by R. P. Nisbett, Esq., the Civil and Session Judge. As we could not go out to the villages before Monday, I endeavoured to obtain from Mr. Deerr as full an account as possible of the work which had brought me up. I received from him the following particulars.

I. *Number of Inquirers.*

There are not less than fifty-five villages, containing, among them, upward of five hundred families, who are convinced of their lost state as sinners, believe that the gospel of Christ provides the only means of salvation, and are ready and anxious to be baptized into that faith. These families average about six in a family; so that there are not less than three thousand souls seeking admission into the Christian fold.

II. *Origin and commencement of the work.*

He had heard, in the beginning of 1835, of a persecution against a sect composed partly of Mussulmans and partly of Hindoos. This sect was called "Kurta Bhoja," Worshipers of the Creator. They are derived from the sect of the Dervish among the Mahomedans; but have adopted, in addition, some articles of the Christian faith. In speaking upon the Christian religion, he did not think there was much impression made; but he left them some copies of the gospels, and determined to visit them again. He renewed his visit in the beginning of 1836. They received him more cordially, listened to him more attentively, and an impression was evidently made, favourable to the truth. After several visits of a similar nature, he asked to have public worship among them. They agreed, but with considerable reluctance, as they were afraid of increasing persecution. After dinner, the inquirers assembled for worship, and many of the heathen joined them. They showed, however, great fear and timidity. The missionary asked them, one by one, "Are you afraid to pray?" They replied, "No, we are not afraid." He then said, "Let us pray;" the inquirers immediately fell upon their faces. The heathen were startled at this, as they considered the very act of prayer with Christians an avowal of Christianity. Hence, all these inquirers were, from this time, considered as out of the pale of heathenism; their caste was gone, and they were looked upon as the followers of Jesus Christ. They were put under Christian instruction, and, a few months after, were baptized. A most rigid persecution was now commenced against them. Their wives and children were taken from them by their heathen relatives, and only restored by an order from the magistrate.

In 1838, the leading men in ten villages belonging to the Kurta-Bhoja sect avowed their belief in the gospel, and, after instruction, were baptized into the faith of Christ. They straightway confessed him before the heathen, and established public worship in their villages. This created great excitement and curiosity among their relatives and connexions. They attended the worship, to know what it all meant; more violent opposition and persecution were the result, and every one that attended the worship was considered a Christian.

In only one instance he has found that an individual professed himself a Christian from fear, and not from principle. This the man has since confessed. His father-in-law had become a Christian. He visited him, to talk with him on the subject. He was considered, for this act, a Christian, and cast out by his neighbours on his return. He has, however, since given good-hope.

Here is his statement of the origin and progress of the work. It appears natural, and what we should have expected. We hope it is of God; but we would speak with caution, and wait to see farther.

III. *The Present State of the Work.*

Mr. Deerr thinks, that out of the five hundred families who are candidates for baptism, two hundred of them are prepared for the holy sacrament; that is, about

twelve hundred individuals. I proceeded to ask the following questions regarding them.

1. Do you think that there is any secular motive which has influenced them in seeking to become Christians?

He thinks there may be, in some instances, a little; but nothing more than the religion itself must indirectly present. It teaches love and sympathy, and to render assistance to one another in want, &c. This is the whole of temporal motive that he can possibly imagine. It is a religion of love. Many of the people at present are in distress; they were not so when they first offered themselves as candidates for baptism. This distress has been occasioned by an inundation, which has destroyed the crops throughout the district. The villages were all under water. Relief was sent to the suffering Christians, many of whom had had no food for days.

2. Have the two hundred families, or the adult part of the twelve hundred individuals, whom you think fit for baptism, an adequate knowledge of Christianity?

Their knowledge is not very enlarged, but he considers that it is sufficient for candidates for baptism. They know the elements of the truth; for instance, that they are sinners: that, as sinners, they are subject to wrath: that God, in mercy, has provided salvation through his Son: that he who repents and believes on Christ shall obtain salvation: that it is the Holy Spirit alone who can make them see and feel their sins, and lead them to rest on Christ for the forgiveness of them: that there will be a resurrection of the dead, and a judgment of all men: that the righteous shall be saved, the wicked lost for ever, &c. &c. They can repeat the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments.

3. Are they willing to forsake all for Christ, to give up their heathen habits, and to lead a life of self-denial?

They have already given proof of this, in what they have had to suffer: they expect persecution, and are prepared for it: they entirely renounce idolatry, and every custom and habit which the gospel prohibits. In a word, they are desirous of putting themselves under the Christian pastor, and attending to his godly direction in all things.

4. What is the present state of their temporal circumstances?

The majority of them, in common with all in the district, Christian and heathen, along the Jellingha river, are in the most destitute condition—their poverty inconceivable. The inundation has entirely destroyed the crops. The second is coming, but they have little to hope for before March.

5. How are the spiritual wants of these people to be supplied, should they be admitted into the church?

(1.) There are, Mr. Deerr, and Mr. Alexander, a European catechist, who has lately been sent to assist in the mission.

(2.) Two native catechists, Paul and Ramdhun. These are of great importance, in reading the prayers and Scriptures, expounding, catechising, &c.

(3.) There are six readers. Their duty is simply to read the Scriptures and catechise, to read tracts, &c. They have been taken chiefly from the villages, are conversant with the manners of the people, &c. and are very useful in their places.

(4.) The English schoolmaster at Kishnaghur, Moodha Shoodun. He was partly educated at Bishop's College. Besides his duties at the English school, he renders aid in visiting the villages and reading the service, &c.

Saturday evening, Feb. 9, 1839.—After a pleasant Sabbath day at Kishnaghur, on which I preached twice to the residents, and administered the holy sacrament of the Lord's supper, we set off to visit the village, and to judge how far we could concur with our friend, Mr. Deerr, that the work was of God.

We first went to Anunda Bas, a large village about ten coss from Kishnaghur. At this village there were about sixty families seeking Christian baptism. I then arrived there about twelve o'clock. Arrangements for service were made. I then addressed them, Krishna Mohana Banerjea interpreting for me. I expressed to them how thankful I felt that theirs was the first village which we had visited; that I hoped its name was a token for good, and that if they became sincere Christians, real believers in Jesus Christ, it would truly be "Anunda Bas," that is, the "Village of Joy;" for Christianity was the religion of happiness and joy. But as no good could be expected without the divine blessing, before proceeding farther, I requested them to join in earnest prayer for that blessing, and that they might have the Spirit of God to teach them. Mr. Sandys then offered up the sacrifice of prayer and thanksgiving; and never did I see a greater apparent seriousness. The poor people, prostrate on their faces, made their responses in the most solemn and audible manner. Mr. Deerr next gave them an affectionate and earnest address upon the necessity of feeling their state as sinners, of believing in Christ, of renouncing their old habits, and of obedience to the Son of God. His subject was, *As many of you as were baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.* We then proceeded to the most important part, the examination of the candidates for baptism. They were question-

ed as to their knowledge of their own state and condition—of their responsibility to God—of the character of God—of Jesus Christ—of the way of salvation—of the obligation into which they were about to enter, and especially in reference to their motives, their expectations, and their future habits. On these and other topics they gave as satisfactory answers as could have been expected: it rather exceeded, than came short of what we had looked for.

(Signed)

T. DEALTRY,

Archdeacon of Calcutta.

Old Church Parsonage, Feb. 15, 1839.

ART. X.—*New Publication.*

“Biographical Sketches and Sermons of some of the first ministers of the Associate Church in America. To which is prefixed, an 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 Presbyterian Congregation of Argyle, New York. Albany: 1839.”

We have read this work with much interest. Its perusal has increased our attachment to the profession we have made; it has convinced us that the fathers of the Secession in the United States were willing to make any sacrifice rather than their principles, and that the difficulties with which we have recently been compelled to maintain our ground are no new thing in the church. It throws much light upon the double dealing which brought the *Associate Reformed Synods* into existence. We cannot promote the circulation of this book better than merely to lay its contents before the reader.

CONTENTS.—The first Petition for Supply of Preaching—The Mission of Messrs. Gellatly and Arnot—Their constituting themselves into a Presbytery—New Castle Presbytery's Warning—Results favourably to the cause of the Missionaries—Mr. Arnot returns—Death of Mr. Gellatly—Messrs. Proudfit, Henderson and Mason sent over by the Associate Synod—The admission of and union with some Burgher Ministers—Disapproved of by the Synod in Scotland—Arrival of Messrs. Smith and Rodger—Union with the Burgher brethren dissolved—Proposed union with the Synod of New York and Philadelphia—Division of the Presbytery—Union proposed between the Reformed Presbytery and the Associate Presbytery—Conference on the subject at Donegal, in 1777—And at Pequa, in 1778—Mr. Murray's Overture—Presbytery and Conference at Middle Octorara—Diversity of opinion on the subjects discussed—Propositions drawn up for future consideration—Meeting of Presbytery at Big Spring, at which other propositions were drawn up—And to which a representation and petition were sent, expressing dissatisfaction with the Union—Conference at Pequa, June, 1779—Mr. Linn's sentiments—Attempt to compromise the difference of sentiment—Case of Mr. Rodger—Andrew Patten—James Martin—Ultimatum drawn up by Messrs. Smith and Marshall—Answer, from the Reformed Presbytery—Union apparently abandoned—Revival of the Union—Terms drawn and agreed upon by some members privately—Subject again introduced into Presbytery—Basis proposed—Objections stated—Union closed by the casting vote of the Moderator—Protest of Messrs. Marshall, Clarkson and others—Remarks on the Union—The Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania continued—The organization of the Associate Reformed Synod—Remarks—Notices of those who voted for and acceded to the Union—Proposal for re-union—Mr. Annan's Ruling Elder—Low state of the Presbytery—Application to the Synod in Scotland for more help—Arrival of Mr. Anderson—of Mr. Beveridge—Narrative and Testimony—Unanimity of the Members—Revival of the Secession cause in the State of New York. Return of Mr. Henderson—Extension of the Presbytery—The Secession cause spreads in western Pennsylvania—In Vermont—In Kentucky—In Tennessee—In the Carolinas and Virginia—The appointment of a Professor—The first student licensed—Public Covenanting in New York—Act on Covenanting—On occasional communion—The Synod constituted—Reflections. Also, Biographical Sketches of and Sermons by the

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR;

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

SEPTEMBER, 1839.

ART. I.—*Strictures on the Articles of A. R.*

[Concluded from p. 145.]

A. R. seems to think that "voluntary servitude is a strange conception, and makes men no servants at all, the obligations being mutual and reciprocal between the parties contracting, one engaging to do one thing, and another engaging to do another thing." Now we think this is wherein its great beauty lies. This is the very principle that Christ laid down among his followers, that he that wanted authority must be servant of all. Let him be useful to his fellow man. A man employing persons on this principle, paying them for their services, may be called their servant, as he is bound to give them an equivalent for their labour, which equivalent does them a service, and by this means, might bring down on his head the blessing of many who were ready to perish. Slavery is neither expedient nor necessary in any case whatever, nor has it any beneficial results to any part of God's creation. It is a curse to both master and slave. If we look into Leviticus xxv. 47, we will find there a Hebrew selling himself to the stranger who sojourned with him. Here is voluntary servitude. All Jews that were reduced to servitude may be said to be voluntary, except what the circumstances of the case imposed. It was voluntary servitude with the man who had his ears bored. The same sentiment is held out in Job xl. 4. The Almighty, speaking of the leviathan, says, "Will he make a covenant with thee, wilt thou take him as a servant for ever?"

Now we think it clearly evident that the contracts between the Jews and their heathen neighbours were of the same character, namely, voluntary; they were to buy of the families that hired in their own land. We never hear an instance of a third person mentioned in such contracts; they were to go to the persons themselves, "Of them shall you buy;" not persons they had stolen and reduced to slavery; not persons taken as captives in war and reduced to slavery, but of these people themselves, "and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land." How could it be

any thing else than a voluntary contract? The buying was no more than paying the wages in advance. And the contract with these heathen was exactly the same as the contract made with the Jew, which we have previously mentioned, who sold himself to the stranger, or sojourner, who lived among them: he was to live with this stranger until the jubilee, if not redeemed. So in the same manner did this heathen live with the Jew until the jubilee, when *all* the inhabitants of the land were free. Now, we ask, is this not more in accordance with the spirit of the scriptures than to say God instituted such a revolting system of oppression and cruelty as we have in these United States? The standard of morality in the Old Testament was the same as in the New: "Love your neighbour as yourself." Our Saviour, in the parable of the good Samaritan, shows that all mankind were their neighbours, even those they had the strongest prejudice against. Did the scriptures permit them to mal-treat, or vex, or oppress any stranger amongst them? How often does God command them not to vex or oppress the stranger, and remind them that they were strangers themselves in the land of Egypt, where they were severely corrected for the part they took in endeavouring to entail slavery on their brother? These very men, who most wickedly and unnaturally sold Joseph for a slave, had afterwards, we have no doubt, to sell themselves to the Egyptians for corn, and thus were they and their posterity reduced to bondage. God has, in all ages of the world, most severely punished oppressors. And if God will punish the man of sin, who sits in the temple of God showing himself that he is God, how much more severe punishment, think ye, they are worthy, who usurp his moral throne? God, the great moral governor of the world, has always retained the government over his rational creatures. He gave man dominion over all irrational creation, but the government of man, he always held in his own hand, except some brief authority he delegated for the well-being of society. Now, we repeat, if the man of sin is to be punished, who professes to give laws to man in spiritual matters, how much greater assumption of power, or how much greater *thrust at the throne of Jehovah, to take man both soul and body*, and hold him as chattel personal for our own use!—holding him as the beast that perisheth, without any provision for the immortal soul! Oh! that we could indite as the learned, and had the pen of a ready writer, that we could delineate the enormity of this evil; that we could touch the heart of all we have access to, who are partaking in this evil, or take pleasure in those that do!

A. R. takes exception to the action of the Secession Church on the subject of slavery; his bowels of compassion appear very much moved for A. B.'s slave, of Virginia, who was married to a girl, the property of C. D., a neighbouring farmer. A. B. is a member of the Secession Church; she will not admit him to sealing ordinances except he liberates his slave. The laws of the state will not permit the slave to use any of the functions of a free man; and if he is removed into a free state, he will be parted from his wife and children, as the church has no control over C. D., who owns the wife. How is it that A. R. is so very compassionate, and makes such a dolorous lamentation when any thing like manumission is mentioned? Does he not see that this is the unavoidable result of the

system which he says is at least *tolerated by God*? Will it not frequently be the case, that some of an A. B.'s slaves, a church member, be married to a C. D.'s, who has not professed to bow to the name of Jesus, and will sell his chattel personal, man or woman, as the case may be, from the husband or wife? Even suppose that all church members would treat their slaves with parental kindness, which is far from being the case, true it is, if we were in that dreadful situation, we would take it out of choice to be slaves to many a man who never professed to bow to Christianity, before some *slaveholding ministers of Jesus Christ*.

Reformation work is severe work; it is like plucking out right eyes or cutting off right hands, and the innocent is often involved with the guilty. A. B. might certainly continue his slave in his employment and pay him wages. Bad as they are in the slave states, we do not think they would disturb an orderly, well-behaved coloured man who had been freed. We do not think they would either abuse the person or property of this freed man; and if it is to be the dernier resort, that he is to be sent to a free state, it is nothing more than the ordinary course of proceeding he might expect. It is not deemed necessary to make any reply to what A. B. says about the ignorant, friendless African, after he leaves his *guardian master*, as it is the common saying, *niggers* cannot take care of themselves if they were let loose. But, if this were the proper place, we could give ample evidence that they are quite competent to take care of themselves. Would A. B., a church member, be supposed to rest easy, when he was holding his fellow man by the same tenure he does his brutes? even on the supposition that he would treat them with parental kindness, and not avail himself of the unlawful authority delegated to him? Did he not hold him in a situation that would be liable to all the calamities represented by A. R., except his wandering through a free state friendless? The master might become embarrassed in his pecuniary concerns, and the slave be sold to liquidate the debt; or he might be called off by death, he goes with other paternal inheritances to the heirs; and "no man knows who is to come after him, whether a wise man or a fool." What might A. B.'s example do? Though he might be an obscure individual, he might be the means of calling forth investigation on this subject, and of liberating *all the slaves*, as one poor man saved a city. Would not the love of Christ constrain him to this? Christ shed his blood to redeem him from slavery, and how could he hold his fellow man in bondage? He could not do this great evil, and sin against God. He had been a bond-man to sin and Satan, and Christ had redeemed him from spiritual thralldom. It is just such characters as A. R. represents A. B. to be, that sustain slavery. A. B., reputed a moral and upright man, having a respectable standing in the church of Christ, holds slaves. If it were an evil, this man would not participate in it; the hallowed name of Christ gives it reputation in the world. If slavery were excluded from the church of Christ, and none held slaves but the profane and irreligious, it would be deemed as disreputable in the United States of America as we now consider those who kidnapped their ancestors on the shores of Africa. And why should they not? We are still perpetuating the wrong they then inflicted, and we bear testimony of

our approval of their deeds of atrocity. We heartily acquiesce in the proposition of A. R., that "the free states participate in the sin of slavery;" that sentiment has been iterated and reiterated in the pages of the Monitor. But, on A. R.'s principle, we cannot see that we participate in the sin of slavery. The way that we participate in the evil, according to A. R., in a national capacity, is by our sanctioning the purchasing of the slaves, and the sanction which the constitution gives for holding men as property. Now, A. R. says that the sin does not consist in the buying or holding them as slaves, but in the treatment. As every state is sovereign, relative to its own internal regulations, we cannot see how we participate in the evil of those oppressive laws, regulating the system of slavery in the slave-holding states. As it respects the oppressive laws made against the coloured people in the free states, we do not offer one argument to palliate their iniquity; we say they are wicked and oppressive in the extreme. But A. R. and we might differ very much in the source from whence they flow; we account them the *legitimate offspring of slavery*. Those laws are made in complacency to the slave-holding power; the coloured man must be held a degraded, contemptible being, in order to keep up the credit and honour of those who enslave. On this very principle, we must not acknowledge the independence of a sister republic, because her inhabitants are coloured. The majority of our politicians and commercial men act from the above principle; and a number of our other inhabitants have contracted a prejudice against coloured people, because they have always known them in a state of slavery, and associate with the colour every thing low and contemptible.

We have no idea, from the foregoing remarks, to transfer the sin of slavery to the slave-holding states exclusively. We do, with shame and confusion of face, and, we trust, with contrition of heart, acknowledge, as a nation we are highly implicated in this sin. In whatever way the constitution of the United States has or does give it countenance or support, its existence in the District of Columbia is exclusively of a national character. And one great pillar of slavery is the favour it receives from *public sentiment* in the free states; it is evidently growing in the esteem of many of our citizens; it has many advocates and apologists; and this is not to be wondered at, as sin is never stationary, and evil communications corrupt good manners.

Now, seeing that we are so highly implicated in the sin of slavery as a nation, how are we to pay the debt of love which we owe to nearly *three millions* of our fellow beings, who are groaning under the galling yoke of slavery, which, taken as a system, is the most oppressive that has ever existed under the sun? their chains are tighter and their veil of ignorance thicker than has heretofore been known in any country, considering the great effulgence of light which shines around them, and the unparalleled liberty with which our country is blessed. Wherever the blessed gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ goes, the votaries of oppression, either civil or ecclesiastical, must always keep their vassals in ignorance. On this principle, the Polish church has, as much as possible, discouraged education.

The question returns, how are we to pay the debt of love we owe

to our enslaved brethren who are in bondage? whom we are to remember as if we, ourselves, were bound? If we, ourselves, were the victims of these bonds, and had equal facilities for their removal, how very differently would we act; every man would be accoutred with his whole armour.

Who is to go first in this bloodless warfare, but she that is clothed with all the panoply of heaven; "that looketh forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners?" What a reproach to the church and her ministers, that deeds of mercy and benevolence are performed by good Samaritans, (voluntary associations,) when Priests and Levites are passing by on the other side! nay more, many of them are throwing obstacles in the way—entering the arena to conflict against their fellow men having their natural rights. If the church, in her different branches, had faithfully declared the whole counsel of God on this all-important subject, slavery would, long ere this, as ashamed, have hidden its head in this Christian republic. If the church would now come out in one solid phalanx, in the majesty of divine truth, and lift her united testimony against slavery, it could not long withstand so potent an adversary; exercise her discipline, which is potent in the hand of God to reform abuses and exclude all slave-holders from her fellowship. If the pure, holy, Christian church retains slave-holders in her fellowship, from what other quarter could we expect an accusation? We cannot expect that civil government will go in advancement of the church in moral reform, the church being the light of the world and the salt of the earth. We bless God that the branch of the church to which we have the honour and the privilege to belong has exercised her disciplinary powers by excluding slave-holders from her communion. But has *she*, by this exercise of discipline, *entirely washed her hands from its impurity*, so that the blood of souls will not be required at her hands? Have not her official officers, the watchmen on Zion's walls, "to cry aloud and spare not, to lift up their voice like a trumpet," and show their straying countrymen the enormity of the evil of thus continuing in their sin? We hope they will not say to slave-holders, as was said to Ephraim of old, "He is joined to his idols, let him alone." We owe a great debt of love to our southern brethren, who are the immediate instruments of holding their fellow men in a state of slavery, thus both robbing God and man; although the more we love them, the less we may be loved. But a necessity is laid upon us, to rebuke them for their sin.

It may be said, we have no access to slave-holders; we cannot rebuke them. But we have the principle amongst us: our slave-holding brethren might well retort, "Physician, heal thyself." If slave-holding had not such a good character in the free states, it would be a great step toward its removal, as "a good name is rather to be chosen than great riches." It is only at the north the truth can be preached on this subject, as Christian liberty is entirely gone at the south. A man would be liable to have his blood mingled with his preaching, who would speak the truth on this subject at the south. So long have ministers been silent on this subject, that their lips are now well nigh sealed for ever. We hear a great deal said and preached about the advance of Popery, and great alarm produced

from its increase, as it is inimical to the salvation of souls, and lest it should jeopardize our civil and religious liberties, and justly too; and who is it does not know that slavery produces all these baneful consequences?

It may be said, Christ and his apostles did not preach against slavery. It would be too much of an assumption for us to say they never preached on slavery, as we have only a very small portion of their preaching on record. We know that wherever the Christian religion was preached, slavery fell before it. It is evidently growing in our country, which is an evidence that our preaching is of a different character. We make this remark with many honourable exceptions.

We do most respectfully implore, and most ardently hope, that all the members of the Secession Church, more particularly her ministers, will avail themselves of that powerful auxiliary, prayer, for the removal of this moral pestilence from our nation; many of whose prayers, we trust, are as incense, and the uplifting of whose hands are as the evening sacrifice. "Let the priests, the ministers of the Lord, weep between the porch and the altar;" let them say, "spare thy people, O Lord!" We trust they will not be found "asleep in the side of the ship, when the sea is boisterous;" that they will not fail, both publicly and privately, to wrestle with God in prayer, for the removal of this accursed thing, and thus "stand in the gap, that our nation perish not."

There are nearly three millions of their enchained brethren, by the lifting up of their manacled hands, saying, "Come and help us;" yet dumb they are, not daring to open their mouth, except in the ear of the prayer-hearing God, who will, in his own good time, hear the groans of the mournful prisoners, however incoherent. And may their hands be stayed up by the omnipotent God, lest they become heavy from hope deferred, until liberty is proclaimed to the captives, and the opening of the prison doors to them that are bound, both temporally and spiritually.

ANTI-SLAVERY.

ART. II.—*Reflections on a sick Bed.* No. II.

Sinning and suffering is the common history of all. My heart is pained. Oh! that it were pained from a sense of sin, and that the arrows of Christ's love pierced it. Oh! that I might be duly affected with gratitude to Him, whose heart was pierced and bled, that my heart might be renovated and healed.

My bodily health is sometimes better; but oh! my spiritual deadness! My prayers want fervency, are formal, are more the breathings of the mouth, than of the soul. My affections seem cold, my heart frozen. Is this my winter season? Is my soul ice bound, that it cannot make the desired port? Have my corruptions clouded with malignant vapours my hemisphere, and like a thick veil shut out the warming vivifying rays of the Sun of Righteousness? Oh! arm of the Lord, sweep away these gloomy clouds. Oh! Spi-

rit, breathe upon my dry bones, kindle into a flame of holy zeal all my frozen affections; give a praying frame importunity, strength to "prevail with God." Let the summer sun of thy smiling countenance, soon take the place of thy winter coldness. To have "a name to live, and yet be dead," is an awful mistake. But can the dead have consciousness and fears? Can they mourn over their nauseous corruptions, and be actuated by desires after life and holiness? However dead my spiritual sensibilities, yet I *feel* my deadness, am *conscious* of coldness, can regret my want of a lively interest in the discharge of duty, and do, God is my witness, that I do desire freedom from the dominion of sin, and the spirit of fervent prayer. I have some unfeigned desires to enjoy fellowship with God, and to be conformed to his image.

Prayer and fasting are good means of warming a frozen heart; like friction, they give a glowing circulation of life, and vigour, and love through a diseased system. Pray on, continue wrestling even when faint, give it not up; though almost asleep, seek the Spirit of prayer, and asking shall not be in vain. Sometimes Christ seems fast asleep, and will let us knock long and loud to wake him. Though his bowels yearn over us in love, yet he lets us dream, and feel after him. Oft he seems to hide his face, that we may feel and mourn his absence, and be brought to hate our corruptions, which, rising up as a thick cloud, shut out his brightness, and cause our blind errants to wander in gloomy mists. Oh! that his salvation would beam forth "as brightness," and that he would cause us to "rise and shine in the beauty of his holiness, which shall be in and upon us "as the shining light, which shineth more and more till the perfect day."

What a world of hunger this is, where universal famine and want reign, and where disappointed anticipations, and blasted hopes mingle their wormwood and their gall in every gilded cup of earthly pleasure! Some hunger for riches, some for fame, some famish through ambition, for honour and power; and in their fevered fancies "they are like a man who dreams that he eats and drinks; but when he awakes, behold he thirsts, and his soul is faint." The greatest enjoyments of the rich and gay of this world, are only deceptive dreams; when some afflictive stroke of adversity, or the shock of death, or when the thundering peals of Jehovah's voice from his tribunal at the judgment day, shall awaken those from their delusive dreams, they shall find that their enjoyments of carnal pleasures were not real; Satan has a cunning art of feasting the disordered fancy of his subjects on pleasing phantoms, and of preventing them from suspecting a delusion.

The people of God have, likewise, a hungering; they have a thirst for distinction, ambition for the highest honour, to be kings, to reign with the Christ of God on his throne, to unite with him as royal priests in the functions of his sanctuary, and to banquet with him at his feasts of heavenly joys. And though their longing desires are not satisfied in time, yet a rich foretaste is afforded; and through the means of grace, a measure of the purest joy is communicated to their souls. But because we cannot enjoy enough of Christ, of heaven, or earth, how often do we faint? How often under the influence of unbelief do we give vent to our desponding feelings, as

they of old, "A table in the wilderness can God prepare for us?" He bears with our folly, and in his mercy lets fall a few crumbs, and rains manna around our dwellings. We taste, we long for more, our cry is, "O for the wings of a dove to fly far hence, to escape" from this wilderness, where famine still annoys us. Faith and hope give wings to the soul to ascend and feast with Christ above, at his banquet of celestial bliss. Oh! to be seated with him, to lean on his bosom, to drink wine with him, and to receive love-kisses from the hallowed lips of this fair lovely One. Time, roll on; death, quicken thy pace, and heave thy deadly thrust against thy suffering victim; I will own myself thy debtor, in giving me a quick passport to the right hand of God, where there are joys for evermore. "My soul with longing faints;" but should not such fervent aspirations of the soul be checked in some measure? Have not I often said, "Thy will be done?" Have I not sought to be a pilgrim, journeying homeward? And now God is giving me no resting-place, no comfort, till I get home. Then, let me be contented with rough fare, and poor lodgings, by the way; the more loathsome the inns, the less inclined will I be to remain long in them. The pain and fatigue of the journey, incline us to test and use many helps which we otherwise should have slighted. Afflictions make us willing to employ a physician, and try cures, which otherwise should have been regarded as matters of mere speculation. Oh! to be healed, to be feasted, to be in marriage union with the Beloved, to be crowned by him, to be like him, to walk with him, to live and reign with him above. "The Lord is my portion, saith my soul."

"Every morning I receive new chastisement." The rod still smarts. Why is it still inflicted? Who hath appointed it? Is this my daily food, "tears my drink;" and is suffering the medicine of my soul? The "bread of affliction and water of adversity" were the common fare of the Saviour of men; should I expect or seek better fare than he to whom "belongs the cattle on a thousand hills?" Is it not love that prompts to the infliction of chastisements? When God lifts his hand to smite his erring child, love-smiles beam from his countenance, and his soothing voice is heard in these strains: "Let him take hold of my strength, that he may make peace with me, and he shall make peace with me." All are familiar with the demonstrations of filial and parental affection, when an offending child comes sorrowing in tears, craving pardon, and throws itself into the arms of a kind father, who holds in his hand the rod of correction; this touches his heart, turns away his anger, and secures more tender expressions of love; this "takes hold of his strength," so that he cannot punish, and makes happy peace between the parties. Oh! for wisdom to do likewise. Oh! that my eyes were a fountain of tears, and that faith would give me legs to run and wings to fly, I would fall into the hands of my offended Father; I would hide me from the scourge, in the bosom of his well beloved Son, who is the strength of God; and thus I would make peace with him on the basis of the new covenant of love, in the way of touching the springs of his tender affections.

This diseased, dissolving system is ever filled with bitter groans; the smoke of this world makes our eyes weep bitter tears. Could any one wish to remain long an inhabitant of a smoky, decayed

tenement? But some dwell in "ceiled houses;" they are greeted with morning smiles and a radiant sun; "the dew lies all night upon their branches;" but, alas! they are like the ox fattened for the slaughter; some sudden stroke in providence, perhaps death, awakes them from their life of dreaming fancies; their eyes are opened, and lo! the world, which had appeared all fair, plastered over with a silver and golden hue, seems but clay to be burnt up. Travellers need not care how soon they leave this smoky tavern, in which they, as weary pilgrims, suffer many privations—the north wind in their face, and disappointments which prove anticipations false.

Death's frequent blows make such wide breaches in my earthly house, that it cannot long contain the imprisoned spirit. Oh! that my affections had wings to soar above the "leaden-footed" pleasures of earth, and to seek fruition of joys at God's right hand. But much sediment yet remains in this earthen vessel, which is being prepared for the upper sanctuary. Afflictions seem happily designed to cast out this sediment of fleshly lust, and, like rough scouring, to cleanse out all filth and remove all stains.

We are all a great compound of guilt, defections, and infirmities. Although we had sealed to us the pardon and removal of our guilt, yet we need a Saviour to heal the diseases and weaknesses of the new man, to remit our *pious sins*; we need his spirit to wash away the stains of our sanctification, to remove the dross and scum of spiritual love. But our guiltiness and defections afford materials for our Almighty Saviour to work upon; our clay house is a good work-shop for the All-wise Spirit, where his skill is requisite, and is exercised in repairing, garnishing, and making it a fit dwelling for himself. A room long filled with filth requires hard and repeated scrubbing. "Oh! cleanse me from secret faults and presumptuous sins." May I have wisdom to bear patiently the purifying operations of the Spirit.

God's blasting east wind still wastes me away; yet nothing but chaff and dust shall be blown off. And when thoroughly sifted, Oh! how much chaff! how feckless, unsubstantial our moiety of grain! God winnows his people by trying providences; and when their doubting fears, corruptions, fretting, with a fruitful produce of cheating tares, are winnowed out, what a disproportioned, massive abundance! Still there is found in them some sound grain; some penitence, contrition, submission, trusting, and hoping, which Christ claims as his fruit, and which endures the fire, when the other stubble and trash shall be burnt up. It is good to be a waiter on Christ; "wait on him patiently—fret not in any wise." "Rejoice in the Lord *always*," even when caused to go mourning without the sun, for "he giveth songs" of joy and gladness "in the night" of gloomy adversity.

When on the bed of languishing, suffering Nature utters a wish that I could say, "*I am well.*" But may I not say, "*It is well?*" it is the doing of the Lord, who doth all things *well*. "He performeth the thing appointed for me." "Wherefore doth a living man complain, a man for the punishment of his sins?" And "after all that is come upon us, then, our God has punished us less than our iniquities deserve." There is a "need be" that we "are in heaviness through manifold temptations." 1 Pet. i. 6. It is *needful*

to empty us of, self, to wean us from the pleasures and vanities of the world, and to show us the vileness of sin. Let me, with Job, daily inquire into the cause and great design of this chastisement: "Surely it is meet to be said unto God, I have borne chastisement; I will not offend any more. That which I know not" of God's intention in his wise and sovereign discipline, "teach thou me:" teach wisdom, patience, thankfulness, with a frame of heart suited to the dispensation. "If I have done iniquity, I will do so no more." But oh! this growing pain! When writhing and "filled with tossings," I must, in the language of my Saviour, breathe this feeling prayer, "If it be possible, let this cup pass from me." "Remove thy stroke away from me: I am consumed by the blow of thine hand. Ps. xxxix. 10. Yet let me seek that disposition of heart which the Psalmist had, "I was dumb, because thou didst it;" and which characterized the Saviour, "Nevertheless, not *my will*, but thine be done."

ART. III.—*The Jews.*

The following items of intelligence respecting this singular people, gleaned from different sources, will be read with interest by all who rest in the promises of God concerning the enlargement of his church. Preserved in the most wonderful manner amidst their dispersions, and destined yet to act a conspicuous part in the future conversion of the world, the Jewish people should have a prominent place in the prayers and exertions of all who enjoy the distinguished privileges of the gospel. We cordially rejoice in the awakened attention of various sections of the church to the claims of Israel, and in the remarkable encouragement presented, in several quarters, to increased efforts for their conversion; and, considering it as a service to the cause of truth and righteousness, we shall occasionally present to our readers accounts of such movements as relate to the external condition of the Hebrew people, or to the success of measures that are employed for their evangelization.

The following extracts, which are from the conclusion of an article in the "Quarterly Review," on *Lord Lindsay's Travels*, presents an able summary of the proceedings of several institutions that are engaged in attempts to promote Christianity among the Jews:

"A growing interest manifested in behalf of the Holy Land is not confined, in feeling or expression, to the Christians alone; it is shared and avowed by the whole body of the Jews, who no longer conceal their hope and their belief that the time is not far distant, when

"The Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people, which shall be left, from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea; and shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and shall gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth.'—Isa. xi. 11.

"Doubtless, this is no new sentiment among the children of the dispersion; the novelty of the present day does not lie in the indul-

gence of such a hope by that most venerable people, but in their fearless confession of the hope; and in the approximation of spirit between Christians and Hebrews, to entertain the same belief of the future glories of Israel, to offer up the same prayer, and look forward to the same consummation. In most former periods, a development of religious feeling has been followed by a persecution of the ancient people of God; from the days of Constantine to Leo XII., the disciples of Christ have been stimulated to the oppression of the children of Israel; and Heaven alone can know what myriads of that suffering race fell beneath the piety of the Crusaders, as they marched to recover the sepulchre of their Saviour from the hands of the infidels. But a mighty change has come over the hearts of the Gentiles; they seek now the temporal and eternal peace of the Hebrew people; societies are established in England and Germany to diffuse among them the light of the gospel; and the increasing accessions to the parent institution in London attests the public estimation of its principles and services.

“Encouraged by these proofs of a bettered condition, and the sympathy of the Gentiles who so lately despised them, the children of Israel have become far more open to Christian intercourse and reciprocal inquiry; both from themselves and their converted brethren we learn much of their doings, much of their hopes and fears, that a few years ago would have remained in secret. One of them, who lately, in the true spirit of Moses, went a journey into Poland, ‘unto his brethren, and looked on their burdens,’ (Exod. ii. 11,) informs us that, ‘several thousand Jews of that country and of Russia have recently bound themselves by an oath, that, as soon as the way is open for them to go up to Jerusalem, they will immediately go thither, and there spend their time in fasting and praying unto the Lord, until he shall send the Messiah. Although it was,’ he continues, ‘comparatively a short time since I had intercourse with my brethren, according to the flesh, I found a mighty change in their minds and feelings in regard to the nearness of their deliverance. Some assigned one reason, and some another, for the opinion they entertained, but all agreed in thinking that the time is at hand.’ Large bodies, moreover, have acted on this impulse: we state, on the authority of another gentleman, himself a Jewish Christian, that the number of Jews in Palestine has been multiplied twenty-fold; that, though within the last forty years scarcely two thousand of that people were to be found there, they amount now to upwards of forty thousand: and we can confirm his statement from other sources, that they are increasing in multitude by large annual additions. A very recent English traveller encountered many Jews on their road to Jerusalem, who invariably replied to his queries, that they were going thither ‘to die in the land of our fathers.’ For many years past, this desire had prevailed among the Hebrews! old Sandys has recorded it in his account of Palestine; but it has been reserved for the present day to see the wish so amply gratified. A variety of motives stimulates the desire; the devout seek to be interred in the soil that they love; the superstitious, to avoid the disagreeable alternative of being rolled under the earth’s surface until they arrive in that land on the great morning of the resurrection; but whatever the motives of a people now blinded by

ignorance, who does not see, in the fact, a dark similitude of the faith which animated the death-beds of the patriarchs, of Jacob and of Joseph? (Gen. xlix. 29,) who, 'when he died, made mention of the departing of the children of Israel, and gave commandment concerning his bones.' (Heb. xi. 22.) In all parts of the earth this extraordinary people, whose name and sufferings are in every nation under heaven, think and feel as one man on the great issue of their restoration; the utmost east and the utmost west, the north and the south, both small and large congregations, those who have frequent intercourse with their brethren, and those who have none, entertain alike the same hopes and fears. Dr. Wolff (Journal, 1839) heard these sentiments from their lips in the remotest countries of Asia; and Buchanan asserts that wherever he went among the Jews of India, he found memorials of their expulsion from Judea, and of their belief of a return thither.

"At Jerusalem, they purchase, as it were, one day in the year of their Mussulman rulers; and being assembled in the valley of Jehoshaphat, bewail the overthrow of their city and temple, and pray for a revival of its glory; their prayer is now assuming a more penitential garb. 'Already,' says Mr. M'Neile, in his excellent lectures on Jewish prophecy, p. 136,

"As we have heard from an eye-witness of the interesting scene, some of them assemble themselves, on the eve of their Sabbath, under the walls of Jerusalem, where the abomination of desolation still standeth, and chant in mournful melody the lamentations of their Jeremiah, or sing, with something like a dawn of hope,

"Lord, build,—Lord, build,—
Build Thy house speedily.
In haste! in haste! Even in our days,
Build Thy house speedily.
Lord, build,—Lord, build,—
Build Thy house speedily.
In haste! in haste! Even in our days,
Build Thy house speedily.
In haste! in haste! Even in our days,
Build Thy house speedily.'

"In Poland, the great focus of the Hebrew people, the sentiment is most rife that the time is near at hand for the turning of their captivity: oftentimes they meet together in their synagogues for humiliation and fasting; and falling on their knees, like Daniel, with their faces toward Jerusalem, offer many of these beautiful and touching petitions:—

"We are more sinful than any other people; we ought to be ashamed more than any nation; the joy of the Lord is gone from us, our hearts are wounded. Why?—because we have sinned against the Lord. The temple is destroyed: there is no Shechinah abiding among us; we are despised and trodden down by all people. The words of the prophets are fulfilled, that Israel is burned on every side, yet he layeth it not to heart. But now, Lord, look down from heaven, Thy holy habitation, and cause the Messiah, son of David, speedily to appear. And, according to thine own promise, sprinkle clean water upon us, and cleanse us from all our filthiness and from all our idols.'

"What a marvellous thing, that this despised and degraded people, in their suffering and baseness, should yet be minutely observant of the royal supplication which fell from the lips of Solomon in the palm days of Jerusalem!

"If thy people bethink themselves in the land whither they are carried captive, and turn and pray unto thee in the land of their captivity, saying, We have sinned,

we have done amiss, we have dealt wickedly; . . . and pray toward the land which Thou gavest unto their fathers, and toward the city which Thou hast chosen, and toward the house which I have built for Thy name; then hear Thou from the heavens, even from Thy dwelling-place, their prayer and supplications, and maintain their cause, and forgive Thy people which have sinned against Thee.' (2 Chron. vi. 37, *et seq.*)

"Though they have seen the temple twice, and the city six times destroyed, their confidence is not abated, nor their faith gone; for eighteen hundred years the belief has sustained them, without a king, a prophet, or a priest, through insult, poverty, torture, and death; and now in the nineteenth century, in the midst of the march of intellect, what is better, in the far greater diffusion of the written word of God both among Jews and Christians, we hear an harmonious assent to the prayer that concludes every Hebrew festival, 'The year that approaches, Oh! bring us to Jerusalem!' This belief has not been begotten and sustained by rabbinical bigotry; for although a fraction of the Reformed Jews have excluded from their liturgy every petition for restoration, and even for the coming of the Messiah, yet it prevails more strongly, if possible, among the converts to Christianity. We have now before us a letter from a Hebrew proselyte, dated but a few weeks ago, at Jerusalem, which the writer was visiting for the first time: his heart overflows with patriotism, and the remembrance of his ancestry; he beheld the land of his fathers, to be hereafter his; 'theirs not by unholy war, nor by stratagem or treachery, but as the gift of Him who is yet to be the glory of his people Israel.'

"The reforms, as they are termed, of modern days, have arranged the Hebrews under the two classes, according to their own designation, of old-fashioned and new-fashioned Jews; the new-fashioned are the 'Liberals' of Judaism, the old-fashioned are governed by the opposite principle. These reforms, which have so favourably exhibited their intellectual powers, have proved fatal to their sentiments of religion: disregarding or denying the truths on which even the Talmud rested as a basis, they have scorned to purge away its dross; and, having broken from the trammels of Rabbinism, strut about in the false freedom of Rationalism and Infidelity. The leprosy has not yet spread itself over a large portion of the people; the chief seat of the disease lies, of course, in Germany; but many individuals have caught the contagion in Lemberg, Brody, Warsaw, and other large towns of Poland. In Germany, they are engaged in the formation of a literature of their own, and wield a portion of the daily and periodical press; new modes of worship are introduced, and the national expectation of a Messiah, being frittered away in figurative applications, is debased, and yet satisfied by their share in the revolutionary changes of the European states. In France, a kindred sentiment prevails; they desire even to abandon the name of Jews, and assume the appellation of *Frenchmen-Israelites*, or 'adherents of the Mosaical religion;' having been emancipated, in the change of policy that followed the revolution in that country, from many burdensome and injurious restrictions, they hail in this ameliorated condition the advent of the Messiah. These principles are asserted in a journal entitled 'The Regeneration,' destined to the improvement, moral and religious, of the Israelitish

people, conducted by some of the most able and learned Jews in Paris, Brussels, and Frankfort.

“It is only within the last few years that the Jews, as a body, have been known beyond the circle of curious and abstruse readers. Their pursuits and capacities, it was supposed, were limited to stock-jobbing, money-lending, and orange-stalls; but few believed them to be a people of vigorous intellect, of unrivalled diligence in study, with a long list of ancient and modern writers, whose works, though often mixed with matter, much of which is useless, and much pernicious, and calculated far more to sharpen than to enrich the understanding, no one can deny to be the produce of the most singular perseverance and ability. The emancipation of genius, which began under Moses Mendelsohn, about the year 1754, brought them no disparagement of fame on the stage of profane literature: the German, which had hitherto been regarded as an unholy language, became the favourite study of the liberalized Hebrews; thence they passed to the pursuit of the various sciences, and of every language, whether living or dead; their commentators and critics, philosophers and historians, condescended to a race with the secular Gentiles, and gave, in their success, an earnest of the fruit that their native powers could reap from a wider field of mental exertion. But the new lights, which shone so brightly on the chiefs of the secession, have done but little to illuminate the body of their followers; popular education, in the strict sense of the term, is still confined to the Rabbinical Jews, who constitute the vast majority of the nation. This class of the Rabbinites, notwithstanding the exclusiveness of their studies, must be considered as an educated people, perhaps more so than any other upon earth; they can, almost universally, read the sacred language, and partially understand it; the zeal of individuals, even the poorest, prompts them to undertake the office of teachers; and so content are they with small remuneration, that a dozen Melammedims might nearly be maintained by the salary required for one English schoolmaster. Parents and relations will endure the greatest privations to save a sufficient sum for the education of their children; and oftentimes, where the income of a single family is inadequate, five or six will make a common purse to provide the salary of a tutor. The evil is, that an excellent system and an admirable zeal are neutralized and perverted by Rabbinitism and superstition; ‘if asked to give,’ says Dr. M’Caul, ‘a concise, yet adequate idea of this system, I should say it is Jewish Popery; just as Popery may be defined to be Gentile Rabbinitism.’ Talmudical learning, and the power of the Rabbies, the depositories of it, are the ultimate objects of Jewish discipline; to increase the one, and dignify the other, their writers have spared neither legend nor falsehood, in which blasphemy and absurdity strive for the pre-eminence; mean while, the doctrine inculcated is bitter in its precepts, unscriptural in its views, and hostile to mankind; and, though amongst themselves they both teach and practice many social virtues, their state must be considered as exhibiting an awful picture of moral and religious destitution.

“That the Jews should be thus degraded and despised is a part of their chastisement, and the fulfilment of prophecy; but, low and abhorred as they still are, we now hail for them the dawn of a better

day, a day of regeneration and deliverance, which, raising them alike from Neology and Rabbinism, shall set them at large in the glorious liberty of the gospel. This desirable consummation, though still remote, has approached us more rapidly within the last few years. The societies at Basle, Frankfort-on-the-Maine, Berlin, Posen, and Breslau, for promoting Christianity among the Jews, have been eminently prosperous; but the London society, the first in date, is likewise the first in its magnitude and successes. This admirable association, long buffeted by the gales of adverse fortune, seems now fairly harboured in public opinion; 'the entire contributions,' says their Report of March, 1838, 'received during the past year, have amounted to the sum of £19,054, 8s. 8d., being an increase of £4,523, 17s. 9d. upon the receipts of the preceding year.' Doubtless their future exertions will be commensurate with their means, and Providence will bless with a larger harvest their increased expenditure and toil. But they have been 'faithful over a few things,' and wrought great effects in the infancy of their fortunes. They have circulated in the last year, besides tracts, Pentateuchs, and other works in great number, nearly four thousand copies of the Old Testament in Hebrew; they have twenty-three stations in Europe and the east; forty-nine missionaries and agents, twenty-four of whom are Jewish converts; and ten schools, two in London, and eight in the duchy of Posen. Although the amount of conversions, relatively to the actual numbers of Israel, has not been large, the spies have brought back a good account of the land; the sample of its fruit may rival the grapes of Eschol, and stimulate the church to rise and take possession. In almost every considerable town of Germany there are to be found some baptized Jews; we learn, by official accounts from Silesia, that, between 1820 and 1834, four hundred and fifty-five persons were added to the church; in East and West Prussia, two hundred and thirty-four in the same time; and from 1830 to 1837, in Berlin alone, no less than three hundred and twenty-six. In Poland, the average amount of baptisms, during the last ten years, has been about fifteen annually, exclusive of the great number baptized by the Romanists, to whom the proselytes are attracted by the hope and assurance of temporal support in the event of their conversion. At the Hebrew Episcopal Chapel in London, seven adult converts, and three children, were baptized last year, making a total thereby of two hundred and forty-six baptisms from the commencement, eighty-five of whom were adults; and among the converts in this country may be reckoned four synagogue-readers, of whom two have lately received orders in the Church of England; and six others, who have taken part in its ministry. This is no sudden or uncertain progress; it is no reproduction of the same Jew, like the annual proselyte of Rome at the feast of St. Peter, who is kept, as the dog at the Grotto del Cane, to be victimized for the edification of the curious; a new spur has been given to the advance and establishment of the faith among them, and conversions are greatly on the increase; 'there is rarely an instance,' says our experienced informant, 'of a return to Judaism. And, though some fall into sin, and misbehave themselves, their profession of Christianity is lasting, and, I believe, sincere.'

"It is a very important feature in the generality of these conver-

sions, that they have taken place among persons of cultivated understandings and literary attainments. We are not to be told that those excellent societies have operated with success on ignorance and poverty, purchasing the one and persuading the other, where either necessity or incapacity lay passive before them. These Jewish converts, like their prototype, St. Paul, brought up at the feet of their Gamaliels in all the learning and wisdom of the Hebrews, now 'preach the faith which once they destroyed.' We have already mentioned that several have become ministers of the Church of England; on the Continent, we find many among the Lutheran and reformed clergy; they have also their physicians, lawyers, head and assistant masters of the German Gymnasia; there are three professors and two lecturers, formerly Jews, in the University of Breslau; five professors in Halle; in Petersburg, a professor of medicine; in Warsaw, Dr. Leo, a convert, is one of the most celebrated physicians; in Erlangen, Dr. Stahl; and in Berlin, Dr. Neander, the great church historian, fully proves that poverty of intellect is not an indispensable preliminary to Jewish conversion.

"But even where the parties have not been fully brought to the belief and profession of the gospel, a mighty good has resulted from the missionary exertions. Ancient antipathies are abated, and prejudices subdued; the name of Christian is less odious to the ears of a Jew; and many of the nation, adhering still to the faith of their forefathers, have ceased to uphold the Talmudical doctrine that the Gentiles are beasts created for the purpose of administering to the necessities of Israel. They have conceived a respect for our persons, and a still greater for our intellects; an ardent desire is now manifested by the Jews to hold conversation with the missionaries; along the north coast of Africa, in Palestine, and in Poland, they have visited them in crowds, and many, doubtless, have borne away with them the seed which a study of the scriptures will ripen into conviction.

"As a consequence of this more friendly intercourse between Jew and Gentile, we must mention the kinder feelings entertained by the Hebrews toward a converted brother. We have heard, indeed, from the lips of a proselyte, that he had, even within the last four or five years, observed an improvement in this respect among his own relatives; and the same fact is most amply attested by the opinion and experience of Mr. Herschell.

"We wish we could say that this sentiment was universal; but, alas, we know many lamentable exceptions. There are Jews in all parts of Europe who dare not avow their Christianity, so great is the fear of public reproach or domestic tyranny. In Constantinople, Tunis, and Turkey generally, where the Jews have a police, and authority over their own body, conversion is as dangerous as in Ireland itself. Whenever a Hebrew is suspected of wavering in his Rabbinical allegiance, he is imprisoned and bastinadoed; and no later than January of this year, a young man in Tunis, who had discovered an inclination to the hated faith, was assaulted so violently by his relations, that he fainted on the spot, says the missionary, and lingered a few days, when he died. Nevertheless, conversions even there, as in Ireland, are constantly on the increase; it being still the good pleasure of God, that the blood of the martyrs should be the seed of the church.

“A desire corresponding to this change of sentiment is manifested to obtain possession of the word of God; and they eagerly demand copies of the Society’s editions of the Old Testament in Hebrew. In the last two years, five thousand four hundred copies have been sold by Mr. Stockfeldt, in the Rhenish provinces; several thousands on the coast of Africa, by Mr. Ewald; and in Königsberg, Mr. Bergfeldt sells copies to the amount of about one hundred pounds annually. In Poland and Jerusalem the missionaries can dispose of all that are sent; and the last Report of the Society informs us, that a less additional number than twenty thousand copies, would be inadequate to the demands of the Israelites in all parts of the world. It is also very observable, that the translation in the vernacular dialect of the Jews, has excited the liveliest interest among the long-neglected females of the Hebrew nation. All this indicates a prodigious change; hitherto, they have cared little but for the legends of the Talmud and Rabbinical preachments; they now betake themselves to the study of scripture, and will accept the Pentateuch, printed and presented by the hands of Christians! This abundant diffusion of the Hebrew Bible has, more than any other cause, contributed to abate prejudice and conciliate affection. Mr. J. D. Marc, in a letter from the Society’s station at Offenbach, affirms that ‘the conviction the Jews now have that the Christians offer them the genuine word of God, and even to the poor gratis, makes an unspeakable impression on them, and begins visibly to melt their hearts.’ And even in Poland, the very treasure-house of Rabbinism, a missionary can find an easy access, and a patient audience of the truths of the gospel, provided he be well supplied with the word of God in its original tongue. Such efforts are felt and estimated far beyond the sphere of their first action; a kindly sympathy is propagated through all the distant limbs of the Jewish body, and traces of the zeal and growing favour of the Gentiles are discernible, even in the remotest country of the east. According to Dr. Wolff, in his several journals, Bibles and Testaments in Hebrew were found at Ispahan and Cashan, which he himself had given from his own store at Jerusalem; he heard of them, also, in Balk, Bokhara, and Affghanistoun. In the Himalaya mountains, far beyond the limits of the British dominion, he discovered even a Brahmin, surrounded by crowds of his disciples, reading the Gospel of St. Luke in the Nagree character; this last fact, though not immediately bearing upon the Jews, well illustrates the efficacy and success of associations combined for the distribution of the scriptures.

“Efforts like these cannot fail to attain the most important results; for the blindness of Israel is still caused, as it was in the days of our Saviour, by their ignorance of the word of God; ‘ye do err, not knowing the scriptures.’ A deeper acquaintance with their own holy books is an indispensable preliminary to general conversion; and we must bestir ourselves to multiply facilities by the widest possible circulation of them. The wiser and more scriptural method of argument now pursued by the missionaries will advance the work; laying aside their reasoning from the Talmud and the Mishna, and perceiving that, with the Jewish people, a right intelligence and belief of the Old Testament is the only foundation for the belief of the New, they have, at last, adopted, toward their Hebrew

disputants, the method of the inspired apostle; for 'Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath days reasoned with them *out of the scriptures*; openly alleging that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead; and this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ.' "

Among the recent movements that appear destined to exert a considerable influence upon the future destinies of the Jewish people, may be mentioned the proposal to build a church at Jerusalem, if possible, on Mount Zion, and collect a congregation of Jewish converts in the metropolis of Judea. Rev. Mr. Nicolayson, who was lately ordained by the Bishop of London, has been appointed to labour, at Jerusalem, among a continually increasing number of Jews, gathered from different countries, and in company with Mr. Pieritz, a Hebrew convert, has entered upon the work.

The growing interest manifested in behalf of Palestine and the adjacent countries, the large investment of British capital, and the confluence of British travellers and strangers from all parts of the world, have led the British Government to appoint a Vice-Consul for Palestine. He sailed for Alexandria at the end of last September: his residence will be fixed at Jerusalem, but his jurisdiction will extend to the whole country within the ancient limits of the Holy Land; he is thus accredited, as it were, to the former kingdom of David and the Twelve Tribes. From the increased security of property which this appointment will confer, greater facilities will be opened up for missionary efforts in Palestine, and it seems likely that the Jews will be encouraged to return in yet greater numbers from their dispersion, and, although they will not give themselves to agriculture in any other country,* may become, once more, the husbandmen of Judea and Galilee.

The following remarks on this appointment, from the same source as the former extracts, appear just and appropriate:—

"We have done a deed which the Jews will regard as an honour to their nation, and have thereby conciliated a body of well-wishers in every people under heaven: throughout the east they nearly monopolize the concerns of traffic and finance, and maintain a secret but uninterrupted intercourse with their brethren in the west. Thousands visit Jerusalem in every year from all parts of the globe, and carry back to their respective bodies that intelligence which guides their conduct and influences their sympathies. So rapid and accurate is their mutual communication, that Frederick the Great confessed the earlier and superior intelligence obtained by the Jews, of all affairs of moment. Napoleon knew well the value of a Hebrew alliance, and endeavoured to reproduce, in the capital of France, the spectacle of the ancient Sanhedrim, which, basking in the sunshine of imperial favour, might give laws to the whole body

* Dr. Henderson says of the Polish Jews, "comparatively few of the Jews learn any trade, and most of those attempts which have been made to accustom them to agricultural habits have proved abortive. Some of those who are in circumstances of affluence possess houses and other *immovable* property; but the great mass of the people seem destined to sit loose from every local tie, and are waiting, with anxious expectation, for the arrival of the period when, in pursuance of the Divine promise, they shall be restored to, what they still consider, *their own land*. Their attachment, indeed, to Palestine is unconquerable."—*Biblical Researches and Travels in Russia*, 1826.

of the Jews throughout the habitable world, and aid him, no doubt, in his audacious plans against Poland and the east. His scheme, it is true, proved abortive; for the mass of the Israelites were by no means inclined to merge their hopes in the destinies of the empire; exchange Zion for Montmartre, and Jerusalem for Paris. The few liberal unbelievers whom he attracted to his views ruined his projects with the people by their impious flattery, and averted the whole body of the nation by blending, on the 15th of August, the cipher of Napoleon and Josephine with the unutterable name of Jehovah, and elevating the imperial eagle above the representation of the ark of the covenant. A misconception of the character of the people has vitiated all the attempts of various sovereigns to better their condition; they have sought to amalgamate them with the body of their subjects, not knowing or not regarding the temper of the Hebrews, and the plain language of scripture, that 'the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations.'*

"That which Napoleon designed to his violence and ambition, thinking 'to destroy nations not a few,' we may wisely and legitimately undertake for the maintenance of our empire: the affairs of the east are lowering on Great Britain; but it is singular and providential that we should at this moment have executed a measure which will almost ensure us the co-operation of the eastern Jews, and kindle in our behalf the sympathies of nearly two millions in the heart of the Russian dominions. These hopes rest on no airy foundation; but pleasing as they are, we cannot disguise our far greater satisfaction that, in the step just taken, in the appointment just made, England has attained the praise of being the first of the Gentile nations that has ceased 'to tread down Jerusalem!' This is, indeed, no more than justice, since she was the first to set the evil and cruel example of banishing the whole people in a body from her inhospitable bosom. France next, and then Spain, aped our unchristian and foolish precedent. Spain may have exceeded us in barbarity, but we invented the oppression, and preceded her in the infliction of it."

We mention with pleasure, also, that, at the last meeting of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, it was resolved to commence a Jewish mission, and that this subject is at present occupying the attention of the friends of religion in Scotland, a deputation having been lately appointed to visit Palestine and other countries where the outcasts of Israel are scattered. These instances, and others, of which we reserve the details for a future paper, encourage the hope that the period determined in the Divine counsels, and the subject of frequent and distinct prediction and promise, is

* Numbers xxiii. 9.

† "Look to their present state of suffering in Poland and Russia, where they are driven from place to place, and not permitted to live in the same street where the so-called Christians reside! It not unfrequently happens, that when one or more wealthy Jews have built commodious houses in any part of a town, not hitherto prohibited, this affords a reason for proscribing them; it is immediately enacted, that no Jew must live in that part of the city, and they are forthwith driven from their houses, without any compensation for their loss being given them . . . They are oppressed on every side, yet dare not complain; robbed and defrauded, yet obtain no redress. . . . In the walk of social life, insult and contempt meet them at every turning."—*Herschell's Sketch*, p. 7.

rapidly approaching, when "the Deliverer shall come out of Zion, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob," and when "the receiving" of the outcasts of Israel shall be to the church "life from the dead."—*Belfast Covenanter*.

ART. IV.—*The Duty of Professors to Avoid the Appearance of Evil.*

"God hath called us unto holiness."—1 Thes. iv. 7. Impressive idea! It is our very vocation to be holy. Holiness was the image of God in which man was created, against which the envy and malignity of Satan were directed, and which he dashed at and destroyed, when he found himself unable to reach the divine original. Holiness is the end of all God's dispensations towards his people, whether of Providence, of Grace, or of Glory. Holiness will constitute the perfection of man's moral nature in heaven; it is the spotless garment in which the seraph ministers before the throne of the Eternal; it is more, for it is the beauty of the Divine Being himself; not so much a separate attribute of his nature, as the perfection of all his attributes. "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all;" and from the midst of his excellent glory, he is ever calling to us and saying, "*Be ye holy, as I am holy.*" True religion is conformity to God, and God is holy. Herein is Christianity distinguished from idolatry, and its infinite superiority above the classic paganism of antiquity demonstrated. Some of the philosophers, especially of the Stoic sect, delivered many fine sentiments, and even beautiful maxims, of a stern and rigid morality, but their ethics had no connexion with their theology. "The gods of the Pagan heaven were little better than men's own evil qualities exalted to the sky, to be thence reflected back upon them, invested with Olympian charms and splendours. A mighty labour of human depravity to confirm its own dominion! It would translate itself to heaven, and usurp divinity, in order to come down thence with a sanction for man to be wicked." So that while men in Christian lands become wicked for want of religion, those that dwell in heathen countries become wicked by religion. The moralist and the priest are in opposition to each other; and the former, if he would succeed in making men better, must caution them against allowing the latter to bring them within the precincts of a temple, or introduce them to the presence of a God. But it is the excellence and glory of Christianity, that its refined morality is founded upon, and arises from, its pure theology; which contains every possible motive and every necessary means to holiness. Our great business, then, in this world, is to be made and kept holy. Our whole life is to be one incessant struggle against that moral evil, which is all around us and within us. "*We are called,*" I repeat the expression, "*to holiness.*"

How emphatic, how comprehensive, is the apostolic admonition which is the subject of this chapter, "*abstain from all appearance of evil.*"—1 Thes. v. 22. Some expositors render the expression thus: "abstain from every sort or kind of evil." In this sense, it is a most important precept. Evils are of various kinds and degrees,

and it is a Christian's duty to avoid them all. He must not reconcile himself to any one thing that is contrary to God's word. He must declare war and maintain irreconcilable hostility against every sin.

But, probably, the true meaning of the text is the commonly received one, that we are not only to abstain from those things that are really and manifestly evil, but from such as are only doubtfully and in appearance such. We must avoid not only the identical thing itself, but all shows and resemblances of it.

1. Professors should abstain from the smallest beginnings of evil, the first buddings of sin; those things which would not be noticed in others, and are made apparent, like faint stains upon cambric, only by the white ground of their profession; and which, after all, in the estimation of many, are so small and insignificant, as to be rather appearances than realities. Little sins lead on to greater ones; and if they did not, and were not feared on account of what they may lead to, should be shunned for their own sakes. A female, vain of her beauty, is annoyed not only by sores upon the countenance, but by freckles. A professor is not to be vain of the beauty of holiness, but still he is to be watchful of it, and must therefore avoid the smallest disfigurement of it by sin.

2. We must not venture to the extreme verge of what is good, nor try how near we can come to evil, without actually committing it. The boundary, as I have elsewhere remarked, between right and wrong, is an invisible line, which many rash adventurers have passed, ere they were aware they were approaching near to it. Besides, though it may be quite perceptible, and avoided by those who are near, yet persons who are close to it may appear to others, who look from a distance, to be gone over it. It is a most dangerous thing for ourselves, to go as near sin as we can without committing it; and as to observers, there are many to whom we are certain, in such a position, to seem to be committing it. All sober, serious, conscientious, and considerate Christians, try to keep far within the territory of holiness, being aware that the border country is generally disputed ground, and much infested by marauders from the opposite land, who are lying in ambush to make captives of those who adventure beyond the line of their defence. But there are many of an opposite description, who have so little circumspection and tenderness of conscience, that if they can but keep themselves from that which is intrinsically and notoriously evil, make no scruple of venturing upon the borders and edges of sin.

3. We must take care not to "let our good be evil spoken of;" for even virtues may be sometimes so exercised, or exercised in conjunction with such circumstances as to give them the appearance of evil. There is, in some instances, as great a want of judgment in the doing of what is good, as there is in others a want of conscience in the doing of what is evil, and, in the end, with much the same result; I mean, the disparagement of religion. It is truly painful to think how much of real and even eminent holiness has, in some cases, been witnessed, not only without admiration, but with disgust; and has been spoken of rather with contempt than applause, merely in consequence of the incrustations of folly by which it has been disfigured. A professor, eminent for her earnest solicitude

about her soul, in her anxiety to grow in grace, and keep up the vitality of religion, will, perhaps, neglect all the duties of her household, and leave a sick child to servants, in order to attend a prayer-meeting or a sermon. A second, in his zeal for the cause of Christ, will give that property for its support which belongs to his creditors. A third, in his hatred of sin, will be guilty of all kinds of rudeness in reproving transgressors. Mercy sometimes degenerates into a pernicious weakness, justice into harshness, spirituality into cant, humility into meanness, devotion into superstition, and a tender conscience into a diseased one. If it be injurious, and most injurious it is, to the cause of holiness, to give the names of virtue to vice, and thus reconcile men to a bad thing by the potent spell of a good word, it is not much less so, perhaps, to disgust men against what is really good, by affixing to it the appearance of what is evil. Names have a mighty influence in human affairs. Hence the wo denounced against those who call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!—Isaiah, v. 20.

4. The rule commands us to abstain from what appears to ourselves of doubtful propriety. There are many things of which the sinfulness is so manifest, which have so much of the palpable substance as well as the appearance of evil, that they are shunned, without a moment's hesitation, by every one who has the least regard to the authority of God. But there are others, the criminality of which is not so clear, and of which, therefore, even a good man may stand in doubt. We oftentimes meet with such things, and are in much and painful indecision whether we may lawfully venture upon them or not. This is the state of mind which has been called "*a doubting conscience*." The apostle has laid down rules for guiding us safely out of this dilemma, and which are sufficiently plain for all ordinary cases. "He that doubteth is damned (condemned) if he eat, for whatsoever is not of faith (that is, which a man does not believe he may lawfully do) is sin."—Rom. xiv. 23. Doubts about the propriety of an action are strong presumptive evidence that it is unlawful, for they must have their origin in the perception of some appearance of evil. Still there are persons of such a timid and nervous constitution, of such a physical incapability of coming to *any* conclusion that shall be free from all scruples, that if they never acted till they had got rid of *all* doubts, they would never act at all. The following rules may, perhaps, be of service to such persons, and, indeed, to all.

When, in the proposed actions, all the doubts lie on one side, there need be no hesitation. When one action will promote our interest, and the other oppose it, the probability is, that the way of duty lies in the course which is disadvantageous to us. It is always best, in doubtful cases, to take the safer side; that which, as far as we can judge, will involve least risk of our own reputation, and the comfort and well-being of others. It is well, in some difficult cases, to suppose the affair to belong to somebody else, and to look at it, as far as we can, as theirs, and then to ask ourselves the question, "How should I judge for *them*?" and *vice versa*, to suppose them looking upon us, and to say, "What will be *their* opinion how I ought to act?" In all cases we should consult the word of God; but

not, however, to find passages which will favour that side of the question to which we are already, perhaps, inclined, but with a sincere desire to know the will of God, and, at the same time, accompanying this exercise with fervent prayer to God for direction. If, after all, we should be still in doubt, we may then ask the opinion and advice of some discreet Christian friend or friends, on whose judgment and conscientious impartiality we can rely.

When we have thus endeavoured to know what is right, we are to proceed to action, and should not allow ourselves to be checked, interrupted, or distressed by any speculative doubts, or by the fears and misgivings of a sensitive and somewhat morbid imagination. We must be led by judgment, and, in some cases, against the doubts and fears that arise from these sources. There is frequently an apprehensiveness which makes some persons pause and hesitate, and almost resolve to turn back, even when their judgment urges them on; just like that groundless fear which makes a timid traveller doubt and ready to return, although the finger-post over his head and the mile-stone by the way-side tell him he is right. A really sincere desire to know and do the will of God, at all risk and all costs, will rarely leave a person in much doubt, as to what is right to be done. God has promised to guide the meek in judgment, and to show them his way. As a general principle, then, it holds good, that what appears to be evil *is* evil, and must be abstained from. We must not go on against the convictions of our judgment, nor even its well-grounded fears. When conscience meets us in the path we are going, striding across the road, as did the angel to resist the progress of Balaam, we must not resolve to force a passage, and continue our course.

A question will, perhaps, arise in the minds of some, of this import, "Are we bound in *all* cases to follow the dictates of conscience? If so, as conscience is often misinformed and erroneous, we may sometimes do that conscientiously which is evil." True it is, as Christ foretold his disciples, many have thought they did God service when they persecuted and murdered his saints. And the apostle tells us that, in his unbelieving state, he verily thought he ought to do many things contrary to Jesus of Nazareth; and yet, though he did it ignorantly, at the dictate of an erroneous conscience, he calls himself, on that account, the "chief of sinners." It is not to be doubted that others do many evil things, and yet act conscientiously therein. How, then, are we to judge? If we say that conscience is *not* to be followed in all things, we depose this internal monitor from his throne, and affirm that we are not always bound to do that which we believe to be right; while, if we say we always *are* to follow conscience, we seem to prove, that some do right in sinning against God, because they do it conscientiously.

It will help us out of this difficulty, to consider what is conscience. It is that power which the mind possesses of judging its own actions, by comparing them with some acknowledged rule of conduct, and of approving or condemning them according as they agree or disagree with it; together with that susceptibility of self-approbation, or pain of remorse, which follows the verdict. Conscience is not the rule of action, but the faculty of judging ourselves *by* a rule. This rule is the word of God. When, therefore, the

question is asked, "What is right?" we answer, not what conscience, but what the scriptures declare to be so. Still, however, the question returns, ought we not to do that which we believe is enjoined upon us by the word of God? I answer, yes; but then we ought also to form a right judgment of the word itself. We are responsible for our opinions. Our duty, therefore, may be thus stated: *our conscience must be first directed by the rule of scripture, and our lives guided by our conscience.* It is certainly true, that if we act in opposition to our conscience, we sin; and no less true, that we sin if our conscience is opposed to the word of God. We hence see the necessity of searching the scriptures with trembling awe, simplicity of mind, and earnest prayer to God. And we may rest assured, that whatever we do, which is condemned by this infallible rule, will be considered and treated by God as sinful, notwithstanding it has been done at the dictate of conscience; for the error of the judgment must have originated in something wrong in the heart, some deficiency of caution in examination, or some prejudice or selfish end we wished to serve, by which evidence was resisted, and a wrong conclusion drawn.

5. We ought, in many cases, to abstain from what appears evil to others. Here, of course, some exceptions must be made.

If any thing which is good in itself should appear evil in their eyes, we are not in this case to avoid it. The whole Christian religion appeared evil in the eye of the Pagans among whom it was first propagated, and was persecuted by them as such. Protestantism appears evil in the eyes of Papists; Nonconformity appears evil in the eyes of High Churchmen; and spiritual piety appears evil in the eyes of worldly-minded people to this day. In all cases of this kind, and in whatever is our duty to God, we must disregard the opinion of the world, and do what is right. To all who would turn us from the path of duty, we must give the apostle's reply, "Whether it be right to obey men rather than God, judge ye." We must not venture upon a scandal to the church, to avoid a scandal to the world. It would be a most preposterous kind of charity to please men by disobeying God. Though all the world should utter its howl against the strictness of our religion, and demand a relaxation of it, we must not gratify their humour, nor seek to win them by relaxing the least part of that severity which the law of God and our own conscience require of us.

If the strictness of our religion should, as it sometimes may, accidentally prove an occasion of sin to our neighbour, we are not, even on that account, to abate it. There is no doubt that fervent and consistent piety does oftentimes excite not only the ridicule, but the malice of the wicked. It has not unfrequently happened, that they have been provoked into a truly diabolical spirit, and have been irritated by the religion of their friends into greater lengths of wickedness, till those very friends have been ready to conceal or give up much of their religion, under the idea of preventing the wickedness it seemed to occasion. But this is wrong. Our Lord was a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence to the Jews; some were scandalized at his doctrine, as a despiser of the law of Moses; others at his conduct, as being a glutton and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners, and a sabbath-breaker: but yet, for all

these calumnies, he altered nothing in his teaching or in his conduct, but, amidst all their clamours, still went on preaching and doing. Those that are his disciples must also go on in their course of spiritual religion, although they should perceive that evil men, on this account, wax worse and worse in their hatred of God and his people. Much spiritual discretion, I admit, is required not to offend unnecessarily, by adding to our religion that which God has not commanded; by performing religious duties out of place and season; by the rigid maintenance of an unprescribed precision; and especially by needlessly obtruding our piety in a way that looks like ostentation and parade. All sacrifice of principle, and violations of conscience; all giving up of acknowledged duties for the sake of preventing the outbreaks of wickedness, softening prejudice, and conciliating good will, is doing evil ourselves, to keep others from doing it.

Nor must we sacrifice our principles, and act in opposition to our conscience, even to please the church of Christ. We must separate from what we deem to be an unscriptural communion, and abstain from what we consider a sinful practice, although it be under the condemnation of many professors of religion, or even the majority of them. Separation from our brethren without a cause, and opposition to them without sufficient reason, are evil, as disturbing, without grounds, the unity and peace of the church; but where there is ground and reason for these, such conduct is strictly proper. "If that appear a duty to us," says Bishop Hopkins, a former Prelate of the Irish Church, "that hath an appearance of evil to the generality of the most sober-minded and serious Christians, why, now, though this should not presently sway our consciences, yet it should engage us to make a strict search and inquiry, whether it be our duty or not; if it be that which is contrary to the opinion and practice of holy and pious Christians, it ought to have this authority with us, to put us to a stand, and to make us examine whether that we account a duty be a duty or not. As, for instance, some among us at this day are persuaded that they ought to worship God one way, and some another; and what appears to be a duty to one, hath the appearance of evil in it to another. Why, now, follow neither of these because it is *their* judgment and practice; but yet if thy persuasion be contrary to the persuasion of the most pious and sober-minded Christians, this ought so far to prevail as to make men suspect lest they are mistaken, and to put them upon diligent inquiry and an important search into their grounds and arguments; but after all, still follow that which you are convinced in your own conscience is your duty, how evil soever it may appear to others, one way or another." These remarks must commend themselves by their candour as well as truth, to every honest mind, and had they been acted upon by the bulk of professing Christians in every age, would have spared the ecclesiastical historian the trouble of recording the thousand angry controversies and horrid persecutions which have disfigured his pages, and disgraced the various parties which, for the time, have gained the ascendant in Christendom. Schism and persecution would never have existed, though many separations would: but the seceders would have acted cautiously and conscientiously, while those from whom they had retired, perceiving upon

what motives they had acted, would have revered the principle, however they may have lamented the act, and neither attempted to crush them with the arm of power, nor brand them with the charge of schism.

The appearance of evil, which we are to avoid out of regard to the feelings of others, is such as appertains to *things indifferent*, or, in other words, is connected with the enjoyment of our Christian liberty. Amidst the infinite diversity of human opinion, it is to be looked for, that some things of a perfectly neutral character, which may be done or not done without blame in either case, will appear evil to some; and from which, therefore, in some cases, it is both matter of charity and duty in a Christian to abstain. The manner in which we are to use our liberty in things indifferent is stated at length in Rom. xiv., and 1 Cor. viii. A question had arisen in the primitive church, about the lawfulness of eating meat that had been offered to idols, and of attending the feasts that were held in the heathen temples in honour of the god. Some of the primitive professors reasoned thus: "I believe the idol to be a mere nullity, and therefore can, not only eat the flesh of animals that had been offered in sacrifice to him, but I can even go to his feast, for the so-called deity is, in my esteem, a nonentity, a mere name." "But," says the apostle, "take heed, lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling-block to them that are weak. For if any see thee which hast knowledge, sit at meat in the idol's temple, shall not the conscience of him who is weak be imboldened to eat those things which are offered to idols; and through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish for whom Christ died?"—1 Cor. viii. 9—11. Now, observe the apostle's noble, charitable, and self-denying resolution, "Wherefore, if meat make my brother to offend, (i. e. if my example lead him to sin) I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend." The same reasoning is applied to a similar case stated in Rom. xiv., and the same conclusion is come to: "Let us follow after the things that make for peace, and things whereby one may edify another." "We then that are strong, ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves. Let every one of us please his neighbour for his good to edification. Even as Christ pleased not himself." This, then, is the law of Christian liberty in things indifferent. When we do those things which we know to be lawful, yet still not obligatory, but which others think to be sinful, we do not act charitably, and such things, therefore, should be avoided: to do them is not an act of duty, for they are confessedly indifferent, and to leave them undone is not an act of sin; while the doing of them, in such circumstances, is attended with many disadvantages. 1. Your own piety is brought into suspicion. 2. Others may be unnecessarily grieved, and the communion of saints be interrupted. 3. Some may be led by your example to do the same things in opposition to their conscience, and even to go much farther in what is wrong.

Still this deference to the opinions of others has its limits, nor does it, in any case, forbid the attempt to remove their scruples by argument and persuasion. We are not obliged to consult the whims and caprices of every ignorant or fastidious individual who chooses to take exception to our conduct; nor to submit to the unreasonable

and impertinent interference of every one who assumes a right to call us to account: much less to solicit the opinions of our neighbours on all occasions, for this would be endless and ridiculous; but still a man who is regardful, and every man ought to be regardful, of his own Christian reputation, the credit of religion, and the comfort, especially the safety of his neighbour, will often say to himself, in reference to a particular action, or course of actions, "Well, although I could do this with a clear conscience, because I believe it is quite lawful, yet, as I am not obliged to do it, and I know it is thought to be wrong by others, I will abstain from it, lest I injure my religious profession in their estimation, or lead them, by my example, to do the same thing, in opposition to their own conscience." Many a professor has injured, if not ruined his reputation for ever, in the estimation of some persons, by actions which appeared quite lawful in his own eyes, and, perhaps, were really so, but they were not thought so by those observers of them. *Their* decision was contrary to charity; but *his* conduct was no less contrary to prudence. Reputation is a thing which no man may trifle with, but which every one must watch with a sleepless and jealous vigilance; and it is assailable from so many quarters, and wounded by such small and seemingly contemptible weapons, that we must never be off our guard. It is not enough to do what we know to be good, but we must ever be studious to avoid what others imagine to be evil. We must not only be harmless as doves, but wise as serpents. It is our duty, in some cases, to yield to the ignorance we cannot enlighten, and to give way to the prejudice we cannot convince. We must never, I allow, carry our candour so far as to give up principle to our own harm, nor bow to prejudice to our neighbour's; but when we can give way without the risk of injury to ourselves or our neighbour, and with the probability of good to both, no obstinate attachment to our own opinion should prompt us to stand out. Great sacrifice of feeling, and considerable self-denial, will be sometimes necessary to act upon this plan: but, then, what is religion but one continued course of self-denial. Taking up the cross is the condition on which alone we can be accepted as a disciple of Christ. It may, perhaps, occasionally inflict a wound upon our pride, make a deduction from our self-importance, and be felt as an abridgment of our independence, to make this concession to weakness or fastidiousness; but it is due alike to ourselves, to our neighbour, and to God. It is the law of religion; and, after all, is the perfection of human character, which consists of the admixture, in due proportions, of the opposite elements of self-willfulness and servility. Sin, in any form, and in any degree, is so evil, and should be felt by the Christian to be so hateful and disgraceful, that he should wish to stand clear of it, and be acquitted, not only in the court of conscience, and of God, but at the bar of every human being upon earth. His religious character, as a professor, should be as dear to him, and guarded with as much care as that of her social reputation to a female, to whom it is not sufficient to know that she has committed no violation of the law of chastity, but wishes to avoid what might *appear* to be such, in the estimation of all, and who would not be suspected by a single individual in the world.

Professors, consider this close and comprehensive rule of conduct!

It is not enough not to *do* evil, for we must not even *seem* to do it: we must avoid the first for the sake of conscience, and the second for the sake of reputation; the first for our own sake, the second for our neighbour's sake; and both for God's sake. It is not enough to ask concerning an action, "Is it lawful?" but "is it seemly?" nor must we say, "Prove that it is evil, and I will abstain from it;" but "If it has the shadow, though it has not the substance, the mere show of evil, I will avoid it." And if, then, we are to avoid the resemblance of evil, how much more evil itself: if what only some men *think* to be sin, how much more what all men know to be such. And while we are to abstain from the mere likenesses of evil, we are also not to be content with the mere likenesses of good; the former as too much, and the latter as too little, to content a Christian mind. By giving ourselves to follow the shadows of evil, we may sink to perdition, while the mere shadow of good will never lead us to heaven.—James's Christian Professor.

ART. V.—Logan's Reply to A. R.

Mr. Editor,—I have before me A. R. Why does he waste the precious pages of the Religious Monitor, that should be asking for "the good way," with a justification in some cases of the *relation* of slave-holder and slave? Hear his words: "It would be fulfilling the law of love to *enslave* a person." Why does he complain of misrepresentation? I have given his words. Had it not been for the doctrine contained in the quotation, I would have held my peace. I believe it contains the *ligament* of slavery. Only admit that the *relation* of slave-holder and slave *may be* sinless, and the *enemy* retains his strong hold; for he is willing that men should attempt to make the fruit good, if they will only allow the tree to be corrupt. Why speak of continuing, in any case, the *relation*? Wherein does it differ from the *relation* of robber and robbed? Are not men's liberty as really their own as their life? Can we, by violence or kindness, get a right to either? Is the doctrine true, that we may enslave a person, if by it we lessen his ills? Can we, in any sense, "enslave a person," without infringing on the *inalienable right* of personal liberty? If A. R.'s doctrine be true on lessening woes, and I were to find him in the midst of robbers, taking his *all*, might I not drive them off, and take *half*? And when he called on me for it, might I not tell him, Sir, I have lessened your calamity, therefore you have no right to complain; it "was an act of mercy." Or, if I found him about to be burnt by slow fire, might I not, on A. R.'s principle, shoot him, and say, Oh, it was an act of mercy; I lightened his sufferings? Wherein does the sentiment differ from "doing evil that good may come?" Where the Bible speaks of persons who are wrongfully deprived of their liberty, does it allow the *relation* to remain? What is meant by *breaking the yoke*, if it does not mean destroying the *relation*, (see Jer. xxxiv. 17) in reference to those who were wrongfully deprived of their liberty? "Ye have not hearkened to me in *proclaiming liberty*, every man to his brother, and every man to his neighbour." And what is the

consequence? Hear: "I proclaim a liberty to you, to the sword, the pestilence," &c. If A. R. had been there, would he not, very sagaciously, have informed them, that they need not *break the yoke*, only *lighten it*? nor need they *proclaim liberty*, only let *merciful men* buoy them up, and "treat them with humanity, kindness and equity?" Why was he so tedious and circumlocutory in arriving at, and so sportive when he came to, the interrogatories, unless it was to raise smoke and dust (called, by warriors, diversion) sufficient to conceal his signal defeat before them? Why make such an ado about my doctrine of exceptions, when it would result the same to the argument, whether he or I was right? for both views admit that the authority for heathen servitude and the destruction of the Canaanites is now abrogated: and on this rests his excuse for not answering the interrogatories, whereas it is plain it was but a mere *pheasant flutter* to hide his "enslaving a human being." Is it sound to say God so *modifies* his law as to *suit* the condition of his creatures? Why say I confound the law and providence of God, when the very proof he furnishes against me proves that he confounds them? for a leading difference between the law and providence of God is, that his law is a *rule of action*, but his providence is not. Was not the command to Israel to destroy the Canaanites to be a *rule of action* to them? A. R., having now utterly failed in conflict with the interrogatories, he falls down at their feet a begging, and supposes that I, by my reasoning, admit that the law of the Jews authorizes slavery. This I never did admit; nor do I believe it. I only reasoned that we could not defend under authority not now in *force*. The position is not, however, true, that a law once given of God can be repealed only by a positive command to the contrary. If this were true, most of the judicial and ceremonial laws would be now in *force*. Why say we "have not resisted unto blood?" did not the Rev. E. P. Lovejoy do so at Alton, whose memory is embalmed in the hearts of all true men? He is now beyond the power of the *Illinois Mobocrats*. He feared not them who killed his body. As a man falls before wicked men, so he fell; at which all true patriots weep.

What does the editor mean by pledging non-interference, and, in the same breath, interfering; and, in a subsequent one, makes a direct attack on my doctrine of exceptions? Is this *fair play*? I am sure I am willing he should decline *mine* and fight with his *own* weapons. What does he mean by calling an exception to a law, "repugnant" to it? Are the "works of necessity and mercy" repugnant to the fourth commandment? and do not the standards of the church to which he belongs call them exceptions? So I might say of self-defence being an exception to the sixth, yet not repugnant to it. What does he mean when he says he has "no sympathy?" &c. I ask him to give us a description of the persons he alludes to, that if any of us be amongst them, we may leave them, and enter the old paths, that we may find rest to our souls. May God bless you, and assist you in your *difficult task*.

LOGAN.

Logan will excuse us for the omission of several paragraphs in his communication. Without such omissions the paper was wholly inadmissible, on account of its personalities and impeachment of his

opponent's motives. When we gave a pledge to our patrons that offensive personal allusions should not pollute the pages of the Monitor, we did not anticipate that a necessity would be imposed on us to exercise such constant vigilance on this point. It seems we are misunderstood both by friends and opponents. A critical condition. But, by the grace of God assisting, we hope to disappoint both. No consideration can induce us either to assail the motives or character of others, or permit our correspondents to abuse each other. How often shall we be compelled to make this declaration? And how long will it be before men professing godliness will learn that "the wrath of man works not the righteousness of God?" A bitter spirit and a harsh manner will injure any cause, and is destructive to truth and sound morals. If our aims be good, the means used must be equally so.

We confess our disappointment with Logan's production. It was expected he would *answer* A. R., without the introduction of extraneous matter. Personal assaults are not statements of truth, which ought to be maintained irrespective of persons; neither are interrogatories arguments. Almost any man may ask a hundred questions, and not be able to answer one of them. And as several of his interrogatories in the paper before us imply erroneous sentiments, we could not see the propriety of inserting them, merely to incur the labour of answering them.

Had Logan attended to the scope of our note to correspondents, in the July number, he would have perceived that the word "disposition" is there used in the sense of *inclination*, or *desire*; and this would have prevented the mistake of calling it a *pledge*. He supposes the following words aim a blow at abolitionists:—"We have no sympathy of feeling in common with those who would drive a crusade against this sin only in others, or adopt unlawful measures for the liberation of the slave." Perhaps we need not regret Logan's misapprehension, as it presents us with an opportunity of giving our views more at length.

In the first clause of the sentence, our allusion was to a very numerous class in the non-slave-holding states, who condemn this sin in their southern brethren, in no mild terms, while they congratulate themselves on account of their supposed exemption. We hold the whole United States, as a nation, guilty of slavery in the sight of God, for the following reasons: 1. The constitution permits, and the laws *enforce* the sin. 2. This is done by the aid and co-operation of non-slave-holding states. 3. Vast numbers in these states derive their wealth from slave labour; and roll in luxury on the toil, the tears, and the groans of the poor African.

In the latter clause, our allusion was to a very common charge brought against abolitionists, that they are pursuing unlawful measures for the liberation of the slaves, such as inciting them to insur-

rection, bloodshed, &c. Whether this charge has any foundation in truth we have not the means of knowing with certainty. So far as our information extends, it is unfounded. On this point we say, with the apostle, "If thou mayest be free, use it rather."

In relation to A. R., we are unable to perceive that he is justly chargeable either with corrupt motives or with the sin of advocating slavery. He is only mistaken in one point, namely, supposing the relation of slave-holder and slave may be justifiable in some cases. On this point, the answer of Logan is sufficient. But A. R. is, in some places, misconstrued by Logan; and in others Logan gives his own *inferences* from what A. R. has said as his language, which is always an unfair method of discussion. And even "Anti-Slavery," who writes in a becoming spirit, and says many good things, is not wholly free from this error. We should regret extremely the loss of A. R. as a correspondent: many of his productions are excellent, both as to matter and manner, of which his communication for the August number is an example; and he generally contrives to write in such a way as to secure a reading, both from friends and foes. His answer to Logan's interrogatories, however, gave general dissatisfaction, simply because he had the wrong side of the question. This necessarily led him to wander; but even that paper has some redeeming qualities. It contains a merited rebuke of the temper and spirit of the times. Yet we are not quite sure that he has, himself, altogether escaped the infection; "political curs"—"make devils laugh" are neither mild nor classical terms, even when used in a general way.

An esteemed friend, who is also a minister in the Associate Church, writes thus: "I think such articles as the last of A. R.'s are of but little interest to any one, as there is no argument, scarcely, but a manifestation of temper, a little display of his talent for controversy, suitable to a political journal. And I think just as little of Logan's queries. They seem to display neither argument nor a Christian spirit. He says, (Vol. XV. p. 564,) 'It requires the meekness of Moses to keep in temper arguing with those who are still willing to 'enslave' a human being.' Now all that is required in such a case is simply the spirit of the Christian, which is 'pure, peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits.' It is much to be regretted, that those who are enlisted in a good cause have not more prudence: but 'to err is human.'"

We trust our friend will excuse this extract from a *private* letter. It so fully expresses our own views, that we could not resist the temptation to give it a place in the Monitor.

"Logan asks, "What does the editor mean by calling an exception to law *repugnant* to it?" The editor has not done this. His language is, "the judicial laws of the Jewish nation were not exceptions, that is, not repugnant to the moral law." Logan had inquired

whether they were not exceptions; and A. R. took the word, as we think, improperly, in the sense of inconsistent or repugnant. Hence, the language we used was not a disapprobation of Logan's use of the word, but of A. R.'s sense of it. An exception may or may not be repugnant to a law.

It is not sound to say "God *modifies* his law to suit the condition of his creatures," any more than it is sound to say "a law once given of God can be repealed" without the interposition of the same authority that enacted the law. Nor will it follow from this that any of the ceremonial or judicial laws are now in force; because, the authority that enacted these laws *has* repealed them. If Logan will turn to Heb. x. 9., Matt. v. 31—48, and other parallel passages, he will find this statement corroborated. It is admitted, however, that some of the judicial laws expired by their own limitation; and that others, being not only consonant to God's moral government of the world, but of universal application, are embraced in the moral law.

Unless Logan and the editor have better weapons than their own, they will make but a poor defence of the truth. When men depend upon their own weapons, they seldom fail to "*fight*," in the worst sense of the word.

If we understand A. R., his doctrine is simply this: The *relation* of slave-holder and slave is not, in itself, essentially immoral; at least in certain circumstances,—when the design and effect of the relation is to mitigate the severity of existing servitude, for which there can be no other remedy. In this opinion A. R. is not alone; and it is surely great injustice to charge any man holding such an opinion with being *willing to enslave a human being!* The editor of the Monitor does, indeed, take the negative of this question, while many whom he acknowledges his superiors take the affirmative. He thinks the moral law tolerates neither venial sins nor mitigated servitude. But, if any person should suppose he intends to exclude articles containing much that is good, and, on the whole, valuable, because they may advance a single point of difference from his own views, they mistake both his temper and spirit. Much less would he cast out of the pale of Christian charity any individual, merely on the ground of such differences. On the other hand, he will labour to vindicate the truth with meekness, that, if possible, the erroneous may be won to its cause. He believes the subordinate standards of the Associate Church imbody a system of truth, more conformable to the oracles of God than any other known to him. And the principal cause of difficulty in the church is, doubtless, a criminal ignorance of these excellent formularies, the want of love for them, and of a life conformable to their peculiar principles. It is, however, respectfully suggested, that A. R. would promote the interest of our periodical by waiving this controverted point, and proceeding on the even tenor of his way with other topics.

We have often been surprised that abolitionists should permit themselves to be driven from the moral law, the rule of conduct now in force, which is clear and unequivocal, to an abrogated law, which, to say the least, admits of controversy on the subject of slavery. Whether the judicial laws of the Jewish nation tolerated slavery or not, we will not pretend to decide. We disbelieve full one-half that is said by the contending parties on this point. The abolitionists, so far as we have seen, have given no satisfactory solution of Gen. xvii. 12., nor of Lev. xxv. 39., and several other similar passages. In the first cited passage it is "bought with money of any stranger," not of HIMSELF. In the latter, a distinction is made between a Hebrew servant bought with money and a BOND-SERVANT, and a command is given requiring more lenient treatment of the former than of the latter: "Thou shalt not compel him to serve as a BOND-SERVANT," or, as it may be read, "Thou shalt not serve thyself with him with the service of a BOND-SERVANT." Again: the *stranger*, or heathen *bond-men*, were for a "POSSESSION," property; (ver. 46,) they shall be your bondmen FOR EVER. But provision was made for the redemption of Hebrew bond-men. It is incumbent on those who are so confident that the judicial laws of the Jewish nation did not tolerate slavery, to give us a satisfactory exposition of these texts. It is more than probable the Jews were allowed to make slaves of the heathen nations against whom Jehovah had passed a sentence of extermination, for their wickedness. This view derives support from the covenant transaction between Joshua and the Gibeonites, and goes far to remove several difficulties. It may be regarded as an act of beneficence in God; because it was a mitigation of the original sentence: and may have been extended, in his providence, only to such as manifested some tokens of submission to the Divine will, accompanied with a corresponding outward reformation. External reformation may not only mitigate, but remove temporal calamities, as in the case of the Ninevites. So much for the abrogated judicial law.

But we can never believe the *relation* of slave-holder and slave justifiable in any shape, and, at the same time, believe the Bible to be a revelation from God. For, in reference to the moral law, there can be no dispute among such as truly recognise its authority. It requires love to our neighbour, of the same kind and degree with self-love; to do to others as we *wish* others should do to us; and requires active benevolence toward the whole human race. It not only prohibits us from putting forth the hand against the life, liberty, property, or reputation of our neighbour, but it *commands* us to engage in the use of all lawful means for the promotion of his happiness, both temporal and eternal. The priest and the Levite who passed by the man that had fallen among thieves, were guilty

of a flagrant breach of the moral law. It will not be difficult for an enlightened conscience to see the application of this example to the present condition of the much-wronged and oppressed African, in this land of boasted liberty, where the sacred rights of man are toys and playthings, and human nature is debased, nay, sacrificed on the altar of MAMMON. The *relation* of slave and slave-holder is monstrous wickedness, the bare contemplation of which is fearful. And we never yet could see how good men can, in any case, as is sometimes done, *purchase* the slave's freedom, and then compel him to work out the price of his freedom. How much soever we may admire the spirit that prompts to such an action, the action itself ought to be condemned; because it is a practical acknowledgment of the usurper's right. It is a reward to felony. Who ever thought of rewarding the robber, as an inducement to disgorge the property of another?

But this article is becoming long, and we will conclude with an extract or two from *Wayland's Elements of Moral Science*:

“The relation in which men stand to each other, is essentially the relation of equality; not equality of condition, but equality of right.

“Every human being is a distinct and separately accountable individual.* To each one, God has given just such means of happiness, and placed him under such circumstances for improving those means of happiness, as it has pleased him. To one, he has given wealth; to another, intellect; to another, physical strength; to another, health; and to all in different degrees. In all these respects, the human race presents a scene of the greatest possible diversity. So far as natural advantages are concerned, we can scarcely find two individuals who are not created under circumstances widely dissimilar.

“But, viewed in another light, all men are placed under circumstances of perfect equality. Each separate individual is created with precisely the same right to use the advantages with which God has endowed him. This proposition seems to me, in its nature, so self-evident, as almost to preclude the possibility of argument. The only reason that I can conceive, on which any one could found a plea for inequality of right, must be inequality of condition. But this can manifestly create no diversity of right. I may have been endowed with better eye-sight than my neighbour; but this, evidently, gives me no right to put out his eyes, or to interfere with his right to derive from them whatever of happiness the Creator has placed within his power. I may have greater muscular strength than my neighbour; but this gives me no right to break his arms, or to diminish, in any manner, his ability to use them for the production of his own happiness. Besides, this supposition involves direct and manifest contradiction. For, the principle asserted is, that superiority of condition confers superiority of right. But, if this be true, then every kind of superiority of condition must confer corresponding superiority of right. Superiority in muscular strength must confer it, as much as superiority of intellect, or of wealth; and

must confer it in the ratio of that superiority. In that case, if A, on the ground of intellectual superiority, have a right to improve his own means of happiness, by diminishing those which the Creator had given to B, B would have the same right over A, on the ground of superiority of muscular strength; while C would have a corresponding right over them both, on the ground of superiority of wealth; and so on, indefinitely; and these rights would change every day, according to the relative situation of the respective parties. That is to say, as right is, in its nature, exclusive, all the men in the universe have an exclusive right to the same thing; while the right of every one absolutely annihilates that of every other. What is the meaning of such an assertion, I leave it for others to determine."—p. 201—203.

"Every human being is, by his constitution, a separate and distinct, and complete system, adapted for all the purposes of self-government, and responsible, separately, to God, for the manner in which his powers are employed. Thus, every individual possesses a body, by which he is connected with the physical universe, and by which that universe is modified for the supply of his wants; an understanding, by which truth is discovered, and by which means are adapted to their appropriate ends; passions and desires, by which he is excited to action, and in the gratification of which his happiness consists; conscience, to point out the limit within which these desires may be rightfully gratified; and a will, which determines him to action. The possession of these is necessary to a human nature, and it also renders every being, so constituted, a distinct and independent individual. He may need society, but every one needs it equally with every other one; and hence, all enter into it upon terms of strict and evident reciprocity. If the individual uses these powers according to the laws imposed by his Creator, his Creator holds him guiltless. If he use them in such manner as not to interfere with the use of the same powers which God has bestowed upon his neighbour, he is, as respects his neighbour, whether that neighbour be an individual or the community, independent. So long as he uses them within this limit, he has a right, so far as his fellow men are concerned, to use them, in the most unlimited sense, *suo arbitrio*, at his own discretion. His will is a sufficient and ultimate reason. He need assign no other reason for his conduct, than his own free choice. Within this limit, he is still responsible to God; but, within this limit, he is not responsible to man, nor is man responsible for him."—pp. 213, 214.

"Domestic slavery proceeds upon the principle that the master has a right to control the actions, physical and intellectual, of the slave, for his own, that is, the master's, individual benefit; and, of course, that the happiness of the master, when it comes in competition with the happiness of the slave, extinguishes in the latter the right to pursue it. It supposes, at best, that the relation between master and slave is not that which exists between man and man, but is a modification of that which exists between man and the brutes.

"Now, this manifestly supposes that the two classes of beings are created with dissimilar rights: that the master possesses rights which have never been conceded by the slave; and, that the slave has no rights at all over the means of happiness which God has given him,

whenever these means of happiness can be rendered available to the service of the master. It supposes that the Creator intended one human being to govern the physical, intellectual, and moral actions, of as many other human beings as, by purchase, he can bring within his physical power; and, that one human being may thus acquire a right to sacrifice the happiness of any number of other human beings, for the purpose of promoting his own.

“Slavery, thus, violates the personal liberty of man as a physical, intellectual, and moral being.

“1. It purports to give to the master a right to control the physical labour of the slave, not for the sake of the happiness of the slave, but for the sake of the happiness of the master. It subjects the amount of labour, and the kind of labour, and the remuneration for labour, entirely to the will of the one party, to the entire exclusion of the will of the other party.

“2. But if this right in the master over the slave be conceded, there is, of course, conceded all other rights necessary to ensure its possession. Hence, inasmuch as the slave can be held in this condition only while he remains in the lowest state of mental imbecility, it supposes the master to have the right to control his intellectual development, just as far as may be necessary to secure entire subjection. Thus, it supposes the slave to have no right to use his intellect for the production of his own happiness, but, only to use it in such manner as may conduce to his master’s profit.

“3. And, moreover, inasmuch as the acquisition of the knowledge of his duty to God could not be freely made without the acquisition of other knowledge, which might, if universally diffused, endanger the control of the master, slavery supposes the master to have the right to determine how much knowledge of his duty a slave shall obtain, the manner in which he shall obtain it, and the manner in which he shall discharge that duty after he shall have obtained a knowledge of it. It thus subjects the duty of man to God entirely to the will of man; and this for the sake of the pecuniary profit. It renders the eternal happiness of the one party subservient to the temporal happiness of the other. And this principle is commonly carried into effect in slave-holding countries.”—pp. 220, 221.

ART. VI.—*The State of Religion and Morals in France.*

EVERY year, Mr. Stapfer, that venerable servant of God, who combines an humble faith with profound learning, takes the occasion of our religious anniversaries to exhibit important thoughts upon our religious and moral condition. Mr. Stapfer is an attentive observer of the evils of our age, and he knows how to point out the proper remedy for them, because he is acquainted with the gospel of Christ, the inexhaustible source of all good and all prosperity. His discourse this year bears, like his preceding discourses, the double stamp of piety and mature thought. I cannot quote it entire for want of space, but I will try, at least, to give you an exact outline.

Mr. Stapfer discusses this question: What is the power of con-

science among the French of our times? In other words: Are the French any more governed by inward principles? And the speaker is forced to answer, no; the French, for the most part, no longer listen to the voice of conscience; they live in a constant turmoil, so occupied with external objects as to be continually drawn out of themselves, and not to know what passes in their own hearts.

This sad state of things did not always exist in France. There have been times when the men of this nation examined carefully their inward principles of action, and brought to this subject a force and penetration hardly equalled by other nations. France gave to the world the most studious and most illustrious *scholastic* doctors in the middle ages; and surely though these doctors have taught many errors in religion and morals, they possessed great clearness and subtleness of mind, and were accustomed to search into the deepest recesses of the soul. At a later period, France produced reformers who exhibited faculties for meditation of the first order, and unfolded better than any others the mysteries of the human heart. If we come down to the seventeenth century, we shall see that France produced such eminent thinkers as Descartes, Pascal, Arnauld, Bossuet, Fénelon, Claude, Bochart, and many others. At this period, men and women of the highest rank, attendants at the Court of Louis XIV., were occupied with subjects of profound reflection, studied the severest moralists, and did not shrink from the most abstruse metaphysical investigations. The French nation had then an inclination for religious discussions, and took great interest in them.

Whence has this character changed? What causes have weakened or destroyed their powers of reflection on what passes within them? Why have this people, once so careful to examine the phenomena of conscience, now become so indifferent? Mr. Stapfer points to the Revocation of the edict of Nantes, as one of the great causes of this change. When the Reformed Church stood opposed to the Romish church in our country, and could defend herself with the arms of the Bible and of science, the Catholic doctors felt the need of study, in order to maintain the contest. Laymen themselves, witnessing the great struggle, devoted to it all the powers of their minds, and thus learned to think seriously upon religious subjects. No one remained wholly a stranger to such discussions, comprising, as they do, all that is most elevated in this life and the life to come. But, after most of the Protestants were driven from France, and they who remained dared not lift up their voice, this *salutary opposition*, as Mr. Stapfer expresses it, this opposition which exerted a strong influence upon the Gallican church, suddenly disappeared, and gave the Romish priests leave to rest. Intellectual languor, neglect of theological questions, indifference for serious objects, took the place of the discussions which had occupied the two preceding ages. The clergy neglected study, and with much more reason did laymen abandon their examination into difficult points of Christian doctrine. The revocation of the edict of Nantes was not only an odious act of tyranny and persecution; it was also, in some sense, a religious and moral suicide for France. Just retribution of God, who smites the enemies of the truth with the arms which they had prepared against its friends.

Another cause which has contributed to weaken the thinking fa-

culties of the French people is *the bull Unigenitus*, by which the pope ordered the Jansenists to submit unreservedly to the decisions of the holy see. Rome did not wish nor dare to engage in discussion; she ordered silence, blind obedience, and made use of her temporal power to punish those who should still try to defend their opinions. The result was, that religious discussion was suppressed, and the press had to seek other subjects of controversy. The French, no longer having subjects to investigate in the world of mind, resorted, as a substitute, to the examination of physical objects. Instead of exploring religion, they studied natural history, chemistry, mathematics; all their researches were directed to the laws of the material world. Hence, their materialism. God was banished from human thought; the soul was neglected and forgotten; morality was nothing but a calculation of private interest, and sensual pleasures were sought, in order not to fill the void left by the absence of religious meditations.

This is not all. Their political condition at the close of the eighteenth century also concurred to divert the French from the contemplation of other objects. So many revolutions agitated the minds of men, and excited their passions; so many wars within and without the country exerted a pernicious influence upon our moral condition, that the men of this vast kingdom, continually shaken by the revolutions, as by a volcano, had not time to compose themselves and to reflect. They had thrown down the tribunal of conscience, in their haste to acquire political liberty. And here, mark an inherent danger in political debates; Christians, as well as others, should watch against it, lest they become its victims. Doubtless, it is well, it is even a duty, to give some attention to politics. The duties of the citizen harmonize with those of the Christian; and, perhaps, he who remains indifferent to public affairs, is not a *complete* Christian, in the full meaning of the word. But he should observe great moderation. A man who allows himself to be *absorbed* by politics, cannot be really a *religious* man. The tumult of legislative assemblies stuns him, and he is constantly driven out of himself; he loses gradually all his moral principles; he forgets that there is any thing higher than popularity, or more valuable than human honours; he subjects the dictates of his conscience to the caprice of public opinion; he is prejudiced in favour of his friends, and unjust to his adversaries; in a word, he cannot be a Christian.

Such is the sad experience which many Frenchmen have made, and which they still make. Their misfortune is to attribute too much importance to politics; they worship liberty rather than God; chimerical hopes of advancing in civilization, take the place of the hope of a blessed immortality; conscience is driven from her seat by a perpetual anxiety about public affairs. And then this very liberty, sought for so eagerly, is endangered, and civilization is retarded by too much anxiety to promote it. It cannot be too often inculcated, that men who wish to be and to remain free, should reserve much of their time and energy for religious and moral subjects. If they are not good Christians, they cannot be good citizens.

Mr. Stapfer points out other causes of the decline of morals in France; and here I cannot refrain from copying a part of his excellent discourse. He says:

“ All concurs to this sad result: the want of sound religious and moral instruction, in place of which we have doctrines and worship addressed too much to the senses and the imagination; a propensity to live wholly in a world of sense, occupied with fugitive impressions, with transient enjoyments; social habits hostile to domestic life and all retirement; the predominance of the theatres over all other pleasures and diversions of mind; those branches of literature only taught which agitate the passions, feed frivolous tastes, and require the least possible attention. Writers try to spare their readers all laborious application, all fatigue of mind; and this is also one of the causes which have weakened the powers of reflection, so essential to spiritual life.

“ The worst of all is, that the paralytic does not believe himself sick. Far from suspecting that he is buried in the sleep of spiritual death, he believes that he is alive, because he mistakes his mental efforts for indications of moral life. But even if he makes his conscience the object of his reflections, he treats it as something distinct from himself, a mere matter of philosophical investigation. He attends to the phenomena of conscience as to an exhibition at the theatre; he pictures it seated upon its tribunal, uttering its decrees, while he remains as indifferent as the philosopher who is investigating a law in the material world. Conscience is with him a *curious* fact, not a personal concern. Thus all the operations of the soul are regarded as objects of science or amusement; men of active minds and laborious habits seem to live, but are spiritually dead. The voice of conscience ceases to be heard.”

[For the Religious Monitor.]

ART. VII.—*Obituary Notice.*

Departed this life, in this city, on Friday morning, the 23d inst., MR. JOHN M. SCROGGS, preacher in the Associate Presbyterian Church, in the thirty-first year of his age.

The individual whose death we have recorded was known, personally, to a considerable number of the readers of the Monitor; and we doubt not but to such this announcement will awaken the most sorrowful feelings. But it cannot but abate their regret, when informed that he has left a witness behind him that he has exchanged the troubles of this life for the joys of a better world.

Our deceased brother was born April 23d, 1808, in the state of Ohio. In the fall of 1827 he entered Franklin College, New Athens, Ohio. Here he continued until he graduated. While at this institution his conduct was marked by diligence in his studies and very creditable improvement. As an evidence of this, he was called upon to officiate as Professor of Languages during the last year of his collegiate course. At this time the President of the institution was removed by death, and he was called upon to supply his place; the duties of which were faithfully discharged. But, alas! while he was thus training his mind, as he thought, to qualify himself for usefulness in the world and church, he was, insensibly, preparing his body for

the house of silence. His close application and uninterrupted diligence brought on dyspepsia, the wasting influence of which he long experienced. This speaks a warning to the youthful student. How many are there who, while endeavouring to expand and elevate their minds, are depressing and wasting their bodies, and preparing them for days and nights of pain and disease, and, at last, for a premature grave? But it was not only for his diligence that our deceased brother was characterized during his collegiate course, but also for that sweetness of temper, social disposition, and pious deportment which were so visible in the latter part of his life. It was these traits of character that won for him the affections of his fellow students and the respect of his professors. In the former part of his collegiate term, he professed the principles of the Secession Church; to which he always manifested a sincere attachment and faithful adherence.

In the fall of 1832 he was received by the Muskingum Presbytery as a student of theology, and repaired immediately to the seminary. While at the seminary, he was visited by the loss of a much beloved brother; which dispensation, together with his precarious health, taught him that lesson which only can be obtained in the school of affliction. His fellow students who were present with him at the Hall will not forget the cheerfulness he always evinced in the midst of his afflictions. They will not forget the ardour and sincerity of his attachments, and, above all, his devoted piety. After having completed the usual course of studies at the seminary, he was licensed to preach, on the 16th of June, 1836. During the first year of his ministry he was sent, by the appointment of Synod, on the western tour. This appointment is to be lamented, as the fatigue and expense consequent upon a mission of this kind were very unfavourable to his already delicate and enfeebled constitution. But why should we lament it? His Master, we trust, had a work for him to perform, and there he went, willing to spend and be spent in the glorious cause he had espoused. But his work, though laborious, was short. In the winter of 1837 he was attacked with a slight hemorrhage, which confined him for one month. From this time till the meeting of Synod in Pittsburgh, May of the same year, he was incapacitated, by bodily weakness, for public service. While at this meeting, he received a call from the congregation of Princeton, Indiana. The acceptance of this call he was compelled to decline from his delicate health. This circumstance gave him much sorrow, as we have often heard him express the warmest affection for those from whom it came, and his great desire, had it been the will of Providence, to labour among them. After the meeting of Synod, the deceased proceeded to Baltimore, where he preached one Sabbath. But the exertion was too great for his feeble frame; a return of the hemorrhage was the consequence. Thus his prospects were again darkened by the clouds of affliction, and he was under the painful necessity of discontinuing the southern tour to which he had been appointed. After a short stay in Baltimore, he proceeded to Philadelphia, where he remained for some time, and then returned, in the fall, to the west. Here he was advised to take a trip to the south, with the hope that a kind Providence would make it instrumental to his recovery. While on his way to the city of Tuscaloosa, he was often visited, from the fatigue and privations to

which he was exposed, with days of affliction. Oh! how sweet is health to him from whom it is withheld! Here is one willing to forego the sweet companionship of friends, and endure the fatigue and exposure of a long and solitary ride, for that which we so little regard and so often misimprove. In Tuscaloosa Mr. Scroggs remained for some time; and we hope that his stay there was productive of much good, in encouraging the hearts and edifying the souls of the little flock who enjoyed his society and services. From this city he returned, by sea, to New York, by the way of Mobile and New Orleans.

A short time previous to the meeting of Synod he returned to Philadelphia, with health apparently much improved. But ah! how often do our hopes prove vain in this life. Shortly after his arrival he was attacked, while in the house of Mr. Laird, by a copious discharge of blood from his lungs, and again was he brought to the brink of Jordan; but his time to pass this river to enter the land of promise had not yet arrived; darker days and severer trials yet await our hitherto afflicted brother. In this house he continued, being unable to return to his friends, until the day of his death, with the exception of a visit to the country and the city of Baltimore. While here, he was cheered by a visit from his brother, who came on to accompany him to the home of his birth. But, alas! that home he was never permitted to see. Here we hope to be excused for mentioning the unfeigned kindness and the unremitting attention manifested to the deceased by the family with whom he continued during the last year of his life. Were we to pass this by unnoticed, we would not do justice to our own feelings, the feelings of those who have witnessed their kindness, and, we are sure, the feelings of his friends, from whom he was providentially and unavoidably separated by a great distance. Nor can we refrain from referring to the kind, constant, and disinterested attentions of Dr. Gerhard, of this city, whose skill and medical attainments are well known.

Thus, we have given a short account of the labours, travels, and trials of a brother beloved; and we are sure that they will not be altogether without interest to those who were acquainted with him. In the character of this individual we see much to admire. Follow him from the day that he leaves his father's house, through the college and the seminary, and in his laborious travels: what diligence and perseverance mark his course; what ardent desire to be found useful in the service of his Master. Follow him in his social walks: how amiable and agreeable as a companion; how affectionate and confiding as a friend! Follow him in his religious course; and here we find him the faithful minister of the New Testament, and the devout Christian. Follow him to the bed of sickness; ah! here is the place to try the soul, and here, severely, was the soul of our deceased brother tried, to the honour of the grace of God. Those who visited him during his confinement will bear testimony to his patience and resignation to the will of Providence. Although his afflictions were long and painful, yet a murmur was never heard. There was a firm and unshaken confidence manifested by him in the wisdom and goodness of God in sending him these severe afflictions. But we need not dwell upon his state of mind at this time, as this is exhibited to us in the articles entitled "Reflections on a

Sick Bed," which are now in course of publication in the pages of the Monitor. The promises of God administered to his soul, in the dark hour of his adversity, much strength and comfort. A considerable number of these were committed to writing by him, and preserved for the time of need. Often has the writer of this notice found him rejoicing in the sweetness and fulness of these promises, as an all-sufficient support and a delightful cordial to the soul. It was his blessed privilege to have made his calling and election sure to himself; he could say, in confidence, "I know that my Redeemer liveth;" nay, a short time previous to his death, he expressed himself as happier than ever he had before been, verifying the declaration of the prophet Isaiah, "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee." He was much concerned for the state of our Zion at the present time, and the cause of truth. Often did he speak of the destitute state of the heathen, and bewail a want of sufficient zeal and activity in sending them the gospel. During the greater part of his sickness, he was incapacitated for speaking in such a way as to be heard. This was a severe trial to him who was anxious to enjoy the society of his friends, and desirous of telling what God had done for his soul. But, though disabled from speaking, he wrote notes to his friends who visited him, giving them an account of the state of his body and soul, and exhorting them to faithfulness to Christ. Those who received these notes will not forget the ardent love to Christ, submission to his will, and longing for the joys of heaven they always breathed. But we forbear to dwell longer in contemplating the character of our departed brother. Let us profit by the example of one who was long in the furnace of affliction, and who, we trust, came forth purified as gold tried in the fire. Here is another witness to the many that have been given us of the faithfulness of God to his promise, that he will be with his people in six troubles, and in seven not forsake them.

Precious, in the sight of the Lord, is the death of saints. The day of his death is better than the day of his birth. Can there be any comfort like that which the gospel brings at such a time? Can there be any joy like that with which the promise of a covenant God inspires the soul of the departing Christian? No; here was one that could say, in the words of another, "Why should we fear? The grave is not to be a prison-house, but a bed-chamber. We shall not be thrown into it as criminals, but kindly conducted to it as friends; there our toil will be at an end, our conflicts will cease for ever; endless joy will take the place of transient sorrow, and an eternal weight of glory be the substitute for the afflictions of a moment."

"Here I am, like a ship at anchor in a wind-bound condition, longing to sail to the haven of eternal rest. Oh! what a day, 'when I shall behold his face!' I now find him 'the shadow of a great rock for refuge,' and 'as rivers of water' for refreshment. I have 'peace and quietness' now; and 'assurance for ever' in that which he calls me to possess."

"He was a man among the few,
Sincere on virtue's side;
And all his strength from Scripture drew,
To hourly use applied.

That rule he priz'd, by that he fear'd,
He hated, hop'd, and lov'd;
Nor ever frown'd, nor sad appear'd,
But when his heart had rov'd.

For he was frail as thou or I,
And evil felt within;
But when he felt it, heav'd a sigh,
And loath'd the thought of sin.

*His joys be mine, each reader cries,
When my last hour arrives;
They shall be yours, my verse replies,
Such only be your lives."*

P. S. The deceased, we may remark, has left behind him several manuscripts and papers, which may yet be presented to the public.

ART. VIII.—*The Jewish Creed.*

[From Mr. Loeser's Catechism for Younger Children, prepared for a Jewish Sabbath School, Phila.]

I. What do you call a Creed?

Those doctrines which are the foundation of any system of religion. In other words, those ideas of belief which one admits as the follower of a particular faith.

2. Have we any ideas peculiar to us, as followers of the Mosaic Law?

We have; and upon the admission thereof rests the distinction which divides us from other nations.

3. Is the belief in this creed alone sufficient to ensure salvation?

By no means; we should believe and confide in the truth of religious doctrines; but without acts to demonstrate the existence of such faith, our life is not pleasing to God, who demands of us active exertion in his holy service.

4. What is then the use of a Creed?

The firm faith in, and admission of acknowledged truths which will best promote a correct course of life; for by being impressed with holy feelings, we will be best able to withstand temptations and the inclination to sin inherent in man.

5. Which are the chief doctrines already given?

I. The belief in God.

II. The belief in the revelation of the Law.

III. The belief in reward and punishment after death.

6. Are there not some modifications, or more extensive ideas connected with these chief doctrines of Faith?

There are several, which have been already partly mentioned.

7. Into how many divisions, then, is the whole Jewish Creed divided, as generally accepted among us?

Into thirteen; which are generally called the Thirteen fundamental Principles of the Jewish Faith, because upon the admission of them we found the truth and the justness of our lives as Israelites faithful to the law of God.

8. Please to recite them in the order in which they are found in our books.

I. I believe, with a firm faith, that there exists a Creator, who, blessed be his name, has created and governs all his creatures; and that He alone has made, does make, and will make all things that can, by any possibility, have existence.

II. I believe, with a firm faith, that the Creator is one, and there is no unity like Him in any manner, and that he alone is our God; who was, who is, and who will be.

III. I believe, with a firm faith, that the blessed Creator is incorporeal; that no bodily infirmities or accidents can reach Him, and that He can be compared to nothing corporeal of which we can form any idea.

IV. I believe, with a firm faith, that the blessed Creator is the first and the last.

V. I believe, with a firm faith, that the blessed Creator is the only one to whom we should pray, and there is, besides Him, no being to whom we ought to address our prayers.

VI. I believe, with a firm faith, that all the words of the Prophets are true.

VII. I believe, with a firm faith, that the prophecy of our teacher Moses (upon whom be peace) is true, and that he was the chief of all the wise men that lived before him, or will come after him.

VIII. I believe, with a firm faith, that the whole law which we have now in our possession, is the same which was given to our teacher Moses (upon whom be peace.)

IX. I believe, with a firm faith, that this law will not be changed; nor will there be another law from the Creator, blessed be his name.

X. I believe, with a firm faith, that the blessed Creator knows all the deeds of the sons of men, and all their thoughts; as it is written: "He fashioneth all their hearts, and understandeth all their works."

XI. I believe, with a firm faith, that the blessed Creator will reward those who keep his commandments, and punish those who transgress them.

XII. I believe, with a firm faith, in the coming of the Messiah; and though he tarry, still will I daily wait for his coming.

XIII. I believe, with a firm faith, that the dead will be called to life at the time it may be the will of the blessed Creator, whose memorial be glorified for everlasting, and to all eternity.

10. Why do you believe these doctrines?

Because they are all founded upon the revealed word of God, as we have shown by the various texts from the Bible which we have quoted before. In short, our creed is based upon the truth of God, in confidence upon his wisdom and goodness, and in reliance upon his mercy and justice, which, like His existence, are everlasting.

ART. IX.—*Conflict between the Government and Church of Scotland.*

It appears that a Mr. Young, a licentiate, was presented with a vacancy by one of the patrons within the bounds of the Presbytery of Auchterarder; that a large majority of the congregation were opposed to him; that the Presbytery, on this ground, refused to ordain and instal Mr. Young; and that the matter went up to the General Assembly. The Assembly sustained the Presbytery by a decided vote; asserted, in unequivocal language, the supreme headship of the Lord Jesus Christ over the church, and the ancient privileges of the Kirk of Scotland; and that they would withhold ordination from any man who would suffer himself to be thrust into a congregation against the will of a majority; but admitted the right of the government to dispose of the temporalities of the church. From this decision Mr. Young, or his patron, appealed to the government. The following is the result, as given in the Belfast Covenanter for May, 1839:

“This celebrated case of dispute between the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland and the Court of Session, the supreme Law Court in Scotland, has been tried by appeal before the House of Lords. Judgment was recently given by the Lord Chancellor and Lord Brougham, in opposition to the deliverance of the General Assembly, last year. Mr. Young, the presentee of Lord Kinnoull, the patron, is declared to be the lawful minister of the parish, although he is opposed by a large majority of the parishioners, and by the ecclesiastical courts. While this final judgment of the House of Lords affords a melancholy proof of the Erastian control which the state exercises over the Church of Scotland, and of the deplorable evils of patronage, we trust it will be a means of awakening the faithful in the Church of Scotland, both ministers and people, to redoubled efforts for terminating these unscriptural and most injurious systems.”

The following paragraphs contain the latest action of the General Assembly in the case:—

“The General Assembly having heard the report of the Procurator on the Auchterarder case, and considered the judgment of the House of Lords, affirming the decision of the Court of Session, and being satisfied that by said judgment all questions of civil right, so far as the Presbytery of Auchterarder is concerned, are substantially decided, do now, in accordance with the uniform practice of this church, and with the resolution of last General Assembly ever to give and inculcate implicit obedience to the decisions of civil courts in regard to the civil rights and emoluments secured by law to the church, instruct the said Presbytery to offer no farther resistance to the claims of Mr. Young, or of the patron to the emoluments of the benefice of Auchterarder, and to refrain from claiming the *jus devolutum*, or any other civil right or privilege connected with the said benefice.

“And whereas the principle of non-intrusion is one coeval with the Reformed Kirk of Scotland, and forms an integral part of its constitution, embodied in its standards, and declared in various Acts of Assembly, the General Assembly resolve that this principle cannot be abandoned, and that no presentee shall be forced upon any parish, contrary to the will of the congregation.

“And whereas, by the decision above referred to, it appears that when this principle is carried into effect, in any parish, the legal provision for the sustenance of the ministry in that parish may be therefore suspended, the General Assembly being

deeply impressed with the unhappy consequences which must arise from any collision between the civil and ecclesiastical authorities, and holding it to be their duty to use every means in their power, not involving any dereliction of the principles and fundamental laws of their constitution, to prevent such unfortunate results, do therefore appoint a committee for the purpose of considering in what way the privileges of the National Establishment, and the harmony between Church and State, may remain unimpaired, with instructions to confer with the Government of the country if they see cause."

Thus, it appears, the Church of Scotland is in *subjection* to the powers of this world. Her allegiance to the King of Zion is virtually defined and regulated, not by His instructions, but by the *will* of the civil magistrate; and the ambassadors of the Lord Jesus Christ, even learned and hoary-headed doctors of divinity must go to a girl, scarcely out of her *teens*, to learn how they ought to behave themselves in the house of God! It seems as though the blood of Scotland's martyrs has been shed in vain. They hold the principles for which their fathers bled, and yet "*instruct the Presbytery to offer no further resistance*" to the encroachments and usurpations of the civil arm. Yet in their peculiar circumstances present submission was probably a duty. But should the government persevere, as it most likely will, in these usurpations, it will be generally admitted that the Christian church had better dissolve her connexion with the powers of this world than to surrender her spiritual independence, and betray into the hands of enemies the prerogatives of Zion's King.

The following note, appended to the first volume of Dr. McCrie's *Life of Knox*, is so much in point that we are induced to give it a place:—

"By the laws of the Romish church, no female can be admitted to a participation of clerical power. Not so much as the ancient order of deaconesses now remains in her. Her casuists have examined and debated this thesis, Whether a woman may have the degree of doctor of divinity conferred upon her; and have determined it in the negative. But of the philosophical dignity they are not quite so jealous. Helen Lucrecia Piscopia Cornaca, of famous memory, once applied for her degree in divinity in an Italian university; but cardinal Barbarigo, bishop of Padua, was far from being disposed to grant it; so that this learned lady was obliged to content herself with a doctorate in philosophy, which, with universal applause, was actually conferred upon her, June 25, 1678. But the English climate savours nothing of this Italian jealousy; nor are the divines in it so niggardly of their honours. We do not hear, indeed, that they have formally matriculated any ladies, in the universities, or obliged them, by canon, or act of parliament, to take out degrees, in either law, philosophy, or divinity, to qualify them for ecclesiastical preferment, (even the highest pinnacle of it;) though their laws hold males utterly unqualified for holding any lucrative place in the church, or in the ecclesiastical courts, without these: Nor can a man be admitted to the lowest curacy, or be fellow or student in a university, until he have learned and digested all the articles, homilies, canons, rubrics, modes, and figures of the church of England, as he cannot even be serjeant or exciseman, till he understand perfectly the superior devotion of kneeling above sitting. But it is very possible, though they do not bear the learned titles, the ladies may know as much of learning and divinity, as those who do. And though they may not receive ordination on Ember-week for the inferior orders, yet it is enacted and provided, that one of their number may be raised at once *per saltum*, not only above all the peers and peeresses, but over all the graduates, reverend dignitaries, and mitred heads in the kingdom. The solemn inaugurating unction once applied, then *cedite Romani doctores, cedite graj*. Henceforward, as the queen of Sheba came from the uttermost end of the earth, to hear the wisdom of Solomon, and to have every enigma and hard question solved, so must every master, doctor, heads of universities, every diocesan and metropolitan, however wise, have recourse to their queen, by reference or appeal, with every difficult question, and every learned and deep controversy, and be responsible to her for their every decision. How flattering a constitution this to woman-kind—if they be indeed so very fond of precedence and rule, as is commonly said! She must have an unreasonable and unbounded ambition indeed whom this will not content; though she should not be also further told in plain terms, that she is a goddess, and in her office superior to Christ; as some court-clergymen have ventured to affirm of their visible head."—A *Historico-Politic-Ecclesiastical Dissertation on the Supremacy of Civil Powers in Matters of Religion*, particularly the Ecclesiastical Supremacy annexed to the English Crown; by Archibald Bruce, Minister of the Gospel, p. 46—50. Edinburgh, 1802.

ART. X.—*Summary of Religious Intelligence.*

FRANCE.—The lamentable effects of Erastian influence, exercised by the Popish government of France over the French Reformed Church, have been recently felt in the introduction into one of the theological professorships, at Montauban, their principal college, of M. Nicolas, a man of infidel sentiments, who, in his inaugural address, did almost positively declare himself an anti-supernaturalist. In some late numbers of the *Archives Du Christianisme* there are several faithful and able expositions on this subject: but the matter of deep regret is, that the Reformed Church in France is so shackled by subjection to the state, that they cannot redress so monstrous a grievance.

ROMANISM AND PROTESTANTISM.—It is stated in several French papers that a number of popish bishops and archbishops are about to meet at Aix, in order to adopt measures for opposing the progress of Protestantism. It is also said that a society has been lately formed in France, by some leading popish ecclesiastics and others, for bringing back Great Britain to the profession of Romanism. When will Protestants become thoroughly awake to a true sense of the restless designs of their implacable enemy?

EFFORTS FOR THE SPREAD OF POKERY.—The hosts of darkness are every where in motion, spreading their soul-ruinous delusions; and the events of almost every day declare, that the time is rapidly approaching when Antichrist will make his last dreadful onset upon the witnesses for truth. The following items of intelligence on this article are gleaned from various journals, religious and others:

“The Pope is at present occupied in bringing into heaven and the almanac, four new saints and one saintess. These five persons are to be canonized, according to rule, in the course of this year. The Pope and Cardinals, in a secret sitting, lately held at Rome, have decided that the alleged miracles performed by them are authentic.”—*Archives du Christianisme*. This, we suppose, is a part of the evidence relied upon by certain liberal Protestants, to show that popish superstition has changed its hideous features!

“A society has been formed in Bavaria for the conversion of North Americans to the popish faith.”

TAHITI.—*South Sea Islands.*—About two years ago, Pomare, the young queen of Tahiti, refused permission to two French priests from the popish missionary establishment on Gambier's Island to settle in her dominions. The priests, however, disregarding her injunctions, landed in another part of the island, and were taken under the protection of the American Consul, a Belgian by birth, and a Roman Catholic by profession. When, ultimately, the queen proceeded to enforce obedience to the laws, and compelled the priests to depart, a representation was forwarded to his most Christian majesty, the King of France, who ordered the commodore of a French war frigate to proceed immediately to Tahiti, and to demand reparation for the alleged insult offered to France. The terms offered by the French commander were, 1. To pay two thousand dollars. 2. To hoist the French flag on the island, and fire under it a salute of twenty-one guns; and 3. The queen to write an humble apology to Louis Phillippe; and in the event of refusal, the town of Matavia, the infant metropolis of Tahiti, was to be battered down, and the government overturned. With these most unreasonable demands the young queen was advised by the British Consul and several British settlers, who generously furnished the money which her own treasury was unable to supply, to comply, rather than peril the existence of her throne. These islands, the scene of the wonderful triumphs of the gospel in modern days, are under the protection of Great Britain; and it remains to be seen whether the British government will permit such an unwarranted aggression to be made upon an unoffending and defenceless people, simply for enforcing obedience to the laws of the nation, and for resisting the insidious and wicked designs of the abettors of popery.

EXTINCTION OF COLONIAL SLAVERY IN SOUTH AFRICA.—On the 1st of December last, the apprenticed labourers in the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope, amounting to nearly *thirty-six thousand persons*, chiefly of the Hottentot race, were set free from a state of comparative slavery, and fully invested with the rights and privileges of British subjects. It is gratifying to be able to say, that this great act of justice was procured chiefly through the active exertions, and bold and manly expostulations of Dr. Phillip, and other devoted missionaries; and that, by the latest accounts from South Africa, the liberated apprentices were conducting themselves suitably to the profession of Christianity, which many of them had made.

ART. XI.—*Pious Sayings of Good Men.*

“The difference between a true and false hope is this: a false hope is founded in ignorance, falsehood, and presumption. It lives in inholiness, and lives only in prosperity. It separates the means from the end. It looks for heaven, and yet is ever on the way to hell. A true hope delights in God and in his ways; it unites the end and the means, and that diligently and perpetually. It is humble, modest, penitent; and it thrives equally in prosperity and adversity.”—*Howels.*

“The disposition to give a cup of cold water to a disciple is a far nobler property than the finest intellect. Satan has a fine intellect, but not the image of God.”—*Ibid.*

“I find, daily, more and more reason without me, and within me yet much more, to pant and long to be gone. I am grown exceeding uneasy in writing and speaking, yea, almost in thinking, when I reflect how cloudy our clearest thoughts are. But I think again, what other can we do till ‘the day-break and the shadows flee away.’ As one that lieth awake in the night must be thinking, and one thought that will likeliest often return, when by all others he finds little relief, is, ‘When will it be day?’”—*Leighton, shortly before his death.*

“How welcome will death be to those who truly mourn for sin, feel the burden, taste the bitterness of it, and long for complete deliverance from it!”—*Adam.*

“The righteousness which exposes to persecution is something different from that which passes for religion in the common opinion of the world; namely, a decent, civil behaviour, attended with beneficent actions, and the profession of religion to a certain degree; for that never is persecuted, but, on the contrary, entitles those who are possessed of it to general esteem. The true evangelical righteousness, opposing itself not only to the sinful practices, but vain customs, insnaring pleasures, and mistaken pursuits of the world, will be sure to draw the enmity of the world upon it.”—*Ibid.*

“Begin the Christian race from the cross, and whenever you faint or grow weary, look back to it.”—*Ibid.*

“Oh! for the Spirit’s sense of sin! the Spirit’s sight of Christ! the Spirit’s work of obedience!”—*Ibid.*

WHAT CAUSES JOY TO THE CHRISTIAN.—Blessed Jesus, we can add nothing to thee, nothing to thy glory; but it is a joy of heart unto us that thou art what thou art, that thou art so gloriously exalted at the right hand of God; and we do long more clearly to behold that glory, according to thy prayer and promise.”—*Dr. Owen.*

HOW TO KEEP FROM SINNING.—Know your guilt and weakness, your desert and danger; think what you are bound to by the law, even sinless obedience, from the first to the last moment of your life, and what you have to trust to if left under its condemning power, even everlasting punishment; then view the loving-kindness of God in giving his Son to fulfil all righteousness in our stead; and then tell me if it be possible, while under the lively sense of his mercy, to sin against so much goodness.—*Arrowsmith.*

A WORD TO A DESPONDING SOUL EARNESTLY SEEKING THE FAVOUR OF GOD.—If thou shouldst see divers children playing some untowardness in the street, and shouldst see a man that passed by, single out one of them and correct him, and yet the child should follow him, would you not say, *he was the father of that child, and not ashamed to own him?*—*White’s Sermon.*

A CONTRAST.—Near the end of his days, the licentious Byron wrote the following lines:

“My days are in the yellow leaf,
The flowers and fruit of love are gone;
The worm, the canker, and the grief
Are mine alone.”

Near the close of his life, “Paul the aged” wrote to a young minister, whom he greatly loved, as follows:

“I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a 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.”

Is there not a difference between him that serveth God and him that serveth Him not? All experience, as well as conscience, answers, Yes!—*Watchman of the South.*

Most men need patience to die, but a saint who understands what death admits him to, should rather need patience to live; methinks he should often look out and listen, on a death-bed, for his Lord's coming; and when he receives the news of his approaching change, should say, "The voice of my beloved! behold he cometh, leaping over the mountains, skipping upon the hills."—*Flavel's Saint Indeed.*

A sweet assurance of pardon, a comfortable persuasion of our reconciliation with God, an established hope of eternal glory through Jesus Christ; these will be operative in the soul, as "a torch in the sheaf." These will enkindle love, and increase watchfulness; these will beget the true humility of mind, and work an unfeigned abhorrence of sin.—*Hervey's Theron and Aspasio on the Most Important Subject.*

ABUSE OF LIBERTY.—He that resolves to use all his liberty cannot be innocent, so long as there are in the world so many bold temptations and presumptuous actions, so many scandals and so much ignorance in the things of God; so many things that are suspicious, and so many things that are of evil report; so many ill customs and disguises in the world, with which, if we resolve to comply in all that is supposed lawful, a man may be in the regions of death before he perceives his head to ache: and instead of a staff in his hand, may have a splinter in his elbow.—*Jeremy Taylor.*

PRAY WITHOUT CEASING.—The bird is not always on the wing, but he is ready to fly in an instant; so the believer is not always on the wing of prayer, but he has such a gracious aptitude for this exercise, that he is prepared in an instant, when in danger or need, to fly for refuge to his God.—*Rowland Hill.*

A GOOD SERMON.—The only true praise of a sermon is some evil left, or some good done, upon the hearing of it. One such fruit, so brought forth, were a more ample commendation than many mouthfull of good words spent, and copies taken, and printing, and I wot not what. And sure it is, on whom a sermon works aright, it leaves him not leisure to say much, to use many words—but makes him rather full of thoughts. And when all comes to all, the deed done, is it. And it is no good sign in a tree, when all the sap goes up into the leaves, is spent that way: nor in an auditor, when all is verbal that comes, and nothing else: no reality at all.—*Bishop Andrews.*

If we are for setting buttresses to the house that is built upon a rock, what is this, but a disparagement to the foundation? If the foundation be already firm and good, why are you for endeavouring to strengthen it? So far as you set up any props unto Christ the foundation, who is to bear up all by himself, so far you disparage Christ—so far you bring him down, and give him not the pre-eminence.—*Crisp.*

Meekness suffers the word of admonition, and takes it patiently and thankfully, not only from the hand of God that sends it, but from the hand of our friend that brings it.—*Henry on Meekness.*

Heaven must needs be a glorious city, which hath God both for its builder and inhabitant. Heaven is the extract and quintessence of all blessedness. There the saints shall have their wish. They shall "behold the King in his beauty." What a glorious place will this be! In heaven "God will be all in all."—*Watson's Saint's Delight.*

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—Queries respecting the *Societyism* of the present day may be looked for in the next number. But we call upon correspondents to resume their pens; they have become quite remiss of late. But, whether they do so or not, we do not intend that our patrons shall suffer loss, for we have access to abundant materials, both useful and interesting. Yet we think it would be more creditable to the Associate Church, were she to improve, more diligently, the talent God has committed to her, and depend less on foreign sources. We have not forgotten the *Arminian Controversy* promised in the prospectus; but it will require time. If Providence permit, a Review of the Proceedings of the *Anti-Slavery Convention*, which recently met at Albany, N. Y., may be expected in the next number.

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

OCTOBER, 1839.

ART. I.—*Reflections on a sick Bed.* No. III.

God visits me daily, though he sometimes frowns and corrects; yet there is an honour conferred in receiving a visit from the King of kings. He often "turns away his wrath;" and "though he visits our faults with rods, yet he will not take away his love." His "glorious power" can give "patience, and long suffering with joyfulness," under the severest trials. This excites in us a proper sense of his sovereign right to dispose of us, as it did in Aaron, who "held his peace," when subjected to one of the severest trials; and, also, in Eli, who said, under an afflictive bereavement, "It is the Lord; let him do as seemeth him good." By this we also become duly impressed with a sense of his justice and wisdom in dealing with us; that though "clouds and darkness are round about him, and his path in the mighty waters," too deep for us to comprehend his goings, yet faith can discern propriety, wisdom, and tender mercy in the darkest hour of adversity. There is ground of comfort in this consideration, that Jehovah Jesus has, "in all our afflictions," a fellow feeling"—is not one who cannot be touched with "the feeling of our infirmities"—that "he is able to succour"—with him compassions flow. By these visitations he invites and constrains us to "come away with him" to his mansions prepared. "Rise up, my love, my fair one, and come away" from this abode of sin and suffering. Alas! we poor pilgrims have nothing to take with us, we leave nothing; our travelling money is expended, all squandered; yet we need not care, for we will soon get home to a rich Father. When in want, he will send us a morsel by some raven, a messenger to strengthen us on our journey. And if a traveller have only enough of means to reach home, where there is in rich store an abundance, he esteems himself happy. Perhaps we set too high a value upon mercies, and helps, the pleasant shining of "the candle of the Lord," and the gracious manifestations of his loving-kindness to us in this dreary night. When we reach home, we shall no more need these; for the "Sun of righteousness" shall

VOL. XVI.—19

shed his comforting light, and all nations shall be filled with his fulness, and shall glory in his brightness.

The book of Providence is full of instruction, and is a happy subject for meditation. The compendium of all true science is, Providence, our own hearts, and the gospel of saving grace. This is the only study worthy of man, and the only science that can dignify, the only wisdom that can conduct us to honour and immortal bliss. Affliction is an excellent stimulus to the study of these. It makes us "remember the way which the Lord led us these forty years" of all our life, "in the wilderness" of this world of wo, "to humble us and to prove us" by these sore trials, "to know what was in our heart," how much of resignation, how much of repining and desponding; that he might have the evidence "whether we would keep his commandments or not," whether we would still love and serve him, though he chasten us. "Whoso is wise, and will observe these things," to examine the dealings of Providence, and to see what effect these have on his own heart, whether they excite in him humility and love, "he shall understand the love and kindness of the Lord."

"Disease warns me that my sand-glass is near run out: that the number of my months are fast filling up." Oh! that my case may not be such as is expressed in the complaint of old, "the harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved." They are wise who improve the light of the day, and make sure work for eternity; "for the night cometh, wherein no man can work." How is our life like a candle, which lives by its own consumption, is fed by that which, while it causes it to emit a pleasant lucid flame, also devours it, and is useful only while it shines. If, while the lamp of life burns, we only use its light to walk safely over the slippery paths and dangerous precipices in our journey, if we only learn to die well, our candle shall not have shined in vain, our life shall be one of great usefulness.

How much does the theatre of human life seem like a puppet show, or like a masquerade, a great stage performance, in which we, the actors, represent other characters than ourselves, and arrayed, some in gorgeous habiliments, some in rags, we strut about on this public stage, gazed at and admired, none suspecting it a theatrical performance, till death closes the scene, when each assumes his real character. In this drama some act kings, some as the wise and noble of the earth, some as "hunger-bitten" paupers, some as the humble followers of the divine Saviour; but death takes off the garb, restores all to their original oneness, earth, and leaves no distinctions but moral, which is their only real character. While pity might drop a tear over the vain aspirations of many, who "seek for themselves great things," and make showy pretensions, yet the joyful approbation of Heaven is given to the followers of the Lamb, when they assume the character, and claim the dignity of, and aspire to act as "kings and priests of the most high God." Let there be something of solid worth in our life; let it not be as a bubble, which rises, shines for a moment with brilliant colours, and instantly bursts, and is not. God gave us a place among his beings for some important purpose; gave us in trust an important charge, the keeping of our own souls, and he kindly admonishes us to em-

ploy the time of our life as a *non-age*, or *minority*, preparing for a public entrance into our kingdom in heaven, when we shall have arrived at full age.

There is happiness in friendship and familiarity with death. Though he appear as an inexorable, ruthless, hideous giant, ever feasting on blood, delighting in deeds of cruelty, yet there is a pleasing satisfaction in drawing near to, and calmly viewing this slain Goliath. We realize the feelings of a triumphant conqueror when, encouraged by our Joshua, we put our feet upon the neck of this captive foe. Who need fear the roarings and fury of a chained lion? Should a dying foe, though once dangerous, excite dread apprehensions? When intrenched in a secure fortress, should we be alarmed at the sight of a hideous serpent, which appears without the wall, despoiled of its poisonous fangs? When we look on death's grim looks, and see his chains, and hear his feeble threats, all fears are removed by the comforting assurance that our God is a strong defence, that he places around us "salvation for walls," and that death's mightiest assaults can only affect the outer walls of our habitation. His darts can never penetrate into the hiding-place of the soul. This "is bound up in the bundle of life, and hid with Christ in God." Its recess is inaccessible to our enemies.

Come, let me look death in the face, and take off his mask, and become familiarly acquainted with his real nature. Divest him of those horrible features, and ghastly shadows, with which a disordered imagination has surrounded him, and he ceases to be in reality "the king of terrors." Intimacy with him removes his frightfulness. His power is limited, and daily decreasing. His deadliest thrust can never affect our principal part, which is based upon the "Rock of ages." Like the serpent, he creeps upon the earth, and can only reach our earthly parts. While death impairs or demolishes this tabernacle, we, like those in Nch. iv. 17, with our trowel and our sword, our spiritual instruments for work and warfare, ward off his assaults, and advance our spiritual building.

A general rejoices to quit an out-post, and to retire, unconquered and unhurt, into a strong, impregnable city; our bodies may be demolished by death's blows, but we gladly quit this frail, mouldering tenement, not vanquished, but triumphing—not wounded or disgraced, but honoured with a triumphal entrance, in company with the King of heaven, into the glorious city, New Jerusalem, leading, captive, death and hell. A crew, wrecked, are glad to leave their old vessel, if they can only get safe to land, with all their riches in freight; we have this additional comfort over the simile, that not only is the freight of the soul's eternal interests safely secured, but, also, our wrecked vessel is not lost, but, at the resurrection morn, it will be brought safely into port, renewed, embellished, perfected. With joy, then, we quit our tents, as Israel did their camps, to enter the promised Canaan. Death comes to take us, as Pharaoh's messenger did Joseph, out of a dungeon, into a palace, out from the company of the base and wretched, into the princely society of the court.

Oh! how Satan is foiled in his fiendish attempts against us; he had chained us to his car, bound us by a strong cord of a threefold death, natural, spiritual, and eternal, with which he had the hope of draw-

ing us to himself; but Christ, by the sword of his almighty power, hath cut this cord which would have bound us down in the ever-dying pit of eternal misery; by his grace, in the work of our sanctification, he gradually wears away and destroys the binding influence of that cord which holds us in spiritual death; and by the cord of natural death, he draws us up to the realms of life and love. Are we not "more than conquerors through him that loved us?" "Thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

When, through disease, we are weak, and seem deprived of any direct instrumentality in promoting the interests of Zion, still, by the prayer of faith, we become strong; when our feeble arms are *stayed up*, our prayers may bring down the arm of Omnipotence for the defence of Israel, and the destruction of her enemies. The church may engage in the noblest enterprises; her laudable efforts for extending the glory of Christ's kingdom may be a proper and acceptable sacrifice, but our prayers, like Elijah's, must call down fire from heaven to consume our offering, and make the odour thereof pleasing to God. Oh! what can we not achieve by prayer? It should be our food, our amusement, the element which we breathe. To live praying, is to die praising. He who fights, praying—dies, conquering. The habit of prayer is like the constant blowing of a placid zephyr, which moves our tossed, weather-beaten vessel, safe into the desired port. As gentle winds, the breath of the waking morn, always precede the rising sun, so individuals and communities must, and always do, breathe forth their early prayers, before the "Sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings." As the wind, the breezes of the morning, are the "wings" with which the sun flies in his course, so the morning breeze from the praying breath of God's people give wings to Christ to flee speedily to his "dove in the clefts of the rock," and to the abodes of the sick and dying. Every prayer of faith removes a thorn, and, in its room, puts soft down in our dying pillow. The night of death is dark enough to all; wo to them that have no light; happy they whose lamps are trimmed. Prayer is the great means of dispelling the clouds which hang in gloom over this hour; it opens the pipes which convey oil into our lamps; it is the oxygen which combines with this oil of grace, imparting light and heat. Is the "word of God like a hammer?" prayer is the handle by which it is to be wielded for demolishing the strong holds of Satan in our hearts, and throughout the world. Is it "as a fire?" prayer is the breath by which it is to be kindled, the flame of which must consume the temple of iniquity, and the light of which shall cheer up our path through the dark vale of the shadow of death. "Lord, teach me how to pray;" give a praying frame.

We are sore pained from a want of bodily health, and greatly regret its decline; but oh! our sad want of spiritual health! How much languor prevails! There seems to be little or no period of vigorous manhood in the Christian's life; it is either childish levity, or wrinkles, gray hairs, and coldness, symptomatic of infirm old age. If we were to draw closer, and more frequently, to the fire of God's altar, if a coal thereof were to touch our lips and hearts, a genial warmth might be restored, and life and vigour imparted.

“Revive thy work, O Lord;” “send forth thy quickening Spirit; breathe upon these dry bones.”

“Vanity of vanities” is written on all earthly enjoyments. We are taught by Christ not to contemn, but to use these, as a traveller does a staff or a cup of water, helpful to us as we journey home. Our Father feeds us here on hunger and anxious desires. We are best fed when we most “hunger and thirst after righteousness.” Our table is spread, a rich feast provided in heaven. This world can be only the outer court of the soul, which is consecrated for service in the Holy of holies above. There it shall continue to officiate, presenting the members of the body as “living sacrifices,” especially those organs by which we express, in exulting praise, the songs of redeeming love.

ART. II.—*Queries Respecting Voluntary Associations.*

TO THE EDITOR OF THE MONITOR.

Dear Sir,—After my respects to you, I would take the liberty of addressing a line to you on a subject, in my opinion, of the highest importance, not only to the church, but to the community at large; and a subject that, at the present time, is causing a very great excitement in this part of the church. I mean the subject of *Societism*. It is a subject that has employed my thoughts for a considerable length of time; so that I have had, for some time past, strong doubts in my mind as to the *morality* of church members forming, or participating in the formation of those *Associations* which are formed from all classes of society, whether of the church or of the world. My own opinion is, that the church of Christ is a moral society, a Bible society—a missionary, a Sabbath-school, a tract, a temperance, an anti-slavery, or any other kind of benevolent society that is required by the word of God, for the promotion of his glory, or the interest of his church: and the propriety of its members joining these irresponsible associations, to say the least of it, is extremely doubtful. They may, I fear, be charged, as the Jews in the 106th Psalm were, of “mingling with the heathen, and learning of them their ways.” What I wish for, on this subject, is information; and, considering the position you occupy as the conductor of a public religious journal would give you facilities for obtaining information on the subject, not possessed by many of your brethren in the ministry, I have been induced to apply to you for the desired information, by propounding to you the following *QUERIES*, with the hope that you may find leisure time to give the subject a fair and impartial investigation.

1. From a history of the Monastic Society, as formed by Anthony, in the fourth century, what are the benefits, and what the injuries, resulting therefrom to the church of Christ? 2. What the benefit and what the injury from the society of Inquisitors? 3. What the benefit and what the injury from the Masonic Society, as founded by the operative master mason of London, in the sixteenth century? 4. What the benefits and what the injury from the London Home and Foreign Bible Society? 5. What the benefit and

what the injury from the American Home and Foreign Bible Society? 6. What the benefit and what the injury from the London Home and Foreign Missionary Society? 7. What the benefit and what the injury from the different American home and foreign missionary societies? 8. What the benefit and what the injury from the different tract societies in the United States? 9. What the benefit and what the injury from the different Sunday [Sabbath] school societies in the United States? 10. What the benefit and what the injury of the different Colonization Societies, both in Europe and America? 11. What the benefit and what the injury from the different Temperance Societies, both in Europe and in America? 12. What the benefit and what the injury from the different Anti-Slavery Societies, both in Europe and America?

Then, from a fair and full investigation of the whole matter, see if there has not been more injury done to the church of Christ by these associations than all the benefit that could possibly result to those whom they profess to benefit by them.

Then inquire whether there is any warrant, either express or implied, in the word of God, authorizing church members to form associations, irresponsible to either church or state, for the promotion of a moral reformation, or for any other benevolent purpose, in either church or state, and give me the result of your deliberations as soon as you can make it convenient. By so doing you will confer a lasting favour upon an anxious inquirer after truth, as well as a fellow church member.

That the Holy Spirit may direct you in the investigation of the subject will be the humble prayer of your

QUERIST.

It would be gratifying to us to comply with the request of our friend, the Querist; but we are not ashamed to acknowledge that he has imposed a service upon us which we are unable to perform. It is probable, that man is not living who can give a satisfactory answer to every one of the above queries; for no man possesses "all knowledge." The subject, however, is important, and much light may be thrown upon it by such persons as have the means and leisure requisite. Any thing calculated to communicate information on this, as well as any other subject connected with our profession, will be gladly received. We *might* give our own views; but these might not correspond with the opinions of others, and might irritate, instead of producing conviction. If Providence permit, we will give to the readers of the Monitor whatever may come within our reach that appears to be written with candour, and to contain facts and sound argument, on the difficult, but important subject of *Societyism*.

ART. III.—*On Conformity to the World.*

THERE is such a precept as *this* in the Scriptures, "Be not conformed to this world." It is unrepealed, and in full force; and is as

binding upon us, as it was in the days of the apostles. There may exist difficulties in the way of ascertaining its meaning, its applicability, and its limits, but it *has* a meaning. Christians, and even expositors of scripture, may differ in their opinions of its import, but still it is a rule of Christian conduct. There are passages similar to it in the word of God; such as the following, to which the reader is earnestly requested to turn:—1 John, ii. 15, 16. Matt. vi. 24. Gal. i. 10. James, iv. 4. To what does the rule apply? Not merely to actual vice: immorality is forbidden in other places where its acts are enumerated and branded: nor, on the other hand, can it intend to set the Christian in *all things* in direct contrariety to the world. It is not a command to useless and unmeaning singularity for the sake of singularity. The world is sometimes and in some things right; and in all that is kind, courteous, polite and honourable, in all the innocent usages of society, in all the pure tastes and lawful pursuits of our neighbours, we may be conformed to the world. But there are many things which occupy a kind of middle place between these two things; they are not absolutely immoral, nor are they innocent, pure, lawful for a Christian. They are sinful, but yet not what are usually denominated vicious; and some of them are things lawful in their nature, and made wrong only by excess. They are matters which a man may carry on, and yet not lose his reputation with the multitude, even as a professor; and yet they are forbidden.

What is the meaning of the rule?

It will help us to determine this, if we turn back and consider what a profession of religion implies—which is, that we take the Lord Jesus Christ as our Saviour, Lord, and example; are supremely intent upon the salvation of our souls as the great end and object of existence; and make the word of God the rule of our conduct. In these things we are different from the world around us. This, in fact, constitutes the difference. We acknowledge ourselves to be a peculiar people, and that this separation is visibly maintained by our entire submission to the laws of Christ. We say to all around us, “Whatever you seek, I am seeking salvation; whatever rules of conduct you observe, I obey the laws of Christ, as laid down in the scriptures. I am governed by these laws in *all things*; and I cannot allow you to obtrude upon me *your* rules of action. I am determined in what is right or wrong, not by the law of honour, or fashion, or ambition, but by the commands of Christ.” Now this is really the import of a Christian profession, and therefore conformity to the world must be tried by this. The member of a community or of a family situated in the midst of other states or families, must be governed by the laws of his own community, and must not allow the laws of these other states or families to be obtruded upon him, but must obey his own. So the Christian church is a community situated in the midst of the world, and has laws of its own, which it must obey, and not allow the world to impose upon it their maxims, customs, and rules of action. It is not to allow a foreign jurisdiction to come in and modify and relax its code, under the pretext that it is too rigid or severe; too much in opposition to the systems that prevail around. A professor, as long as he is such, must obey the precepts of Christ’s kingdom; and if he will

not, he should retire. The church is Christ's community, peculiar in its nature, different from all others, being a strictly spiritual kingdom, which is not of this world: it is peculiar in its design, being intended to show forth the glory of God in its present sanctification and eternal salvation, through Christ. It must keep up, not let down its singularity; it must maintain its peculiarity of nature and design, as a holy, heavenly body, and not do any thing to soften it down, and blend itself with the kingdoms of this world. All attempts, on the part of its members, to accommodate it to the community by which it is surrounded, is an encroachment on the authority of its head, an incipient alteration of its nature, and a frustration of its design.

We are now prepared to see what conformity to the world is forbidden to a professing Christian.

1. *A conformity of spirit*: and what is the spirit of the world? It is described by the apostle, where he says, "they mind earthly things."—Phil. iii. 19. This is a concise, emphatic, and accurate description of a worldly man; his supreme, yea, exclusive desire, aim, and purpose, is to get as much, and enjoy as much of the world as he can. He thinks of nothing else, and wishes for nothing else. His hopes and fears, joys and sorrows, desires and dread, are all of the earth, earthly. This is set forth in another form by the Psalmist, "There be many that say, Who will show us any good?" This is also an emphatic description of a worldly mind, an exclusive regard to, and wish for, earthly possessions and enjoyments. We have still another representation of it in the rich man in the parable, who, upon the increase of his wealth, is made to say, "Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years, take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry."—Luke, xii. 19. Here, then, is a worldly spirit, *a making the world the highest object of pursuit, and the chief source of enjoyment*. This shows itself in various ways: a love of pleasure in one; avarice in another; ambition in a third; exclusive delight in home in another. In proportion, therefore, as a Christian partakes of this, he is worldly-minded. If he appear like one whose supreme aim is to be rich and happy on earth; if he appears to be continually intent on increasing his wealth and multiplying his comforts; if he look like a man who is entirely occupied in enjoying himself here, he is a worldly-minded man. It is the intention of Christ's kingdom to exhibit a community who live by faith; whose delight is in God; whose joy and peace come from believing; who are not so much seeking to be happy now, as preparing to be happy hereafter. Just in so far as it appears that a Christian is more anxious about the body than his soul; earth than heaven; time than eternity; temporal possessions, than eternal salvation; and just in so far as he seems to derive his happiness from things of sense, rather than things of faith, he is conforming to the world; for the spirit of the world is an *earthly* spirit.

2. Our nonconformity to the world must include in it *a stern refusal to adopt those corrupt principles, or rather that want of principle, on which a great part of the modern system of trade is conducted*. I dwell on this subject, with a repetition that many will dislike, and because of its great importance and necessity. We are commanded to follow whatsoever things are true, just, honest, love-

ly, and of good report; and we are to do nothing that is contrary to this rule. This is the Christian law of trade; this is the scripture system of commercial morality, from which we may not depart. In reply to all this, it is said by many professors, that if they do not, in some degree, conform to the practices of others, in the manner of conducting their business, although their practices cannot be justified on the ground of scripture, they cannot live. Then, I say, they *ought not*, in their meaning of the phrase, to live. For what *does* it mean? Not that they cannot subsist, but that they cannot live so comfortably; cannot have so good a house, such elegant furniture, and such luxurious diet. What saith Christ—"If thy hand offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands, to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched."—Mark, ix. 43. "Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me."—Mark, viii. 34. There was an age of the church, when its members were required to burn a little incense to the statue of the gods or the emperors, and upon non-compliance with the command, were hurried off to be torn to pieces by lions in the amphitheatre. Upon that single act, because it was regarded as a test of Christian character and influence, depended not only their property or liberty, but their life; and myriads sacrificed their lives rather than conform. What is now the ordeal? What is now the trial of integrity? Not an act of homage to Jupiter or Trajan; but bowing the knee, and burning incense to Mammon. And shall there be no martyrs for Christian morality, even as there were once martyrs for Christian doctrine? If the early Christians could not serve God and Jupiter, shall we try to serve God and Mammon? If they hesitated not to sacrifice their *lives* for their profession, shall we think it hard to give up a portion of our *gains*? Trade is the trial of the church in the present day, and fearful are the disclosures which it makes. Other ages, besides our own, have been, in some measure, exposed to this trial. "The disciples of Wycliffe," says the Roman Inquisitor, Reinher, "are men of a serious, modest deportment, avoiding all ostentation in dress, mixing little with the world: they maintain themselves wholly by their own labour, and *utterly despise wealth, being content with bare necessaries*. THEY FOLLOW NO TRAFFIC, BECAUSE IT IS ATTENDED WITH SO MUCH LYING, SWEARING, AND CHEATING. They are chaste and temperate, are never seen in taverns, or amused by the trifling gaieties of life." To go out, or keep out of business, however, in order to avoid its snares, is not required of Christians; but it is evidently their duty to avoid all ways of transacting it that are contrary to the rules of the word of God: the morality of which does not fluctuate with the customs of men and the manners of the age. If we cannot get any thing more than bread and water, without lying and fraud, we must be content even with this hard fare.

3. We are not to conform to the world, *by a deference to its opinions, on questions of right and wrong*. Our opinions must be taken from the word of God, and must be in accordance with that. It must be our standard of sentiment; and we must not adopt any other. It must be the reason, and only reason, why we approve or condemn any thing. We must ask the question, "What saith the

scripture on this subject?" and not "What saith the world?" Having ascertained what is the will of God, what is the law of Christ, we must never want, or care about, the world's opinion; much less must we seek, or in any way desire to bring down the law of Christ to the world's taste or approbation. We must neither do a thing nor avoid it, simply because the world approves or disapproves of it. In many things we shall coincide with the world, but it must not be for the sake of conciliating their favour or commendation, but because the thing itself is right. There is, in many Christians, an excessive and sinful deference to the opinions of worldly people, an obvious wish to stand well with them, to get as near to them as they can, without being actually of their party; a constant aim and endeavour to conciliate their esteem, by humouring their prejudices, thinking, as much as possible, as *they* think, saying as *they* say, doing as *they* do, till the world conclude that these compliant professors are almost won to their party. An anxiety to gain the world's good opinion, on the part of a Christian, is a decisive evidence of that conformity to it, which is sinful. I do not advocate or recommend rudeness, misanthropy, or vulgarity; a Christian may be, and should be, polite, courteous, and refined: but not because the world admires these things, but because they are right. He should seek to please his neighbour; but then it is only so far as he can please God and his own conscience; and even then, not to gain his neighbour's applause, but for his good to edification. He should, of course, be anxious to have the world's testimony to his Christian integrity and consistency: but this is not from a deference to the opinion of the world, but for its welfare, his own reputation, the credit of religion, and the glory of Christ. To give up any one single point of our duty, however minute; to alter any one single religious custom, or habit; to relax in any one conscientious pursuit, or even to conceal any one peculiarity of our profession, from a dread of the ridicule of the fashionable, the contempt of the wise, or the neglect of the great: and, on the other hand, to do any thing, however trivial or insignificant, which our conscience tells us is sinful, in order to avoid these consequences, is a fearful indication of conformity to the world.

4. We ought not to conform to the world, *in such of its social habits, customs, and practices, as are directly or indirectly opposed to the laws of Christ, the spirit of true piety, and the ends of a Christian profession.*

By this rule, theatrical representations must be condemned, as opposed to the laws of Christian morality; and balls, card-parties, and public concerts as opposed to the spirit of religion and the ends of a Christian profession; and for this same reason, large mixed parties, where religious exercises are excluded to make way for dancing, music, and singing. It may not be possible to say, exactly, how many persons, nor what kind of occupations, shall constitute a party, into which a Christian may lawfully adventure: we can only state general principles, remind him of the important design of his profession, and then refer him to his judgment and conscience. It is obvious that the tendency, in the present day, is not towards too much separation and seclusion, but towards too much company, and company too much mixed, for Christian association and edification.

The large and gay parties which some nominal Christians frequent, are an inappropriate adjunct, and exposition of their profession. There is little in such circles congenial with the spirit of piety; little that is calculated to promote spirituality of mind; little that befits a person set apart to be a follower of the Lamb, a witness for God, and a probationer for heaven. The song, the music, the frivolous discourse, the gay apparel, assort but ill with the spirit of penitence, of prayer, of faith. A professor, in such a situation, can neither get good nor do good; he not only cannot introduce his religion, but he cannot promote the cause of common humanity; nor communicate or receive useful knowledge. Parties are convened for amusement, and every thing besides this is thought out of season and out of place. A professor is one who is Christ's; one who desires to obey *him*, and to promote his glory in the world; one whose desires may be summed up in the supreme wish and aim to be assimilated to Christ, to be prepared for eternal glory, and to bring his fellow men to be partakers of the same hope: one who is praying and seeking to be dead to the world, to crucify the flesh, and to get ready for the coming of the Son of God. Is it so, or is it not? If not, what does a profession imply? If it does imply all this, then here is a rule of action, a test of the propriety of a thousand things, which might otherwise be the subject of much debate. "A child can much more easily decide whether a thing be right, by considering if it will be acceptable to the mind of his father, than he could settle its propriety by argument. So a Christian can more easily decide what is right, by considering what will be approved by the mind of Christ, than by reducing it to the touchstone of logical proof. The inhabitant of Sparta could see at once that many things were inconsistent with the design of his republic, and his character as a Spartan, which he could by no means settle in an abstract manner. Whether the aim of the Athenian was proper, or the mild and soft pleasures of the Corinthian, he might not be able to settle by argument, but they would not be the way to train up the Lacedemonian. So it might become a question of abstract casuistry, about a thousand scenes of amusement. It might be easy to argue by the hour in favour of parties of pleasure, and theatres, and ball-rooms, and gaiety, and all the variety of fashionable life, and the mind might 'find no end, in wandering mazes lost.' But apply the safe rule before us, and all mist vanishes. *Since the beginning of the world, it is to be presumed, that no professing Christian ever dreamed that he was imitating the example of Jesus Christ, or promoting his own salvation, or the salvation of others, or honouring the Christian religion, in a theatre, a ball-room, or a splendid party of pleasure.* And equally clear would be this decision in reference to multitudes of pleasures, which it is useless to specify. Our profession *must* be the test of what is right or wrong for us; or rather the word of God, which we profess to make the rule of our conduct."

This test will decide what is improper in dress, furniture, equipage, social intercourse. All restless ambition to rise above our condition and circumstances, to outshine our equals, and vie with superiors; all anxious desire and eager endeavour to appear genteel, and to be thought so; all unnecessary extravagance and show, even

when our income can sustain it; every thing, in short, that evinces a disposition to be admired by the world, that looks like the workings of a mind more intent on earth than heaven, more solicitous to be happy here than to prepare for happiness hereafter, is unquestionably a conformity to the world, forbidden by the precepts of God's word, and the principles of our profession. An obvious eagerness to be fashionable in our dress and social habits; a wish to be considered a person of elegant taste; an endeavour to maintain intercourse with the gay; a constant change and heavy expense to keep up with the fluctuations of fashion, are all violations of the rule of Christianity. And so, also, is the too common practice of bringing up children, with a far greater attention to fashionable accomplishments than genuine religion. The piety of their children is the last thing which many who call themselves Christians seem to think of. Schools for girls are selected with far greater solicitude about the dancing, music, and drawing-masters, and the French teacher, than for the religious character of the establishment; and in the education of boys, Latin, Greek, and the mathematics, are far more thought of than religion.

Nor must I pass over another odious and criminal indication of worldly-mindedness among professors; I mean the preference which is often given to the sect with which they will unite themselves, and the congregation with which they will publicly worship God, and which is decided not on the ground of greater adaptation to personal edification, but of worldly respectability. A fashionable section of the Christian church, and a respectable congregation of that section, are among the demands of some, who would be thought pious too, in the present day. They wish to go genteelly to heaven. They have no objection to evangelical sentiments now they can hear them from the lips of a preacher whom the gay and the great flock to hear: and can endure the most heart-searching discourses, since they are delivered to assemblies in which the diamond sparkles, over which the ostrich wing waves, to which the silk-worm has lent the satin and the velvet, and which the peer dignifies with the coronet. Oh! who would not be religious when they can join in the same prayer or hymn with the aristocracy of trade or of rank. Alas! alas! such professors, had they lived in the days of "the Man of Sorrows," the reputed son of Joseph, the carpenter, who lived on charity, and whom the common people heard gladly, would have been Jews, and not Christians, for the former had the fashion on their side: or had they lived in the days of the apostles, they would never have been the followers of fishermen and tent-makers, but would have gone with the patrician orders to the temples of the gods.

Beware, then, professors, of the love of the world, even in that form of which it appears most blameless, I mean making it the supreme end of life to get money, though by honest industry, and to live genteelly.

"So far," says Mr. Fuller, "is the love of the world from being the less dangerous on account of its falling so little under human censure, that it is the more so. If we be guilty of any thing which exposes us to the reproach of mankind, such reproach may assist

the remonstrances of conscience, and of God, in carrying conviction to our bosoms; but of that for which the world acquits us, we shall be exceedingly disposed to acquit ourselves.

“It has long appeared to me that this species of covetousness will, in all probability, prove the eternal overthrow of more characters among professing people than almost any other sin; and this because it is almost the only sin which may be indulged, and a profession of religion at the same time supported. If a man be a drunkard, a fornicator, an adulterer, or a liar; if he rob his neighbour, oppress the poor, or deal unjustly, he must give up his pretensions to religion; or, if not, his religious connexions, if they are worthy of being so denominated, will give him up: but he may *love the world and the things of the world*, and at the same time retain his character. If the depravity of the human heart be not subdued by the grace of God, it *will* operate. If a dam be placed across some of its ordinary channels, it will flow with greater depth and rapidity on those that remain. It is thus, perhaps, avarice is most prevalent in old age, when the power of pursuing other vices has, in a great measure, subsided. And thus it is with religious professors, whose hearts are not right with God. They cannot figure away with the profane, nor indulge in gross immoralities; but they can love the world supremely, and be scarcely amenable to human judgment.”

Christians, I call you to fight the good fight of faith; one great part of which is, to attack and subdue the world. How can you satisfy yourselves that you are the children of God, if this victory be not gained, when it is said, “whatsoever is born of God, overcometh the world; and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.”—1 John, v. 4. Renew the conflict, grapple with the foe, determine by divine grace to conquer. Understand well the means of maintaining the contest and securing the victory. It is by faith alone you can become conquerors. Losses, trials, afflictions, disappointments, sorrows will not do it: these things have made men hate the world, and flee from it, but not conquer it; have broken their hearts *in* the world, but not from it; and in some instances have made them cling the closer to what was left. It is faith alone that can really exalt the Christian above the sphere of earthly things, and raise him to that lofty mind in which he is so satisfied with the present enjoyment of God, and the hope of future glory, that he is neither weary of the world nor fond of it. Keep faith in exercise; faith which, by truly believing in the truth of gospel revelation, realizes the existence of invisible and eternal glory, and by uniting the soul to God through Christ, accepts the very blessedness of heaven, as our own ineffable portion. Give yourselves more to the contemplation of heavenly bliss. Consider it is the very object of your vocation. “The God of all grace has called us unto his eternal glory.”—1 Peter, v. 10. It was matter of the apostle’s thanksgiving on behalf of the Thessalonians, that they were called by his gospel “to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ.”—2 Thes. ii. 14. What a calling! And yet by allowing the world to have such power and influence over us, we are opposing the holy, divine, and God-like purpose of drawing our hearts up into heaven, and are pulling them down to earth. Has God revealed to us the heavenly state, set open the very doors and

windows of the celestial temple, that we might have the lovely prospect, as far as we *can* have it, before us, and shall we not behold it? Does it become us, is it proper, that we should not open our eyes to heaven, when God has opened heaven to us? Or shall we, in effect, tell him, that we are too much occupied with the cares of business, the comforts of home, or the enjoyments of life, to attend to or to hope for the revealed glory? Oh! how few thoughts we have of it, how little we converse about it! How little does the prospect of the exceeding great and eternal weight of glory weigh down the griefs of our troubles, or the joy of our earthly possessions. There it is, above our heads, bright and effulgent, yet we are too much taken with the things that are of the earth, earthy, to look at it. "If one should give a stranger to Christianity an account of the Christian hopes, and tell him what they be and expect to enjoy before long, he would sure promise himself to find so many angels dwelling in human flesh, and reckon when he came among them he should be as amidst the heavenly choir; every one full of joy and praise. He would expect to find us living on earth as the inhabitants of heaven, as so many pieces of immortal glory lately dropped down from above, and shortly again returning thither. He would look to find every where in the Christian world, incarnate glory sparkling through the overshadowing veil; and wonder how this earthly sphere should be able to contain so many great souls. But when he draws nearer to us, and observes the course and carriage of our lives, when he sees us walk as other men, and considers the strange disagreement of our daily conversation to our so great avowed hopes, and how little sense of joy and pleasure we discover ourselves to conceive in them, would he not be ready to say, 'Sure some or other (willing only to amuse the world with the noise of strange things,) have composed a religion for these men which they themselves understand nothing about. If they do adopt it and own it for theirs, they understand not their own pretences; they are taught to speak some big words, or to give a faint or seeming assent to such as speak them in their names, but it is impossible they should be in good earnest, or believe themselves in what they say or profess.' And what reply, then, should we be able to make? For who can think any who acknowledge a God, and understand at all what the name imports, should value at so low a rate, as we visibly do, the eternal fruition of his glory and a present sonship to him the pledge of so great a hope. He that is born heir to great honours and possessions, though he be at great uncertainties as to the enjoyment of them, yet when he comes to understand his possibilities and expectancies, how big doth he look and speak? What grandeur doth he put on? His hopes form his spirit and deportment. But is it proportionably so with us? Do our hopes fill our hearts with joy, our mouths with praise, and clothe our faces with a cheerful aspect, and make a holy charity appear in all our conversations?

"Doth it not argue a low, sordid spirit not to desire and aim at the perfection thou art capable of, not to desire that blessedness which alone is suitable and satisfying to a reasonable and spiritual being? Bethink thyself a little, how art thou sunk into the dirt of the earth? Is the Father of spirits *thy father*? Is the world of spirits *thy country*? Hast thou any relation to that heavenly pro-

geny? Art thou allied to that blessed family, and yet undesirous of the same blessedness? Canst thou savour of nothing but what smells of earth? Is nothing grateful to thy soul but what is corrupted by so impure and vicious a tincture? Are the polluted pleasures of a filthy world better to thee than the eternal visions and enjoyments of heaven? What, art thou all made of earth? Is thy soul stupified into a clod? Hast thou no sense with thee of any thing better, and more excellent? Canst thou look upon no glorious thing with a pleased eye? Thy spirit looks too like the *mundane* spirit, the spirit of the world. The apostle speaks of it by way of distinction, 'We have not received the spirit of the world, but the spirit that is from God, that we might know or see (and no doubt it is desire that animates that eye, it is not bare speculative intuition, and no more) the things that are freely given us of God.'—1 Cor. ii. 12. Surely he whose desires do not guide his eye to the beholding of those things, hath received the spirit of the world only. A spirit that conforms him to this world makes him think only thoughts of this world, and speak the language of this world. A spirit that connaturalizes him to the world, makes him of a temper suitable to it; he breathes only worldly breath, carries a worldly aspect, is of a worldly conversation. Oh! poor low spirit, that such a world should withhold thee from the desire and pursuit of such glory! Art thou not ashamed to think what thy desires are wont to pitch upon, while they decline and waive this blessedness? Methinks thy own shame should compel thee to quit the name of a saint or a man; to forbear numbering thyself with any that pretend to immortality, and go seek pasture among the beasts of the field, with 'them that live that low animal life, that thou dost, and expect no other.'***

Christian professor, would you then be crucified to the world, and have the world crucified to you; would you indeed, and in truth, have the spirit of the world cast out of you; would you cease to be characterized as minding earthly things, and no longer bear the image of the earthly upon your soul as well as upon your body, go daily, by sacred meditation, to the cross of Christ, and while all the mysteries of redeeming love, as concentrated in the cross, there meet the eye of faith, and the visions of celestial glory, seen most distinctly from that spot, attract and fix the transported gaze of hope, you will see the beauty of the earth fade away before you amidst the splendour of a more excellent glory, and feel the love of the world die within you, under the power of a stronger and a holier affection.—*James's Christian Professor.*

[For the Religious Monitor.]

ART. IV.—*Mr. Gailey and the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church.*

Not long since, the demon of discord entered this church. A compromising few relinquished their distinctive principles; exci-

* Howe's "Blessedness of the Righteous."

sion was a necessary consequence. In their honourable struggle to hold fast what they had already attained, they had the approbation of their sister churches in Scotland and Ireland. After that strife was over, they indulged the hope that all would go on in peace and harmony. But the enemy had departed from them only for a season, as in the case of their Master; and, at a very unexpected hour, a rupture takes place, sudden and unexpected, like the springing of a mine. Mr. Gailey, after having received appointments from Presbytery for the ensuing winter, at the subsequent meeting of Synod, gave in a declinature. This was, perhaps, previously contemplated in his own mind, but not divulged. This unexpected step, no doubt, originated in the disappointment of his not getting Sullivan street church. For, immediately upon Mr. Christie becoming the successful candidate, calumnious charges began to be raised against ministers—that they were unqualified for such and such stations; or unfaithful to the cause; or confederated with malignants in unhal- lowed associations, &c. These evils were the subjects of secret conversation, when opportunity served, and, otherwise, were commu- nicated in private, inflammatory letters to confidential associates. That congregation was the theatre which this popular preacher and his minority had destined for the display of his talents. In the anticipation of this, all other calls were rejected. Failure in this seemed to be a death's blow to every prospect of promotion in the church. Having rejected so many calls, (it is said five,) no other congregation was likely to risk a disappointment. If a settlement in New York could not be obtained *in connexion* with the church, it must be obtained *out of it*. For this end a declinature must be given in; and, as a necessary consequence, they must cancel his license, as he had no right to preach under the authority of their license, having relinquished them as a judicatory. This deed, though perfectly proper, and according to Presbyterian order, is loudly declaimed against by him and his associates, because, say they, having given in his declinature, they had no more to do with him. Try this mode of reasoning in a civil court: the judge is about to pronounce sentence on a culprit; to prevent which he says, I decline your authority, sir. Would this display of folly prevent the judge from doing his duty? If so, very few sentences, certainly, would ever be pronounced; and why should such an act arrest the progress of order in the church, more than in the state. The result was the keenest resentment. So indomitable were his feelings, (feelings which, alas, often appeared, when placidity much more became the place which he occupied, and the character which he sustained,) that nothing could satiate them but a periodical, by which he has it conveniently in his power, at others' expense, to make way for his wrath, and gratify his spiteful feelings. But for these feelings, I confidently believe no such periodical had ever appeared. Had he attended to Ps. xxxvii. 8, it would have prevented a world of ini- quity and trouble: "Cease from anger, and forsake wrath; fret not thyself in any wise to do evil." He may also read the 7th and 9th verses. Col. iii. 3—15.

As a plausible pretext for his abandonment of the church, he has given a distorted view of Temperance, Abolition, and other socie- ties; of which some of the ministers, to their commendation, are

members; yet reproachfully called by him association with malignants, papists, and infidels. This vituperation took very well with anti-temperance members, who, had he advocated, as he ought, these associations, would have been as loud in his condemnation, as they are now high in his praises. But, suppose connexion with these associations were really association with malignants, in the very aggravated sense in which he represented them, their criminality would bear no comparison with his, in dividing and rending the church of Christ. I question if Sharp and Claverhouse, with all their persecuting malice, possessed a worse spirit against the church. If such association was a justifiable ground of abandoning the church, why was it not acted upon till the moment that a committee was about to be appointed to investigate his conduct, in sowing the seeds of dissension in various congregations, and refusing so many calls? That the great outcry of association with malignants, &c., was a mere pretence, is farther evident from two considerations; not more than fifteen minutes before he gave in his declination, he said he had nothing against them. And to the question, would he not have remained in the connexion, and accepted a call, had they not been going to investigate his conduct? he said he would. There is not the slightest ground to question that all his charges against the ministers were hatched in his own feverish brain, to serve the double purpose of palliating his own offences, and of drawing others after him. To him the words of the apostle (Acts xx. 30) most strictly and literally apply, "Also of your own selves shall men arise; speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them." Perhaps a bolder effort at ecclesiastical seduction was never before made in a Protestant church. More artifice, or worse motives did not appear in Absalom's civil seduction; and, as in that case, with a success deeply to be lamented; a success in sin that proved fatal to the adventurer himself. The result of the present revolt, time only can make known. It is a remarkable feature in the character of sin, that no man wishes to sin alone; upon this principle apostates from the church endeavour to draw away as many after them as possible; hence the prodigious number of sectaries that exist in the world. There is also some gratification of vanity in being the founder of a new party, which is the native consequence of all schism. I know of no malignants more prejudicial to the interests of the church than schismatics. I question if the history of the church affords a more flagrant instance of one individual making a bolder effort to become the head of a party; and for the purpose of drawing away disciples after him, he has indulged in slander and misrepresentations with abundant profusion. If this was not his object, why urge the people to hold meetings, to read his letters, and make up their minds whether they would follow him or the ministers; (if not the very words, the very sense;) and conclude a long tirade of abuse, by saying, we will be better wanting such men? If in this there was any thing like modest humility, then certainly that ornament of human character was never wanting in any other. Divisions in the church have always been a ground of lamentation to the godly; but to those who glory in rending the church, divisions can never be matter of the least regret. Therefore, in them this character of the godly must be wanting; and sowing the tares of discord is as uni-

formly regarded as the work of an enemy. When he commenced such an outrageous attack upon the church, uncalled for, unprovoked, he could not have thought of the wo denounced against those by whom the offence cometh, and that the sowing of discord is one of the seven abominations, which the Lord doth hate. It is worthy of our pains to inquire by what ingenuity he has succeeded so well in drawing away so many after him. In this wretched success he is chiefly indebted to his popularity as a preacher. Say his deluded followers, he can preach as well yet as ever. Such sentiment comes ill from those who hold that all things in the church ought to be done decently and in order. The order, peace, and harmony of the church are certainly more worthy of respect than a display of brilliant talents, or mere personal edification; and more especially when the right to exercise these talents is forfeited. It is matter of deep lamentation when intellectual endowments, conferred by God for the edification of his church, are prostituted to the subversion of her interests. But besides his popularity, his misrepresentations have contributed largely to draw a halo of adherents around him, as a centre of attraction. Besides accusing the ministers as being confederated with malignants, papists, and infidels, he has represented them as conniving against him, having spies upon him, stabbing him in secret, and all because he would not join in association with ungodly men, thus representing himself as a sufferer, to gain sympathy. His going about, also, to preach, wherever he could get an opening, and going from house to house, and from one to one, representing the ministers as relinquishing the old covenant and forming a new one; and asking the people if they would follow the ministers, with their new covenant, or stick to the old; and promised them sermons, and held out the encouraging prospect of being joined by others. If this was not decoying and misleading the people, then certainly nothing was ever calculated to have that effect. Now, in view of so many grievous charges against them, how could he say, but a few minutes before he gave in his declinature, that he had nothing against them? Alas for his veracity! He had them prepared for this rupture by his private letters, in which he gave scope to his resentful feelings, but enjoined secrecy. His verbal and written misrepresentations were not sufficient to satiate his resentment, but a periodical must be circulated, by which he had it conveniently in his power, without expense, to misrepresent, and gratify his revenge. What is the avowed object of this periodical? The author himself shall tell. "In presenting this publication to view, the only apology offered is *necessity*." Necessity for what? We are not told. The only charitable construction that could be put on this *necessity* would be, that the reformation cause was wounded in the house of its friends; its peculiarities opposed and condemned; and that he only remained alone to tell the world and the church; and that there was no other mode of defending them but through such a public medium. But is this really the case; or, like other things, merely slanderous invention? What principle have they either abandoned or condemned, that he has vindicated? Not one. Let any impartial person read his pamphlets, and say if there be the smallest appearance of any such defence, or of any other object but to vilify and slander the ministers; and all, evidently, to

set the people against them, break down their congregations, and raise himself upon their ruin. In one instance, I was told, he spoke to this effect: If they did not join him, he would ruin them as a congregation. Whether he uttered this demoniacal threat or not, the iniquity has been materially perpetrated. Any thing, certainly, but the good and prosperity of the church was his object. Had they, in compliance with the wish of a few dissentients in New York, organized a new congregation, and settled him there, there never had been a word of associating with malignants, or any other thing. The whole "*necessity*" of his vengeful pamphlets originated in disappointment, to promote his own selfish ends, gratify his own wrathful feelings, eked out to their utmost extent; vilify ministers that never did him wrong; break down their congregations, and draw followers after him. The accomplishment of these ungodly purposes originated the *necessity* of this inflammatory magazine, a fit emblem of Pandora's box, which was filled with all diseases. Even the manner in which this ephemeral was ushered into the world is worthy of notice: a long list of agents is published. This certainly was very imposing, and full of argument that the work was expected to be something great, and very useful, since patronized by such a long list of respectable agents. These agents, he no doubt expected, would employ their utmost influence to attach to him all in their vicinity, and thus bring the whole community into Mr. Gailey's congregation! A bold conception, truly! But is it capable of credit, that all this is entirely gratuitous? That the long list of names enrolled as agents, was without the least knowledge or consent of the persons themselves? Whether was it an honour or an insult to announce a person as an agent for a work which he must necessarily detest? However, he has gained his end, no matter whether by fair or foul means. He has got the ministers scandalized, congregations divided, and a goodly number drawn away after him. Some have seen their error and returned to their duty. It is to be hoped others, also, will see their mistake, and follow their example. Those who have allowed themselves to be drawn away, have certainly overlooked several very plain passages of scripture, expressly prohibitory of such conduct. Rom. xvi. 17, 18: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them: for they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly, and by good words and fair speeches, deceive the hearts of the simple." 2 Thes. iii. 6: "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly." These, certainly, are very express prohibitions, and expressed in a very solemn manner. The following passages are also declarative of the same thing: 2 Pet. iii. 17; 1 Tim. v. 22; 1 Cor. i. 10; Eph. iv. 3. Any one of these passages was sufficient prohibition, if attended to; how much more, when taken all together! The aspect is bad in him and them both, when a line of conduct is pursued so much at variance with the divine word.

If he really intended a reformation in the church, he has gone to work in a very preposterous manner. He began where others generally end. His first step was to withdraw; then to criminate.

M'Millan, the Erskines, and other fathers of the Secession Church, first remonstrated, petitioned, &c., according to the scripture, "Plead with your mother, plead." And when reclaiming means proved unavailing, then they withdrew, according to other scriptures, "Come out from among them; withdraw from every brother that walketh disorderly; follow not the multitude to do evil, &c." Also, in the more recent divisions in the General Assembly, the orthodox party did not cast out their Hopkinsian brethren, without previously employing reclaiming means. But the first step taken by this anomalous reformer is to withdraw, then calumniate, vilify, and misrepresent. Similar treatment Paul long since experienced, and from the same source, too, false brethren, mother's children. Even these sometimes resemble the madman, who, in sport, casts fire-brands, arrows, and death. The carnal weapons which he has employed certainly betoken a bad cause, as the cause of truth requires no such ungracious defence. If ever there was any thing like stabbing of character, there is certainly enough of it in these scurrilous pamphlets. By his many fabrications, he has evidenced that veracity constitutes no part of his character. What could be more glaringly at variance with this, than the assertion that the stabbing, &c., &c., were because he would not join in entangling association with ungodly men? Such an unfounded charge could apply to no association on earth but one of the most infidel and profligate character. There has been a great outcry of misusage, by him and his adherents, without the slightest foundation. It is true they cancelled his license. This was the necessary consequence of his own violent and disorderly conduct. And all the calumnious charges brought against the ministers were all merely puerile fabrications to cover his own delinquency and excite sympathy. The whole was his own doing, from first to last. They have allowed him to vilify, misrepresent, and stab them at pleasure, as his fancy or resentment dictated, in his low and scurrilous pamphlets, one after another, without one word of defence. What, then, have they done to merit so much calumny? I know it not; it requires yet to be told. I doubt not that the circumstance of their making no reply is to him mortifying; that they have not considered him and his periodicals of sufficient importance to be noticed in the pages of their magazine. Though in this I do not consider they have acted wisely. The advice of one, on a certain occasion, was, I think, worthy of their attention: "Never despise an enemy so much, however mean, as to take no notice of him; for he may do more mischief than you ever anticipated." God has seen meet, in his providence, to permit this evil to befall the church, as he did Shimei to curse David; but of their conduct in letting him entirely alone, I, by no means, approve. Though by their silence they cannot be charged with rendering railing for railing. Although they were willing themselves to bear his railing accusations, a public defence was loudly called for, on various accounts; chiefly on account of those who, unwilling to follow divisive courses, wished to hold fast their profession without wavering, yet were in danger of being led away by the error of wicked misrepresentations, and might, like others, be left to fall from their own steadfastness. They were ignorant how matters really were. They hoped they were not so bad as represented.

through this suspicious medium; and in the faith of this, they clave to the Synod; but they had no certain information to the contrary. They could neither be certain themselves, nor satisfy others. Their implicit faith, and the antidote that the magazines contained to their own poison, were all the support that they had, whereby to withstand the torrent of opposition. Something ought then to have been done on their behalf. Something should have been done, also, for the sake of those who have been misled; and even for his sake who caused them to err, if peradventure they may be undeceived, and reclaimed from the error of their ways. For such neglect they are sharply reprov'd, (Ezek. xxxiv. 4—10.) The flock was scattered and driven away, as in the present case, and nothing done for their recovery. They may say they had no prospect of success; true: but duty is theirs, success is the Lord's. They ought, also, to have made a defence for the sake of the public interests of the church. His statements are either true or false; those unfriendly to the church are more ready to believe what is false; especially when stated, with so many aggravations, by a popular preacher, and not contradicted. Silence is generally regarded latent consent. A confutation was necessary for the defence of the cause of truth, and to counteract a wide-spreading evil. To publish against every aberration out of the church, and allow a gangrene *in* the church to affect her very vitals, without an effort to impose a check, is neither wise nor usual. They had a very exemplary precedent set them by the editor of the Religious Monitor, who, in similar circumstances, gave a clear explanation of matters in controversy, and confuted misrepresentations; which, if not convincing to adversaries, were satisfactory to friends. This they ought to have done, and then let the matter rest, without diminishing the value of their magazine by attending to future quibbles. Farther, they ought to have had so much respect to their own character, as to publish in their own defence. They are not their own; they are the public functionaries of the church, and so closely identified with her interests, that they ought to have imitated Paul, who, though sufficiently patient to bear reproach, was compelled to vindicate himself against calumnious charges; and more, I presume, on account of his official than personal character. The church now, as well as on many former occasions, must complain, "My mother's children were angry with me." All circumstances taken together do, in the opinion of the writer, loudly call for a public defence. If "*necessity*" impelled him to publish an erroneous periodical, to gratify his resentment, a much greater necessity lay on them to publish a refutation. I doubt not, the best defence they could make would, like this, be called lies, (a brief mode of refuting charges,) for a person reckless of veracity is never at a loss for an answer. They may think, and justly too, that they have already been sufficiently calumniated before the public; and all that they could publish would only serve as *paulum* for that inflammatory periodical, which, like the allegator, weeps while it devours.

The design of this communication is not to assert immaculate purity or impeccability in the clergy, but, like one in a dispute of old, to show my opinion.

ELIHU.

ART. V.—*Remarks on the Communication of "Elihu."*

After mature deliberation, we have concluded to insert "ELIHU'S" article, although not *directly* interesting to our readers, for the following reasons:—

1. It is well written.
2. It is an item of ecclesiastical intelligence, the publication of which comports with the design of the Monitor.
3. It furnishes an illustration of the true character, the unhal-
lowed means, the "wretched success" which mark, with unerring
certainty, all schismatics, and distinguish them from the faithful fol-
lowers of our Lord Jesus Christ. An individual, or a number of
individuals, conceive the purpose of carrying some favourite plan
in the church, involving their personal popularity or pecuniary in-
terest; they flatter themselves that the glory of God, the purity and
prosperity of the church are identified with the success of their
scheme; or it may be, in some cases, they regard only their own
glory. Others are unable to see the superlative importance of
schemes which have more of a *personal* than *general* bearing; they
withhold their approbation. But ambition and self-interest are not
so easily defeated. There is, also, sufficient ignorance, prejudice,
lack of the means of correct information, which may be operated
upon with a fair prospect of success. The discovery is *suddenly*
made, that those ministers and elders who stand in the way of these
schemes have joined a temperance society or an anti-slavery society,
and are thus associating with "malignants, papists, and infidels," al-
though they may have belonged to these societies for a quarter of a
century. Or, it is discovered that they are opposed to all voluntary
societies, therefore they are drunkards—willing to hold their fellow
men in bondage—Sabbath-breakers—enemies to the spread of the
gospel, &c. Belonging, or not belonging to a voluntary, irrespon-
sible association is of more importance than a saving knowledge of
Christ, and him crucified. An appeal is made to that side on which
prejudice preponderates, in the hope of securing a majority for some
favourite scheme of personal interest, which lies concealed from
common observation.

If this plan of operation should fail, the next resort is to secret
slanders, or open abuse; the ministers are jealous of the delinquent's
superiority; are under the influence of a spirit of popery; are perse-
cutors, and the schismatics are the martyrs. If it should become
absolutely necessary to call them to account in the church courts,
for their abusive and divisive conduct, then these courts are parties,
and incompetent to try them. They will decline their authority,
knowing that some will become their followers; for nothing can be

too absurd for the human mind, in its fallen state, when swayed by ignorance, prejudice, passion, or interest. And then there is a third party, who *disapprove* of the conduct of these schismatics, and yet are filled with astonishment and indignation at the application of the rod of discipline to such cases. They *disapprove*, but support; they condemn, but act with them. These are your moderate men, or, rather, *middle* men; they belong to no party; the very class which withheld the exercise of discipline in the General Assembly till the breach was effected. They always take merit to themselves for their *moderation*, which is displayed by their sympathy for the real authors of division, and their resolute opposition to good government.

If the schismatic be only an individual, a young man seeking promotion, his career is usually commenced with a few finished discourses, prepared, with great care, at the Theological Seminary, under the eye of the professors; on which months of time may have been exhausted. These performances are delivered with fluency, if not pomposity; are well received; and secure, from the inconsiderate, adulation sufficient to stir up the most lofty aspirations for popular applause and worldly emolument. The church at large, in common with the individual, reaps the bitter fruits of this folly. The doctrines of the gospel, the salvation of men, become secondary considerations, and are made subservient to personal aggrandizement; attachment to a man is sufficient evidence of love for the truth; and a refined, impalpable species of idolatry usurps the place of that spiritual worship which is alone acceptable to God. A hasty call succeeds; induced by the glitter of learned words, well-turned periods, and pompous declamation; while the claims of the more modest, pious, and faithful, but less showy student, are wholly disregarded. For it may be laid down as a well-established fact, that the most eminent, the most evangelical men, have generally been most unpopular with the people at the commencement of their career. But, in relation to the case supposed, the novelty of the scene having passed away, the finished discourses being exhausted, mutual disgust succeeds, and none are found doing homage to this victim of popular applause. The people look about for another popular man to build up the church. Or, it is quite possible, the character which we are contemplating may be so elated as to fancy himself destined to fill no ordinary niche in the temple of fame. Calls are refused, because too insignificant; he has no relish for the self-denying labours of the apostles of our Lord. He is not disposed to take an humble station in the church. His pre-eminent gifts—his shining abilities are not to be confined to an obscure corner of the world; neither are the poor, the illiterate, capable of appreciating his merits. He loves the people who have called him; but some

difficulty lies in the way; another congregation calls; he declines choosing for himself; throws the responsibility on the church courts, or the advice of individuals. If he accept, the acceptance is only temporary. He is still a candidate for every congregation in the body, settled or vacant. If he receive appointments from the church courts, though he should agree to those appointments, it is intimated to the people that they are not so advantageous, in reference to future settlement, as they might have been. But, should all this manœuvring prove unsuccessful, schism or apostacy become the only alternatives. A pretence is conceived, multitudes eagerly seize the bait, and become the easy prey of the seducer.

But it sometimes happens that God preserves his faithful servants from falling into error; so that the cunning of the fox is inadequate to find even a plausible pretext for apostacy. Then the delinquent is driven to sad shifts. It is possible he may be left to publish his own shame in such glaring capitals that it is seen and read of all men. He tells the world, with shameless effrontery, that he has prostituted the sacred desk to artifice and deception; that he has proclaimed doctrines, in Jehovah's awful name, which he did not believe, or, at least, concerning the truth of which he had doubts, doubts, too, which ultimately led to their public renunciation! and these doubts become confirmed principles just in the nick of time to secure ——; but we forbear the loathsome detail. And yet we must be told that all this may be consistent, upright, fair dealing; that it is uncharitable to suspect such conduct; unpardonable to lisp aught against it! Our moral sense must be stultified, and we must maintain silence, on pain of being cast out as disturbers of the public peace, by the liberal professors of this age!

Or, it is also possible the delinquent may withdraw silently. This is certainly the least exceptionable method of apostacy. If a man has fallen into that state of mind in which he can no longer endure the restraints imposed by his own voluntary and solemn covenant obligations to God and his brethren, it is certainly less aggravated guilt, in the sight of God, to retire peaceably from the field, than the malignant and futile attempt to cast the odium of his defection upon such as are resolved to maintain their steadfastness. Such an individual may be compared to the soldier whose nerves are too delicate and sensitive to face the enemy. He throws away both arms and ammunition, and trusts to his heels for safety. Ps. lxxviii. 9, 10.

Let it not be supposed that we ascribe all the evils which afflict the church to the causes here enumerated; the people must come in for their full share of blame. For it frequently happens that they first become the tempters, and then the destroyers of the youthful minister. They first tempt by flattery, next by cold neglect. And

the parsimonious, not to say niggard spirit, which they frequently manifest in supporting gospel ordinances not only disgusts a generous young man, but becomes no small draw-back on his labours. It is not in human nature to acquire, all at once, that degree of self-denial and deadness to the world which are imposed by some congregations, by their cold indifference to his temporal wants, if not sinful neglect to pay the promised pittance. He must either devote a part of his time to some secular employment, or leave a profession which fails to secure to himself and family necessary food and raiment; or must be content to sacrifice his own and the temporal happiness of his children for the spiritual good of others, looking for his reward in a better world. How many have devoted talents, time, hard service, and even the products of paternal industry, to the service of the church, which would have given them a high standing in the world! Yet the little that they have received from the people is frequently given as a charity, rather than the payment of a just debt! But they shall not go unrewarded.

Again: many have itching ears. They can be satisfied only with novelty or display. Food for the soul is merely a secondary concern. They are not in love with the unadulterated word of God; because they have only a partial acquaintance with the truth, and are sanctified only in part. Consequently, they look to meretricious ornament as more useful than plain dealing, and thus become the easy dupes of the time-serving and schismatical. It is plain dealing that has, in every age, been instrumental in the salvation of souls; and it is plain dealing that has, in every age, constituted the offence of the cross. And if all were attached to their profession from a proper conviction of duty, the schismatical could not so easily find materials to work upon.

So, then, we see that both ministers and people must come in for their mutual share of guilt. Both have been instrumental in bringing the glorious cause committed to our hands very low. Both are called to repentance. "Oh! Israel, return unto the Lord thy God; for thou hast fallen by thine iniquity."

4. We have inserted the article in question because it is from the pen of a respectable minister of the gospel not in connexion with the Associate Church; but who, nevertheless, has seen the necessity of the course which was pursued by our Synod towards certain schismatics which arose in her own bosom. That course Elihu justifies by sound argument, and substantial proof drawn from the scriptures.

Of Mr. Gailey we have no personal knowledge whatever, and cannot, therefore, be justly chargeable with any degree of prejudice or personal feeling. But if his conduct has been such as is detailed by Elihu, it meets with our unqualified disapprobation. We abhor

such doings in any branch of the Christian church; and happy would it be for the cause of truth and righteousness, if such doings were more generally reprobated by the whole community. It is a malignant and disorganizing spirit, reckless alike of the authority of God, the natural rights and everlasting well-being of men, that is at work in the hearts of this generation. It foment and bubbles up moral stench, nauseous in the sight of Heaven. Its effects are visible in the denunciatory language of the people in their primary political assemblies, from the press, at the bar, and even in the Senate chamber. It appears in the enactment of unrighteous and oppressive laws; in the mal-administration or total disregard of good laws; in the hitherto unknown wild and lawless speculations; the general aversion to honest industry; the tarrings and featherings, and burnings, and murders of mobs; the individual assassinations; and the almost universal desecration of the holy Sabbath. And to all this must be added the divisions, the jealousies, the heresies, the slavery, the schism, and other gross immoralities in the very bosom of the visible church, especially contempt for the divine ordinance of church government. Is this likeness overdrawn? Surely not. And it is not the least of our calamities, that the great body of our countrymen are actually involved in some one of these sins, and therefore blind to others.

If such, then, be our moral condition, we need look no farther for the causes of the almost innumerable fragments into which the Christian church is broken, and of the persecution which the more faithful must expect to suffer. Men will not only "not endure sound doctrine," but the restraints of good government have become intolerable. They are "heady and high-minded." They are ignorant of God and the duties they owe each to another. They are not taught the scriptures in youth; in manhood they refuse to be taught. And thus they perish for lack of knowledge under a dispensation of the gospel. The seventy-ninth and eightieth Psalms contain matter for prayer suitable to our present condition.

ART. VI.—*Anti-Slavery Convention.*

IN the last number a review of the proceedings of this convention was promised, but a more critical examination of their speeches and resolutions has deterred us from the undertaking. The principles, the moral tone, and the spirit of this convention, fall far below our anticipations; so much so, that it is believed it would be unprofitable to fill our pages with their sayings and doings.

1. Their principles are not well defined; scarcely any two speakers agreed in their views of present duty in relation to slavery in

the United States. For, although they passed resolutions to withdraw political support from *pro slavery* men, yet, out of four hundred delegates present, only thirty-eight voted for those resolutions, and ten against them, leaving *three hundred and fifty-two* silent members! Too many non-committals for reformers.

2. Their code of morals appears to be, so far as the majority were concerned, not only lax, but heretical. Utility was, in most of the speeches, made the foundation of moral obligation; a rotten principle of morality lying at the root of the evil they are labouring to remove; and among the many absurd notions broached, was the doctrine that conscience is always a safe and infallible guide, and that Spanish inquisitors, murderers, &c., may now be in heaven, because they followed conscience!

3. Their spirit is ultra. They seem to think steamboats and locomotives are as applicable to moral as natural things; that some undefined and undefinable invention is still a desideratum in morals; that some discovery must yet be made by which the human race may be suddenly emancipated from the huge evil, not only of bondage, but of all other moral evils; that a new path may be struck out, by which men may enter the kingdom of heaven more speedily, and with less toil and self-denial than formerly; and the locomotive on this new moral rail-road, to adopt their own phraseology, appears to be human effort, with money and moral suasion for its impulsive power.

It brings us no satisfaction of mind to say these things. The object they have in view, THE ENTIRE EMANCIPATION OF THE HUMAN RACE, demands our sympathy, our prayers, and our support, in all lawful ways competent to us. But this object, it is confidently believed, can never be accomplished till the hearts of men are changed by the efficacious grace of God. We maintain that civil and religious rights, if not *identical*, are at least *indissoluble*; but the latter is the basis of the former, and piety must precede them both in the order of nature and of time. Men ignorant of the gospel, are ignorant of civil liberty; and though they may have a speculative knowledge of the gospel, they will never yield equality to their fellow men, if they have power to withhold it, till their vain imaginations and haughty looks are subdued by the grace or the vengeance of God. Hence our want of confidence in voluntary associations of every name and description. Like the legalist seeking relief for a guilty conscience by his impotent efforts to mend a broken covenant, they may toil at their human machinery for a thousand years, without effecting the least degree of permanent reform. They neither enforce the true and only principle of reform, the grace of God in the heart, nor do they use the only means which warrants them to hope for success, namely, divine institutions. Those who think differ-

ently are welcome to their views; we condemn them not; we only claim the privilege of giving our own opinion, which thirty years' experience has confirmed.

We know it will be said to this, that civil government is competent to the heathen, and that its principles lie within the scope of natural religion. True. But whoever heard of a heathen government founded on equality, and respecting all the civil and religious rights of men? If there have been any such, we have not read of them. It will be said that civil duties may be performed by natural men, and that we may unite with them in their performance. To this we reply, that the natural man can no more perform *civil* duties from proper motives and to a right end, than religious; and that we are to act with such in the discharge of civil duties only so far as compelled by the existing state of society, on the principle that God does not require physical impossibilities. We are not to seek, but shun such associations, as much as we do a corrupt religious communion, and for the same reasons. Our only astonishment is, that Christians do not see these principles. We have not time, at present, to go into a full discussion of them, but we are fully persuaded that their neglect has paralyzed all efforts of modern reform, and brought us to the brink of national ruin.

As matter of information, we extract a few paragraphs from the speech of Mr. H. B. STANTON, the best which was delivered in the convention:—

“I was surprised to hear the sentiments which fell from the lips of my respected friend, Mr. Cornish, in regard to political action. Does he not know that the principle laid down by him, operates practically to nullify our whole anti-slavery movement? Can he influence the south by his arguments, while he thus practises? Saith the Bible, “let those who bear the vessels of the Lord be pure.” Let abolitionists carry out their principles at every cost, if they would hope to reach the conscience of the slave-holder. What is the doctrine we have invariably proclaimed to our southern fellow citizens? That slavery, at all times and in all circumstances, is sinful; and that every slave-holder is obligated to instantly emancipate his slaves, and every southern voter bound to make the immediate abolition of slavery a test at the polls. We have reasoned with them as follows:—

“‘Slavery is a sin, and should be at once abandoned.’ The slave-holder replied, ‘Our laws sanction it.’ The abolitionist rejoined, ‘But who made your laws? If they were made by slave-holders, and if they are iniquitous, you are responsible.’ ‘But,’ answered the slave-holder, ‘if we emancipate our slaves, they will cut our throats; your abolition schemes will flood our land with blood.’ To this the abolitionist replied, ‘If you would avoid danger from your slaves, attach them to you by the strong cord of gratitude—set them free; doing them good, and *the* good they most desire, is not the way to make them murder you, but doing them injury.’ But if

this consideration is not strong enough, then the abolitionist resorts to his last argument: "Suppose it should deluge your land with blood; if it is your duty to do it, better to wade through blood to the kingdom of heaven, than to sail upon an ocean of nectar to the gates of perdition. Duty is ours—consequences are God's." But, if we convince them that emancipation will not endanger their lives, the slave-holder still answers, 'It will reduce us to bankruptcy.' The abolitionist, in reply, points to the West Indies; to a peaceful and flourishing community, where the bright flush of health, prosperity, and happiness has superseded the pallid hue of ruin and apprehended death. He reads to them the report of Thome and Kimball, proving that emancipation is as desirable to the masters in an agricultural and commercial point of view, as to the slaves in a moral and spiritual. But, if they disbelieve these facts, the abolitionist returns to his high ground, and again urges, 'What if it should reduce you to bankruptcy? Better lodge in an alms-house, on a pallet of straw, with a good conscience, than disobey God, and sleep in a palace on a downy bed.' It is this high moral tone, this unyielding adherence to the stern requisitions of duty, that has distinguished us from all other parties in the land on the slave question. It is this which has made us a reproach and an abhorrence to the public—which has caused us to be persecuted from city to city. It was this which caused Crandall to be imprisoned for months at the seat of our national government; an incarceration which compelled him to flee from the keen edge of a northern winter, with a broken heart and constitution, to the balmy air of Jamaica, where, after resting his weary frame for a few days, under the grateful shadow of a monarch's throne, he finally sunk to rise no more—the only refuge of a republican abolitionist. It was this which caused Dresser to be lynched at Nashville. It was an unyielding devotion to these truths which caused this epitaph to be written, in bloody characters, on the winding-sheet of Lovejoy—**AN AMERICAN CITIZEN MURDERED FOR HIS LOVE OF LIBERTY.** Were these, our brethren, right? We say they were; and we glory in their deeds, and embalm their names. And shall we now turn our backs upon them, and refuse to cling to their principles, thus reproaching them and dishonouring ourselves?

"Permit me, Mr. President, to drop my character as an abolitionist, and assume, for a few moments, that of a slave-holder from the far south, while I address a convention composed of the *elite* of the abolitionists from Maine to Missouri, assembled here in solemn conclave to adopt measures for the advancement of their cause. Gentlemen! you affirm that you have got the grand catholicon which will cure all the evils of our body politic, to wit, immediate abolition. You take the whole south by the collar, and insist that they shall swallow it. You have thundered in their ears that emancipation, immediate emancipation, complete and unconditional, is their solemn duty, and whatever may be the difficulties or the dangers attending it, they must all be encountered; and yet, whilst saying and doing all this, you will not yourselves risk, for a moment, your own little, paltry, pitiful, seven-by-nine partisan interests. If you can carry into power your northern man with southern principles, or your southern man with northern principles, you will not pause a moment for abolition's sake. You demand that we make this

question a test at the polls, and yet you will wear the collar of party, regardless of the chains of the slave. You insist that we wade through blood, if need be, for universal emancipation, while you will not hazard the success of a constable, if nominated by your own party; but, to secure his election, will trample on your principles, and march to the ballot-box over the prostrate body of the slave, to deposite your pro-slavery vote. Practice what you preach, ye hypocrites! You ask us to bankrupt ourselves, if need be, for the sake of principle, while you will stop your ears to the cry of the plundered slave, that you may drop your ballot for Clay and the Bank, or Van Buren and the Sub-Treasury, lest, should your party schemes fail, you would be a little less successful in acquiring wealth. Thus you illustrate the sacredness of the truths you proclaim in our ears! Because we will not practise what you preach, and yield every thing at your dictation, you brand us robbers, despots, man-stealers, the felons of the human race. Perhaps we are—but pray, gentlemen abolitionists, what are you? Ye who say that others should not steal, do you steal? Pluck the motes, yea beams, out of your own eyes, ye arrant apostates!

“I admit that we are frequently placed in an embarrassing dilemma. We often have two pro-slavery men presented to us as candidates, one of whom is against the right of petition and free discussion, and the other in favour of them; and we are exhorted to vote for the latter as the least of the two evils. I will go for neither. Their zeal for the right of petition and free discussion is founded on expediency alone. The candidate regards the rights of free men only—of light-coloured men, and does not advocate the rights of man as man. Away with such an advocate of human rights. His advocacy is leprous hypocrisy. He knows that the stanch friends of the right of petition and free discussion control the ballot-box, and he wants their votes. And when the same expediency which now influences him to such a course shall demand the sacrifice of these rights, he will, for the sake of votes, as readily trample on the rights of the free as he now tramples on the rights of the enslaved.

“A word, in passing, on this matter of free discussion, the advocacy of which by a candidate is made to cover a multitude of sins. Where were these zealous free controvertists in 1835, when this right was trodden in the mire, and we were driven from our halls, and could not deliver an address but we had a storm of brick-bats beating upon our heads? When we could not give away a tract without being tarred and feathered, nor hold a convention in a public building, but it was straightway burned to the ground? One was lolling on his sofa in luxurious ease, deprecating ‘the mad course of the fanatics;’ another was poring over law-books, in search of authority to shield the mobocrats; another was writing articles for the newspapers, apologizing for riots and arson; and another was rolling up his sleeves, and, club in hand, heading the anarchists. But we braved the tempest, and, by the blessing of God, crossed the angry flood, and now we are advanced far beyond it, and are scaling the heights of immediate abolition. Now, forsooth, we are met by a political candidate (one of these very men, probably!) who avows himself a free disputant, and who very modestly says to us, with a bow, ‘Vote for me, and I will not throw you back into the stream

whose waves you have so nobly buffeted.' Indeed! And is this his only claim to our votes? Away with him. Give me the man who will defend the right of free discussion, and all other rights, at all times, and on principle, because they are *rights*.

"But, it is no longer a debateable question whether the anti-slavery-question shall enter into politics; it is in already, and necessarily so. Slavery itself is created and sustained by law. Law is the creator and preserver of the system; and law is the offspring of political action. The American Congress stands around slavery in the District of Columbia as a body-guard, facing outward, with weapons in hand, ready to charge bayonet upon liberty. The slave-trade between the states has shot its roots deep into the soil of political action, till its branches overshadow the land. The whole system, as it exists in the thirteen slave states, is nourished by politics, and riots, and flourishes by their fostering care. Political action is its vital fluid; and by it it lives, and moves, and has its being. Keep the question out of politics! Avoid the winds and tempests of political action! Why, sir, the storm is blowing already like a hurricane. The canvass of our stately ship, United States, is torn to tatters; the shrouds are snapping; she is on her beam ends, and the waves are making a complete breach over her. We have a piratical commander, and an idiot at the helm. The heavens are black with midnight, and rocks and breakers are directly ahead. The question is not now whether we shall go to sea, but being at sea, and in such a storm, whether we shall put a true man on the quarter-deck—whether we shall call all hands to the pumps, and place a sane man at the wheel, so that, with the help of God, we may wear ship, and shun the reef, and save the noble barque, and her precious cargo and gallant crew.

"My friend, Mr. Cornish, is very desirous of keeping the moral and religious interests of this cause above the political. Well, sir, let me say to him, that voting is a moral and religious act, as much as prayer. 'Whether we eat or drink, or whatsoever we do, do all to the glory of God,' saith the scriptures. I know he will subscribe to that doctrine; and I ask him, if we discard morals when we elect the powers that be, and which, through us, are ordained of God? He admonishes us to take things as they are; and how are they? Why, sir, every abolitionist who is a voter, is a very honest, conscientious man during three hundred and sixty-two days of the year, but, during three certain days in the month of November, he says, 'Pardon thy servant in this thing, if I bow myself in the house of Rimmon.' (Loud laughter.)

"Our friend, Dr. Gibbons, stated, as the difficulty of his case, that it was not possible to find a man, in Delaware, who could be run as an abolition candidate. Sir, I think I can find one; I think there is one sitting at that table (pointing at Dr. Gibbons.)—[a laugh.] Let him do as I would do were I in a State where I was the only honest man. I would vote for myself, and I think I ought to be elected.—[Loud laughter and applause.] But the truth is, Mr. President, that we have made ourselves such serfs of party, that party leaders think they own us; and more than this, we talk and act as if they had a sort of claim to us. They hold it as a thing conceded, that there ought to be but two parties, and that we should belong to

one or the other of them, and that we must vote for whomsoever they shall choose to set up. But I, for one, contest their right to set up a candidate for me. True, I will use my common sense and vote for the man most likely to be elected, if I approve his principles, (and, of course, I should select a nominee of one of the parties, if he were a fit man,) but I am not bound to vote for him because he is 'set up.' Set up? In this free country every man is up; and that man is the tallest, according to my measurement, who reaches highest up on the scale of moral principle. Sir, it is time that we twisted this party collar off from our necks: that we shook off these shackles from our heels.

"A single remark before I sit down, as to the duty of voting at all. In my judgment, this convention should proclaim it to every abolitionist in the land, that it is his duty to vote. There is no motive so powerful in its influence over human conscience, as the motive of moral obligation. Don't think to stop a man from doing evil by telling him it is inconsistent with his professions. It is not God's plan. I will tell him it is wrong; I will draw him by the irresistible cord of duty, and not drive him by the hiss of inconsistency. I am for the stern proclamation of truth in this case. And, sir, don't expect to deter me in my course, by the craven cry, that I am trampling on conscience. The abolition conflict, from the beginning till now, has been an assault on conscience. If the man who refuses to go to the polls has a good conscience, nothing that I can say—nothing that this convention can say, will injure him. A good conscience is a shield that smiles at arrows. If the man, after due reflection, firmly believes himself to be right, no paper pellets that can be thrown from this platform will daunt or wound him. The difficulty to be surmounted is not merely to persuade men to vote right when at the polls, but to get up to the polls the thousands upon thousands who never vote at all; and then to induce both classes to vote for the slave. To accomplish this, the argument of inconsistency, as used by a class of abolitionists, and which they would fain have this convention employ, is but a rope of sand. It is defective in principle, and falls to pieces at the touch. If we would draw reluctant men into this field of action, we must use the iron-linked chain of moral obligation—right—duty."

ART. VII.—*The Circus—its Origin, Advantages, and Patronage.*

THERE is a romantic sort of charm thrown around a circular tent, where music and shouts alternately are heard, from mirth and revelry within. A moving caravan—a showy menagerie, accompanied by a band of amateurs, playing on Kent bugles, trumpets, French horns, Pompeian trombones, fifes, clarionets, and drums, is enough to set a country town all astare and agape, and all listen, *arrectis auribus*, to sounds unused, and quite enchanting. Ti yaro! as the Indian would say, who comes here? Oh! it is only a wandering company of gentlemen of leisure, who have escaped from the din and heat of city life, to breathe country air, and, for want of patron-

age there, have pushed off to try their fortune among rustic neighbours, who can seldom enjoy the rare treat of an equestrian display, much as they love it; and who, after harvest times, are as idle as their piping, vaulting visiters could wish, and quite delighted to see the curiosity.

A circus and a menagerie! both to be seen for half of a dollar, and who cannot afford half of a dollar for such an entertainment, whether all his debts be paid, or his clothes whole, or his family in bread, or not. And that only once in a year, or, perhaps, a lifetime. A large giraffe, fifteen feet high, an ibex and a gazelle, sensible animals; a number of tame quadrupeds, on whose well-trained backs grand feats are to be shown; several bipeds, 'ycleped men, (how deservedly I pause not to inquire, since they *show not themselves men*, but of the simia species;) and one soi disant *lady*:—(too true, Mr. Editor, too true! I have it from several reputable witnesses:)—and several *little boys*—dear young children—*trained up* to caper among colts, and make fine citizens in due time! *Are these* to be seen for *half a dollar* a piece. Admirable generosity, to furnish such a feast of soul to gentlemen and ladies, for a few dimes!

What can have been the origin of this delectable soul-stirring entertainment? I think I have found it by research among learned lore of the olden time. I can give you Augustine, and his learned expositor, Ludovicus Vives, for it. It appears that the circensian plays, “Romulus did institute at Rome, in the fourth month after he had built the city (as Fabius Pictor recordeth) the same day that he forced away the Sabine Virgins. Circenses they were called, (saith Servius) because they were compassed with swords; of circa and enses; for the (not as yet nice) antiquitie having not as yet built any places fit for such exercises, practised them between a river side, and a rank of swords, that the idle might see danger on both sides.” “Afterwards Tarquinius Priscus appointed a ring for them, which was afterwards called Circus maximus; and every year, as Livie saith, were those games celebrated, being diversely named, as Magni et Romani, et Circenses. They were consecrated to the god Consus, whom the Greeks call Hipposeidon, that is, Neptune, the horse rider, to whom Evander (as Dionysius saith) erected a temple in Latium, and ordained a feast-day for him, which the Greeks called Hippocratia, and the Latins, Consualia, on which day all the horses and mules were exempted from labour, and were decked with garlands.” He further states, that, “when, as Romulus could not obtain women of the neighbouring nations for his citizens to marry with, by the advice of his grandfather, Numitor, and the Senate, he gave out that he would celebrate some games in honour of Neptune. So ‘the women, their neighbours, coming to see the sports, the Romans took them all away by force (especially the Sabines) out of the midst of the exercises. For, so had Romulus and his companions resolved, the fourth month after the building of Rome.” So much for the *origin* of this *rational entertainment*. From such a beginning we might augur nothing ordinary, in the way of purity of manners and strict virtue, in a community where it receives much countenance. It still, we believe, sustains the exemplary morals of its founders. As to the *advantages of the circus*, we have not much to say. But doubtless there must be many of them, or so expen-

sive and really laborious an institution could not live in a *free, enlightened, and Christian* land. Never having heard others, however, describe any they have discovered or experienced, I am left entirely to my own judgment, and this directed somewhat by the popular feeling, for I cannot speak from experience. But there are these advantages, all will perceive.

1. A good number of beautiful horses are kept well fed and curried; and the horse is certainly a noble animal, and ought to be taken care of. It would be a sin not to be willing they should have all they get, poor beasts! for they perform their part well.

2. Tavern-keepers are able to make some money by the circus; and our worthy inns must be sustained—all trades must live.

3. The wild animals, too, are fed, and have good attendance, such as few of them have any right to expect, seeing they are such enemies to man.

4. The worthy performers chiefly are advantaged. They make their four hundred dollars or so, a day, clear of the expense of feeding their stock, and thus they keep themselves in good condition, from head to heels. *Heels*, we say, emphatically, for full as much depends on their heels as heads, in performance; for those are often where these should be, and without his heels, a performer would be almost as well off as if he had no head.

5. Moreover, the people, for whose pleasure the treat is served up, have a most happy opportunity of getting rid of all their useless money, and of showing their generosity. What care they for five hundred dollars so well spent! They would give twice the sum, rather than miss the sight.

6. The next advantage is the fine sentiment which is promoted by the display—a taste for the arts—for horsemanship—for company—for dress—all these are greatly promoted.

7. Then it is so useful in promoting family order, as parents and children all go, and the father and mother can overlook the behaviour of the young folks, and keep them steady.

We forbear to speak of the advantages in a purely moral and religious point of view, especially if any of old Romulus' sons should happen to be among our modern Circensians, and play the old Sabine game again. They will forgive us the insinuation, we hope, but we do not assert any thing—no! not we! Well, a truce to this. Next, we may consider the patronage given to the circus. And this is a very ample field. We have never observed any thing more general, at any time. All classes, either sex, all ages were there, except a few modish people, always unfriendly to the people's happiness. I could expose them, but my charity forbids. Yes, all classes, I might add, all colours—that is, all we have here, for we do not pretend to have either Patagonians or Circassians, but we have the Caucasian, and African, and all were at the circus. This is real republican fashion—all on equality—none above, none below the rest. How amiable a sight—all on a footing, for the time being! Each with his half of a dollar, or two or three of halves, if more than one is admitted. Now this is something like! It is doing the thing in good earnest! How moving a spectacle! The town is all alive! The streets are strewn with people. The belles and beaux, the haut ton, and the plebeian—the mistress and maiden, all in one

grand procession, their faces all to the same point; in they go—there they see—are seen—laugh, applaud, witness men and boys, and a poor lonely female from among the rest, all striving and toiling to entertain them. Up they go, down they go, over and over they go, again and again and again and again, till they have given jerks and twists enough of their poor limbs to pay their spectators for the fifty cents a piece, and then, ladies and gentlemen, you may go home.

And now, it is all over in one place—and we must leave the agreeable assemblage to take their course to some other borough to give them a share of so rich a treat. Now is not this worthy of an American republic—a patronage such as must surely encourage and sustain the splendid institution. Indeed, so great are the expenses of the institution, that I doubt not the musicians hardly get more than a member of Congress per diem, and each ostler and mountebank not less. And if the institution should go down, do you think, Mr. Editor, what the consequences must be? But it is a happy circumstance, from all I can hear, it is not likely to go down; for it seems to me both church and people are resolved to support it, for many attendants on it are seen at church—though far more, I must confess, never are, or very seldom.—*Presbyterian*.

J. M.

• ART. VIII.—*Early Religious Instruction.*

THE importance of training the rising generation in the nurture and admonition of the Lord is now generally acknowledged throughout the religious community. It is matter of regret, however, that comparatively few seem to be aware that such instruction may be communicated at an early period; and the opportunity of conveying serious impressions to the youthful mind is frequently suffered to escape, until children are sent to school, and then religious subjects, even when they are not altogether neglected, occupy but a subordinate place in a course of education. It is the opinion, we think, of the excellent commentator, Thomas Scott, that children so young as *four years* of age, may be led to understand the great truths of the gospel, and be brought to feel, in some measure, their importance. To accomplish this desirable object, however, there is need that parents and others employed in training the young, should cherish a deep and habitual sense of the greatness and value of their task, and that they should, in a pains-taking, affectionate, and prayerful manner, betake themselves to it.

From a recent number of the *Archives du Christianisme*, a religious journal, published in connexion with the Reformed Church in France, we select a number of useful remarks on this subject. The plan pursued by the writer may be found worthy of imitation by Christian parents and teachers in these countries: we give it, in the earnest desire that Christian parents may be generally awakened to a sense of their duty, to make their little ones, from childhood, acquainted with the Scriptures, which are able to “make them wise unto salvation:”—

“Christian parents have need to be told that they should instruct their children, even when they are in childhood, in the word of God. They should remember what is written,—Prov. xxii. 6, and they should earnestly desire to obtain the commendation with which the Lord honoured his servant Abraham, Genesis xviii. 18. Many, however, appear to be uncertain of the means which they ought to employ to perform faithfully a task so sacred and so difficult. To assist them in this matter, I shall speak of a course of daily instruction, which follows the same order as the Bible, and which constitutes a truly religious service that parents may celebrate with their children, before they have attained the age in which religious instruction usually commences.

“I had two children, the one three years, and the other some months less than two years of age, when I began to institute a special religious service for them. Every morning I took them on my knees, and related to them the histories of the Bible in regular order, beginning with those of the Old Testament; on the Sabbath, I chose my subjects from the New Testament. I did not take the Bible in my hand, but I read it before-hand, and I found, most frequently, that I had only to imitate its language, to bring my narrative within the reach of my little hearers. I added a remark or two, by way of application, suggested by the narrative. Then I selected a very short and simple passage of scripture, corresponding to the subject I had been explaining, and I taught them to repeat it. A very short prayer closed the exercise. The service, in all its parts, extended, at farthest, to quarter of an hour in length. My servants attended, and took an interest in it. A respectable minister, who paid me a visit two or three months after I had commenced this short service with my children, advised me to omit giving passages of scripture to be repeated, as he was afraid that this task would render the whole exercise irksome to my little pupils. I followed his advice; but my children soon began to complain that I was giving them no passages to repeat, and, accordingly, I returned with pleasure to my first plan. My earliest attempts to convey religious instruction, at an age so peculiarly tender, were, as may easily be conceived, by no means encouraging. The children understood my explanations very imperfectly, but their progress was more rapid than I, myself, expected. In a few months, the eldest was quite capable of profiting by the service, and the younger followed soon after. On this plan I went over a complete course of Bible history, confining myself to the historical narratives, as the most interesting and the most useful to the young. I omitted a great part of Exodus, almost the whole of Leviticus. I traced the history in the books of Kings, adding some narratives from the books of Chronicles, by way of supplement. From the book of Job I took five or six lessons. I passed over the Psalms and the writings of Solomon, and selected from the prophets, especially from Jeremiah, such pieces as were strictly historical. When I reached the New Testament, I traced the history of Christ as given by Luke, and the history of the Apostles as contained in the Acts. Here my first course terminated. Every day I pointed out upon a chart, 1st. The portion of scripture from which I had drawn my narrative. 2d. The title of the narrative. 3d. The passage of scrip-

ture to be repeated. As an example, I may select the lesson drawn from the second chapter of Genesis, which I thus described: 'Gen. ii. 1—3,—The Day of Rest,—Exodus xx. 8.' This course lasted three years, with occasional interruptions; and besides, whenever there happened any event more than usually interesting, I made it the subject of my narrative, instead of continuing the Bible history. In this way I varied my instructions, at the same time teaching my children to profit by passing events. Opportunities of this kind, of course, frequently occurred; the anniversaries of the birth of the children, their faults, and sometimes their good actions, diseases, deaths, accidents, &c., furnished appropriate subjects of instruction.'

"Afterwards, when the children were more advanced, a method of instruction was taken which combined the reading of select portions of the scriptures with reciting passages. I prepared myself by reading the portion of the Bible whence I proposed to draw instruction: that preparation is indispensable. At the religious service, I caused each child to bring his Bible, which I had given him as soon as he was able to read. Sometimes I recited, sometimes I made the children read, each reading a verse in his turn. On the historical parts, I presented some reflections, and above all, questions which had for their object to illustrate the precepts of the Bible, and to make the application. I dwelt upon the passages of scripture which the children themselves had searched out: the first who had found the passage read it. I caused them to commit to memory longer passages than those which they had learned during the first course. In fine, besides the verse to be committed, I gave the children, as an exercise, themselves to search out passages in the Bible. Example:—find a passage on prayer; or, as less easy, find a passage on such a subject, in such an epistle, or in such a chapter; or again, quote a feature of the life of Moses or of Jeremiah—or other similar questions. These researches in the scriptures were useful to the children; and the results of them were the more edifying and interesting to the whole family, that from the mouths of little children they learned the great truths of faith. Every day I noted down, 1st. The plan of scripture which furnished my subject. 2. The title which I gave to the instruction communicated. 3. A summary of the instruction and of the principal passages which I had quoted. 4. The passage to learn by heart. 5. The subject which the children were to search out. I can say, that although all has been done very imperfectly, and with an infirmity for which I have cause to humble myself deeply before God, I have constantly seen the children interested, and receiving pleasure in the exercise, whether in the first or second course of instruction."

ART. IX.—*The King of Prussia, the Archbishop of Cologne and the Pope.*

IN a former number we referred briefly to the subject in dispute between the King of Prussia and the Pope, and his faithful allies. From the April number of the *Scottish Christian Herald*, an excellent religious periodical, we extract the following full

account of the origin and progress of this affair, that our readers may be clearly acquainted with it.—*Editors of Belfast Covenanter.*

THE quarrel originated in the question of mixed marriages, or marriages between Protestants and Roman Catholics. For a long time such unions were discountenanced as much as possible; but, failing in this, it was endeavoured to introduce a conditional pledge that the issue of such a marriage should be educated in the religion of the clergyman who performed it. The Protestant clergy, however, in compliance generally with the civil laws of most of the states, very early abandoned the attempt to impose pledges of this nature, and their example was followed by many of the Roman Catholic clergy, while others refused to give the nuptial benediction where the required pledge was declined. The unconditional celebration of the marriage rite has prevailed for a very long period in the old provinces on the Rhine, comprising three-fourths of the Roman Catholic population of Prussia. Not so, however, in the territories constituting the ancient bishoprics of Cologne, Treves, Paderburn, and Munster; the two former of which were united to Prussia in 1815, and the two latter in 1803. In these western provinces, the general practice was a calling upon both parties to sign a written agreement to educate their children in the Roman Catholic religion, and when this pledge was not given, the nuptial benediction was withheld.

Both by the ancient laws of the kingdom, and even by the modified law of 1803, all ante-nuptial compacts, such as we have referred to, were declared illegal and strictly forbidden; and to the four western dioceses, which have since that period been united to Prussia, the same prohibition of all compacts, demanded by the priests before the solemnization of marriage, was extended, in 1825, at the earnest entreaty of both Protestants and Roman Catholics. On the passing of this last enactment, the bishops of the four western dioceses expressed to his majesty their doubts whether they were empowered to call upon their clergy to solemnize, thus indiscriminately and unconditionally, all mixed marriages, without express authority from the See of Rome. The king immediately commanded them to lay their doubts before the Pope, and ask for the requisite powers; and he promised the aid of his minister at the Court of Rome to support their application. The matter was laid before the pope in the spring of 1828, and his holiness, Leo XII., promised, at least, so to modify the discipline of the Roman Catholic Church in the four dioceses as to bring it into harmony with the requisitions of the civil laws. Mean while the reigning Pope died, and the negotiations were resumed under the successor, Pius VIII. They resulted, in 1830, in the offer to the Prussian minister at Rome of two documents, purporting to contain the concessions of the Court of Rome on this subject. These documents, no doubt, dispensed with a *written* promise, as necessary in the case of a mixed marriage, but, beside speaking slightly of the Protestant creed, they enforced the rigorous examination of the Roman Catholic bride, and the exaction of all sorts of *moral* guarantees as to the education of her children.

The Prussian minister, perceiving the hollow nature of the briefs, received them only conditionally, declaring that "he must abstain

from offering, beforehand, any opinion upon the definitive resolution of his sovereign as to their acceptance." When the documents reached Berlin, the King of Prussia, without the slightest hesitation, declared them inconsistent with the promise originally given by Leo, and unsatisfactory in themselves, and returned them forthwith to the Court of Rome. The remainder of the year 1830, and the following years, 1831 and 1833, were spent in fruitless attempts, on the part of the Prussian minister, to procure the desired modification of these briefs.

In the spring of 1834 the ambassador had an audience of leave of the Pope, before setting out for Berlin on his own private affairs. At this audience the Pope requested him to take back the briefs to Berlin, and explain to the king the insuperable difficulties felt by the See of Rome in conceding the modifications required. The Prussian minister stated that he had no authority to accept them, but that he would carry them to Berlin along with the papal message: promising, at the same time, to bring them back to Rome, should the king refuse to receive them. Accordingly, the briefs were again laid before the Cabinet of Berlin; and the ministers, anxious to bring matters to a settlement, decided to forego their objections, and to recommend them to the king's acceptance, provided the bishops, to whom they were addressed, were of opinion that they could be executed without violating the fundamental laws of the monarchy. To ascertain this point they summoned to Berlin the then Archbishop of Cologne, Count Spiegel von Desenberg, and requested his opinion. The reply of this prelate was decidedly favourable, and accordingly an arrangement was drawn up and signed by him and the Prussian resident-minister at Rome, who was then at Berlin, and was appointed by his majesty his commissioner for that purpose. To this "Convention," as it is called, the three other bishops of the Western Provinces gave in their adherence.

Thus matters were apparently brought to an amicable conclusion, not, however, without an evident surrender of principle on the part of the civil authorities. They were desirous of putting an end to such an unseemly collision, and therefore they yielded rather than protract the controversy. The Protestants felt deeply the inconveniences to which they were subjected by the terms of the "Convention," but, from its being sanctioned by the government of the country, they submitted.

In July, 1835, Count Spiegel died, and it became necessary to choose a successor to him in the Archbishopric of Cologne. In a luckless hour the government fixed upon a man of the most violent and intemperate passions, the Baron Clemens-August Droste von Vischering. This person, though by no means a favourite with the civil authorities, was very popular among the Westphalian Roman Catholics; and it was thought that his appointment to the See of Cologne would gratify many parties. It was natural, however, that before the appointment of Baron Droste, the government should be anxious to ascertain his views in regard to the long contested question of mixed marriages. His opinions were given in the following explicit terms: "As to mixed marriages, I have long heartily wished that means might be found to settle this extremely difficult matter. I learned with joy the fulfilment of my wish; and you will have the

goodness to assure the ministers that I will take good care to maintain the Convention made on this subject, conformable to the Brief of Pope Pius VIII., and carried into practice in the four diocesses mentioned; and that I will cautiously abstain from attacking or subverting it, even if it were possible to do so; and that I will apply the same, in the spirit of love, to the purposes of peace." No statement could be, to all appearance, more clear and candid, and the Baron was forthwith elected to the See of Cologne.

It will be interesting to trace the doings of this crafty Jesuitical prelate. No sooner did he receive his appointment than he set himself to the display of his power. His efforts were, in the first instance, directed to the entire subversion of the Convictorium, in the University of Bonn—a charitable institution designed for the support and education of some of the poorer class of Roman Catholic students. This religious foundation, within the walls of the university, had reared up many able and eminent men; but, by the fiat of the new Archbishop of Cologne, it was suppressed.

The next act of Baron Droste was equally summary and high-handed with that to which we have just adverted. The writings of the celebrated Professor Hermes, a Roman Catholic Professor of Theology at Bonn, had been, without apparent reason, condemned by a papal brief, dated 26th September, 1835. By the laws of Prussia, no bull or decree of the pope is of any force without the royal *placet* being affixed to it. In direct defiance of this law and of his oath of office, the Archbishop, in a circular to the professors of Bonn, dated 12th January, 1837, called on them forthwith to act on the papal brief, for the suppression of the doctrines of Hermes, as if it had already received the royal *placet*.

The haughty prelate now proceeded to harass and annoy the professors themselves, and declined to sanction their lectures, thus interrupting the affairs of the university, and with no other view, apparently, than to stretch his ecclesiastical power to the uttermost.

But, passing from these and other matters, we proceed to a consideration of the crafty Baron's conduct in reference to the contested question of mixed marriages. His clergy had been acting, in many parts, in opposition to the convention. Complaints, as of old, arose, and, on inquiry, it was discovered that they had been so acting by the express command of their archbishop. This may appear strange after the explicit consent which he gave to the terms of the convention, before he received his appointment to the See of Cologne. But how does this Jesuit defend himself from so flagrant an inconsistency and breach of faith? He has the effrontery to affirm, that when he gave the promise in question he had never read, or even knew of the provisions of the convention; and he ventures to hint that, in cases where he should think the convention inconsistent with the papal brief, he should feel himself at liberty to elude it. For some time the archbishop persisted in setting at nought the agreement, on the faith of which he had been promoted. The government appealed to the Court of Rome for its interference. The pope declined to take any steps in the matter, although it was shrewdly suspected that the prelate was acting under secret instructions from the Court of Rome.

The King of Prussia was anxious to proceed with the utmost le-

niency in dealing with the refractory archbishop. Count Stolberg, one of his most intimate friends, and the Prussian minister at the Court of Rome, were deputed by his majesty to confer with the baron, both in reference to mixed marriages and his conduct towards the University of Bonn. This conference was utterly fruitless. The deputies reported to the king that they had failed in inducing the cunning ecclesiastic to obey the laws.

Still the government were unwilling to proceed to extremities. A month elapsed before any farther steps were taken. At length, on the 24th of October, 1837, a dignified letter was addressed to him by Baron von Altenstein, pointing out the illegality of his conduct, and calling upon him either to fulfil the promise on the faith of which he had received his appointment, or to resign his See. He replied in the most evasive style, and refused either to fulfil his promise or to resign. Feeling that his case was now desperate, he attempted, by inflammatory harangues, to rouse the Roman Catholic clergy of the district, and to enlist in his favour their sympathies and their influence. He dismissed the professors of the Theological Seminary, and, without waiting for the royal sanction, appointed his secretary, Michaelis, to a professorship, and removed the classes from this national institution to his own palace. Matters were now assuming a threatening aspect. Both clergy and people were in a state of the most violent excitement; and in these circumstances the government felt that they could no longer exercise forbearance. They determined to remove the archbishop from his diocess. Accordingly, on the 15th of November, the order was issued from Berlin, and executed at Cologne on the evening of the 23d. The officers who were despatched to execute the order begged the archbishop to render unnecessary the recourse to violent measures, offering him permission to retire, voluntarily, to his native city of Munster, and to remain there until the decision of the pope would be obtained. All was in vain. The archbishop would yield only to force; and on being informed that they were authorized to use force, should he render it necessary, he got into his own carriage, and was driven, under an escort, to Mindon, where private apartments were taken for him in the house of a merchant.

The news, of course, soon reached Rome; and his holiness, greatly enraged at the firmness and dignified promptitude which had marked the proceedings of the Prussian government, issued a fierce manifesto, declaring the secular power to have persecuted the Roman Catholic Church, and to have broken faith with the Papal See. Our readers may perceive from the simple historical details we have given, how far such charges were founded in fact. This strange document was put into the hands of the Prussian minister, on his return to the papal states for the purpose of laying the whole conduct of the archbishop before the pope. In vain did the minister complain of the violent and unfounded charges contained in the manifesto; in vain did he offer to prove that the archbishop had acted illegally; his holiness would hear nothing until the archbishop was restored to his diocess. To this extravagant and foolish demand, of course, the minister knew that the Court of Prussia could not accede, and he therefore requested leave to quit Rome, as nothing farther could be done in the matter. His place has been sup-

plied, in the mean time, by a *Chargé d'Affairs*, until the pope shall show some disposition to yield.

From letters which have been lately seized by the police, and which Michaelis, the archbishop's secretary, acknowledges to be his, it is evident that the conduct of Baron Droste had been of the most Jesuitical kind. He has been labouring, it appears, since his elevation to the See of Cologne, to introduce Jesuits into the country, contrary to the laws of Prussia, and to restore practices of the most superstitious kind, which had fallen into desuetude. The king has, therefore, felt himself fully justified in all the proceedings which he has instituted against the refractory Bishop of Cologne; and not only so, but so little afraid of the thunders of the Vatican, that he has visited another Roman Catholic prelate, who has also dared to act in a similar way in regard to mixed marriages, with the same treatment.

ART. X.—*Obituary of Rev. Andrew Gray.*

WE seldom meet with an obituary notice containing so much of the realities of human life as the following, which is copied from the *Livingston Republican*, a political paper published in the western part of the state of New York. This brief, unadorned narrative conveys a more thrilling interest to the contemplative mind, weaned from the vanity of pompous titles and the stupid admiration of this world's pageantry, than the gorgeous biography of kings and captains of armies. It furnishes a practical illustration of the following truths:

1. That resolution and persevering industry can overcome obstacles which, to a weak and irresolute mind, appear insurmountable.
2. That the most ordinary lot of God's people, in this world, is one of trial and hard service. "I have called thee in the furnace of affliction."
3. That in all the straits of his people, God extends over them a special, and, not unfrequently, a remarkable providence.

"We regret to record the death of another of those brave men to whom, under God, this country is indebted for her unequalled freedom. The Rev. ANDREW GRAY, of Sparta, died at his house there, on Tuesday, the 13th ultimo, much and justly lamented. He was seized with a paralytic stroke about a week preceding, and continued, nearly the whole time that elapsed before death closed his earthly career, unconscious of suffering. The few lucid moments he enjoyed after being seized, were spent in leaving his dying testimony to the truth and excellence of that holy religion he was long successful in advancing.

"Mr. Gray was born on the 1st of January, 1757, in the county of Down, Ireland; and emigrated to this country, in company with his brother and family, previous to the revolutionary war. At the age of seventeen, he joined in that momentous struggle which awakened the latent energies of the nation, and issued in the establishment of an imperishable basis of our precious and well earned independence. Being a man of uncommon strength and great energy of mind, his services were highly prized in the several engagements where he fought. At the battle of Long Island, he was unfortunately taken prisoner by the Hessians, who, with great barbarity, set him up for a target, to improve their skill in shooting. Three several times he escaped the deadly aim, by falling flat on the ground at the moment the discharge took place. Thinking escape impossible, he remained in this position till the soldier who fired came up and rolled him over to see if he still breathed. Knowing that the bayonet would finish what the musket had left undone, Mr. Gray then sprung to his feet, when at that instant another soldier interfered and claimed him as his prisoner. He seized him by the back of the neck, but the former soldier drew a sabre and aimed a fatal blow at the youthful captive. A merciful providence again interposed for his deliverance. He eluded the stroke, but the soldier who held him had his arm cut off by the wrist. An altercation ensued, and death appeared inevitable; but just then

an officer appeared, and rescued him from danger. He ordered a file of men to escort him within the British lines, who, though they dared not destroy him, gratified their brutal spirit by repeatedly knocking him down with the butt end of their guns. In this manner he was driven before them to the British camp, about half a mile distant, covered with bruises, and more dead than alive. Though he has encountered many perils since that time, and travelled many thousand miles, he has often been heard to say, that this appeared the longest and most dreadful march he ever performed.

“From Long Island, the prisoners were removed to the city of New York, where, with five or six hundred others, he was crowded into a small place of worship, in which there was not even room enough for them to lie down. For two days they remained without food, except a few baskets full of green apples, thrown in among them by the soldiery, to make sport. The camp distemper broke out in consequence, and the scene which ensued baffles all description. From this loathsome place he was put on board of a Jersey prison ship; and for a period of six weeks he passed through a series of privations and cruelties which must for ever redound disgrace to the memory of his captors. Their food and drink were of the most abominable quality, till hundreds perished under the fiery ordeal, and the living could not forbear to envy the condition of those whom death relieved from suffering. These measures were resorted to with a view to make them enlist in the British ranks, and in some instances the dread of hunger and death impelled these poor men to do it. The wretched survivors were taken on shore, a line was drawn, provisions in abundance were exhibited, the drums beat for volunteers, and there was no alternative offered but “enlist or starve.” Human nature could scarcely withstand such a temptation. Mr. Gray being removed on ship board, and having gained a little strength, he watched his opportunity and made his escape.

“Being an expert swimmer, he dropped silently over the vessel’s side, eluded the sentinel’s vigilance, was preserved amid the foaming billows, and, fainting with fatigue and want, he safely reached the shore. The British camp lay between him and his friends, and the country around swarmed with the adherents of the enemy. For a considerable time he lay concealed; when, during the silence of the following night, he contrived to pass the guards, and travelled for nearly sixty miles, exposed to fearful hardships, till he at length arrived at the American lines. These miseries of war did not deter him from again taking up the sword in the cause of freedom. He fought courageously in some of the most bloody engagements that occurred during the war, more especially in those of Monmouth and Brandywine. The time now approached, however, that his strength and talents were demanded in another field. He who had faithfully fought the battles of his adopted country, was henceforth destined to be a valiant soldier of the cross. Having come under conviction of sin, and found relief for an awakened conscience in the redemption of a Saviour’s blood, he longed to proclaim to others the way of salvation. But many obstacles had to be overcome before this could be accomplished. He was a stranger in a strange land—destitute of means to acquire a suitable education for the sacred office—and without one friend to counsel him in his difficulties. Having obtained an honourable discharge when his country could spare his services, he hired himself out, among the Low Dutch, by the day, month, and year, that he might obtain a little money for the accomplishment of his fervent wishes. It was thus he acquired a knowledge of Dutch, in which language he often afterwards proclaimed the “unsearchable riches of Christ.” He now commenced the study of Latin, but his memory, naturally good, had become so imperfect by the hardships he had undergone, that the difficulties he encountered in the study of the dead languages, appeared almost insuperable. But with admirable perseverance he persisted in his design, and gradually he found his memory improve and all his difficulties vanish. By the time he had acquired a knowledge of Latin, his resources failed, and having obtained the situation of usher in a school of eminence, he taught the Latin in the day time and studied Greek at night.

In consequence of his excessive application to study, his health began to sink; and being seized with a distressing vertigo, he was compelled for a time to relax his exertions. Still he was able to keep up with the Greek class, notwithstanding all his disadvantages, and having now become acquainted with the language in which Homer wrote, he commenced to study Hebrew in the same manner. His zeal, ability, and devoted piety, attracted the notice of his preceptor, Dr. Peter Wilson, a warm-hearted Scotchman, afterwards Professor of Languages in Columbia College, New York, in whom the deserving student never failed to find a true friend and powerful patron. Having finished his divinity studies, he was licensed to preach, his inaugural sermon being delivered in Low Dutch, in which language he had studied. When it was announced that the young Irishman was to officiate as a minister for the first time in Dutch, curiosity drew great numbers to hear him, and he who had not quailed where the bullet and the bayonet dealt destruction around on the gory battle field, trembled to face a friendly audience. After a very little experience, however, he

completely mastered this uncomfortable feeling; and few men have displayed greater composure, readiness of utterance, or strength of mind, while officiating in public. His services were put in immediate requisition, and, during the years 1792 and '93, he was engaged to preach for twelve months at Poughkeepsie, in the forenoon in Dutch, and in the afternoon in English. Having become acquainted with Miss Mary Stuart, of Wilkesbarre, Pa., he was married to that lady in 1792, by whom he had a numerous family, most of whom, with his affectionate partner, survive to lament his loss. The next two years he continued to labour in the ministry, where his wife had resided; till, in 1795, he removed to Allegheny county, N. Y., in company with his brave early companion in arms, the celebrated Major Van Campen, and Mr. M'Henry. They purchased about three miles square of valuable land, and gave their joint bond for the amount; but their titles having failed, through some deception, they lost a handsome property. Mr. Gray lived about twelve years in Allegheny county, and for the most of that period watched over the spiritual interests of three congregations, at considerable distance apart, viz. at Dansville, Almond, and Angelica. Few constitutions could have sustained such excessive fatigue as he underwent; but nature had greatly favoured him in this respect, and the promise was fulfilled in his experience, "as the day is, so shall thy strength be." He had often to contend with the fury of the elements, to brave the wild animals of the forest, and even to withstand the attacks of men nearly as savage. The God he served supported him amidst these dangers, and enabled him to say, "hitherto hath the Lord helped me." About the year 1807 he removed to Livingston county, and took charge of the two congregations of Sparta and Groveland. Not long after he was sent on a mission to the Tuscarora Indians, by the New York Missionary Society, and the Lord appearing to bless his labours, he continued among them several years. His ministrations are said to have been highly prized by the dark sons of the forest, and to have been much blessed in the conversion of many of their number. Between twenty and thirty church members were admitted by him to Christian privileges; and those who were benefited by his preaching and example, are spoken of as being highly exemplary in their behaviour. The horrors of war, however, again scourged the country, and he and his little flock were greatly harassed thereby. On the morning of December 18th, 1814, the cry was raised, "Lewistown is in flames," and every one who could, sought safety in flight. It was the Sabbath morning, the day of sacred rest; but no rest did they enjoy. The table was prepared for breakfast, and the tea poured out, when the alarm was given: and in the depth of winter, their perilous march commenced. His household property and library were, of course, destroyed, and he obtained no remuneration for his losses. He returned again to Sparta, and, as long as his strength permitted, he continued to officiate in the work of the Lord. His great age and increasing infirmities rendered him unable to preach for several years preceding his death, and these reasons, together with some unhappy occurrences which it is unnecessary to particularize, induced him altogether to desist from official duty. Toward the close of his life, his mental, as well as his bodily powers, were considerably enfeebled; but though his mind exhibited evidences of decay when speaking of human affairs, it was pleasing to observe how his dim eye kindled, his trembling lips glowed with eloquence, and his soul resumed all its wonted energy, when the Redeemer's love to a perishing world was the theme of discourse. He departed this life without a struggle, in the midst of his afflicted family, who yet "sorrowed not as those who have no hope." A very large and respectable company followed his remains to the tomb, the procession being headed by two of our venerable revolutionary warriors, Captain Prime and Major Van Campen. His funeral sermon was appropriately preached in the meeting house, where he had often fed multitudes with the bread of life, from these words of Isaiah, lvii. 1, "The righteous perisheth," &c. At the time of his death he was in his 82d year, and had been, for nearly 50 years, a minister of Jesus Christ. "And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, write, Blessed are the dead, who die in the Lord, from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours, and their works do follow them."

ART. XI.—*Conflict between the Government and Church of Scotland.*

It appears from subsequent accounts that the Church of Scotland has taken a more decided stand against Erastian encroachment on her independency than we had anticipated. One account speaks as follows:—

"Dr. Cooke is the leader of the subservient, or state, party in the church. He and the Earl of Dalhousie expressed their intention not to act on a committee to be ap-

pointed in the case. The Earl said that he was conscientiously attached to the Church of Scotland, and hoped to die a member of it, but he should not consent again to sit in the judicatories of any church which, gloss it as you may, has resolved, doggedly, but virtually, to set at defiance the law of the land. 'The knell,' said he, 'is now rung of the establishment of the Church of Scotland.'

If the haughty Earl's declaration be true, that "the *knell* is now rung of the establishment of the Church of Scotland," he will, probably, be soon called upon to sing the *requiem* of the Episcopal Establishment in Britain and the Popish in Canada. The most recent account, taken from the *Belfast Covenanter*, is given below:—

"The Assembly decided in favour of the latter motion by a majority of 49—the numbers being 204 for Dr. Chalmers's motion, and 155 for Dr. Cooke's. While we cordially rejoice in the Church of Scotland endeavouring to free herself from evils of overwhelming magnitude, which have hitherto marred her purity, prevented her efficiency, and obliged many who love her standards to continue in a state of dissent from her communion; and while we sincerely and fervently desire that the present difficulties with which she is surrounded may be overruled to facilitate her return to the state of covenanted purity, when she shone forth "clear as the sun, fair as the moon, and terrible as an army with banners," we cannot refrain from making an observation or two in reference to the measures which led to the present collision, and to the expressed views of some distinguished individuals who are contending for the independence of the church.

"1. The *Veto Act* of 1834, although an important barrier against forcible intrusion, is but a very imperfect approximation to the plain principle, equally of scripture and common sense, that those in full communion with the church, and who are accounted worthy to partake of all its ordinances, should have a voice in the election of a pastor. Instead of the communicants, it proposes only the "male heads of families,"—and instead of securing to the people the liberty of *choice*, it only gives validity to their *refusal*. This law is unsupported by any authority from the New Testament; it is repugnant to the obvious principle, that those who are to derive benefit from his instructions should be allowed the unfettered right to choose their teacher, and that just as the interests concerned are the more momentous, so much the more should this right be secured inviolate. The actual members of the church, beyond all question, are the proper persons to choose the minister; and neither the limiting of the electors to the male heads of families, granting them only a negative in the matter, nor setting aside the choice of a majority of the people, by bringing in the amount of stipend paid, as is done by the largest Presbyterian body in our own country, can be viewed in any other light than as an infringement on the sacred rights of a Christian people, and as a sacrifice at the shrine of worldly expediency. We have always regretted that such excellent men as Lord Moncrieff and Dr. Chalmers, who brought forward the *Veto Act* in the Assembly, and the majority who voted with them, should have taken so low ground, and should not at once have recognised the scriptural principle of the right of the people to choose their own pastors. We are well aware that such a recognition would have struck at the foundation of the evil—the existence of patronage; but why not loudly demand the repeal of the Act of 1712? It has been a thousand times proved to be inconsistent with the purity and prosperity of the Church of Scotland; and many of her noblest sons, both in former and later times, have lifted up a bold and uncompromising protest against Patronage. Is it not far more worthy of public Christian men at once boldly to denounce the evil, and seek its abandonment, than to adopt a course by which, in reality, the church sanctions it, and only aims to mitigate some of its evils? We feel assured God will teach his servants otherwise; and we earnestly desire that He may give them another spirit: and we cannot but regard the present difficulties that have arisen in carrying out the provisions of the *Veto Act* as loudly proclaiming that the safe course is not to trust in princes, but, adopting the clear rule of the Divine Word, to go forward in promoting the purity and extending the bounds of the church.

"2. We are grieved to hear such distinguished champions for the truth as Dr. Chalmers, declaring that even the last decision of the Assembly is not to be understood as opposed to patronage; that they are not to be regarded as anti-patronage men at all; and that their maxim is not the '*Christian rights of the people*,' but '*the Christian good of the people*.' The case of the new Church in Leith, which, chiefly through the influence of Dr. Chalmers, was decided by so large a majority as 112, and in which the Assembly, by a solemn act, actually created a new patronage in the family of a single individual, is a melancholy instance to show how far great and good men may be misled through the influence of an evil system with which they have long been connected. If Dr. Chalmers and those who act with him think that thus they will conciliate the patrons, and carry their measure with the govern-

ment, we fear they will find themselves sadly mistaken. If there is any thing in the present contest that will enlist the prayers and exertions of good men of various names in behalf of the Church of Scotland, it must be in her open and undisguised opposition to all Erastian authority and influence. And never, we believe, will it be found that the Christian good of a people will be effectually promoted, where their Christian rights are not fully maintained and perpetuated.

"3. Lastly, we rejoice most cordially in the expression of public sentiment on this great question, that has been given throughout various parts of Scotland, since the rising of the General Assembly, and in the firm and unbending attitude that has been assumed by some of the subordinate courts of the Church of Scotland. Some public meetings have been held, chiefly by the laity, in which the speakers have ably asserted the great doctrines of Messiah's Headship, the independence of the Church, and have proclaimed determined hostility to Erastianism; the most eloquent and warm-hearted tribute of respect was also paid to the memories of our Covenanted forefathers, and even the declaration was put forward, that to return to a sense of covenant-obligation would prove an effectual means of vindicating the church's independence and liberties against the encroachments of the state. These movements augur well for the advancement of truth; and whatever may be the result of the motion, we trust that the knell of patronage and Erastianism has been sounded in the Church of Scotland.

"By recent intelligence, we perceive that the case of *Lethendy*, which was similar to that of *Auchterarder*, has been decided by the Court of Session against the Presbytery of *Dunkeld*, and the General Assembly who instructed them; and that the Presbytery, according to the direction of the commission, appeared at the bar of the Court of Session, and were reprimanded, this judgment being pronounced by a small majority of the judges, instead of the sentence of imprisonment. In the case of *Marnoch*, which was also similar to that of *Auchterarder*, the Synod of *Moray* properly the parties at the bar of the Court of Session, the Presbytery of *Strathbogie* having resolved to submit to the Court.* In all these cases the Presbyteries are prohibited by the Assembly from taking any steps to induct the presentees, while it is admitted that, from the judgment of the House of Lords, they are legally entitled to the temporalities."

ART. X.—*Calumnies of the Romish Priests against the Bible.*

THE evangelical societies of Paris and Geneva continue to send colporteurs into various provinces of France, to distribute there the word of God. The efforts of these obscure and humble labourers, so despised in the eyes of the world, are abundantly blessed by the Spirit of God. They belong, generally, to the lower classes of the people, and have not received a liberal education; but they are taught from above the important truths of Christianity, and often do more good by their simple exposition of the gospel, than divines with all their learning and eloquence. They can say, as the apostle Paul: "My speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power; that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God."

Many facts, related in the letters of the colporteurs, show that the Bible meets with favour among papists. But this success irritates the priests, who are afraid of seeing the last remnants of their authority fall under the influence of the Bible. Some years ago, when Bible societies were less known in France, the priests acted apart, each as his own character and passions prompted him. Now, they form, from one end of the kingdom to the other, a sort of association, or conspiracy, to prevent the circulation of the Holy Scriptures. They have a common accusation agreed upon

* The cases of *Lethendy* and *Marnoch* furnish a higher stretch of the authority of the Court of Session than that of *Auchterarder*. When the presentees were rejected by the people of these parishes, the patrons acquiesced, and issued new presentations. The Court of Session, however, interferred, and came down with *peremptory interdicts*, granted at the request of the defeated presentees.

We intended to have noticed a number of pamphlets which have been published on this subject, and which were kindly sent us.

The speeches of Dr. Chalmers, Dr. Burns, Rev. Mr. Candlish, and Alexander E. Monteith, Esq., in the Assembly, have been published in pamphlets; they are very excellent, and deserve to be extensively circulated. We have also perused with much pleasure the speech of Rev. William Cunningham, delivered at a public meeting in Edinburgh, on the same subject. The fullest and most satisfactory publication, in relation to this important case, that we have seen, is a pamphlet entitled "The Present Conflict between the Civil and Ecclesiastical Courts Examined; with historical and statutory evidence for the jurisdiction of the Church of Scotland," by the Rev. Andrew Gray, A. M. This is an octavo pamphlet, published by Johnstone, Edinburgh; it abounds in valuable information, and forms a masterly defence of the church's independence and liberties.

among themselves, and which they all repeat nearly in the same terms. And what do you think is the accusation? They pretend that Protestants have falsified, mutilated the Bible, adding what does not belong to it, and taking away what does. "It is no more the Word of God," say they: "you sell false translations, in which you have introduced blasphemies, falsehoods, heresies!" Thus write bishops in their pastoral letters, and thus preach curates from the pulpit throughout France. The colporteurs every where meet with people who refuse to purchase the scriptures, saying: "Your Bibles are not the true Bible!"

It is easy to see why the Romish church adopts and publishes this foul calumny. At first, the ministers of this church simply forbade the reading of the Bible, without adding that it was falsified. But this prohibition became disgraceful to them. They were at a loss to justify themselves when reproached with taking away from men the holy Bible given for their instruction. So bad a cause could not be sustained, and often the most docile followers of the priests exclaimed against such injustice. The priests, therefore, changed their ground of dispute with their usual address and perfidy. "Oh! you can read the Bible, if you please; we do not hinder you; we highly respect the Word of God; but be on your guard! The protestant colporteurs bring you books filled with lies, under the title of the Bible!" A convenient calumny, truly, and which would inflict a severe blow upon the labours of Bible Societies, if it were not palpably false. But in this case, as in many others, the calumny falls upon the head of those who invent it.

At *Toulouse*, one of the most important cities of France, the archbishop having stated, in his pastoral letter, that the translations of the Bible were false, several zealous Christians, pastors and members of consistory, replied, in a spirited pamphlet, that they were ready to hold a conference with priests appointed by the archbishop, to compare their translations with the original text. They solemnly challenged the Romish clergy to accept this offer, or to take back their accusation. The archbishop refused to have our Bibles examined in concurrence with the pastors, well knowing that he could not prove his lie. But this refusal itself has opened the eyes of many Roman Catholics; the pamphlet of the defenders of protestantism has been read in the whole city of *Toulouse*, and the archbishop has been obliged to keep silence.

Lately, at *St. Quentin*, a city of the north of France, the vicar repeated, in a public discourse, the same calumny. The pastor wrote immediately to this priest, asking him to prove his assertion or to retract it. The priest replied that protestants had cut off the *apocryphal books*, and that this justified him in maintaining that the Bible was falsified. But the pastor showed him, in a second letter, that this answer was not sufficient, because the attack of the popish preacher was directed against the whole translation, that is to say, against the canonical books as well as the apocryphal books. He again requested him to point out the chapters and verses, the words where the translations appeared incorrect. The curate dared not go farther in this dispute: a new source of confusion to the church of Rome."—G. DE F.

ART. XI.—*Pious Sayings of Good Men.*

BISHOP BURNET, from his zealous care of his diocese, made it a rule yearly to visit the various parishes of which it was composed, and treated, with the most distinguished regard, such ministers as were eminent for their piety, and most attentive in their care of the souls of the people. One of those had frequently expressed the great importance of well understanding our Lord's meaning of the beatitudes, and of this in particular: "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth." Many anxious inquiries yet left this gracious minister unsatisfied in his own mind, of the just and true explanation, and many prayers were added to prevent any partial view, or hasty opinion, from being adopted by him. In this unresolved state, he took a morning's walk some considerable distance from the parish, and observing a habitation more wretched than any he had before seen, walked towards it, and, to his surprise, heard a voice of great and joyous praise: drawing nearer, he heard it as that of an individual only. He wanted to learn the cause, and looking in at the window, viewed the poor inhabitant in the most wretched state of outward want and poverty that he had ever beheld. She had, on a little stool before her, a piece of black bread and a cup of cold water; and with her eyes and hands lifted up to heaven, as in a rapture of praise, repeated these words: "What! all this, and Jesus Christ too! What! all this, and Jesus Christ too!" It wants not to be added, that with the living lesson which this good man here learnt, he, with holy gratitude, returned, well understanding who only inherited, in our Lord's sense, the whole earth, by possessing Him. And thus we best find out the supposed paradox of Paul: "as having nothing, yet possessing all things."

HATRED OF SIN.—All men seem to be in some measure sensible of the odious nature and evil demerit of sin; but the misery is, that it is chiefly of the sins of others, and especially of the sins of others against themselves. If men hated sin as much in themselves as they do in others, humility would be a more common virtue. If it were duly reflected on, it would bring us to a just sense of the nature and demerit of sin, to observe, that they who hug and caress it most in themselves, cannot help abhorring it in others. A man will hate the image of his own sin when he sees it in his friend, or the child of his bosom. What is most unaccountable in this matter is, that men should be so shamefully partial and unequal in their way of judging about it. When the question is about a man's own sin, his heart devises a thousand artifices to excuse or extenuate it, which artifices are oftentimes as applicable to all sin, in general, as to his own sin. But when a man is under the influence of passion against the sins of others, it quite alters the case. He finds no end in exaggerating the guilt of an injury or affront, and his passion will find means to make pretended excuses appear heavy aggravations. The common excuses of human frailty—strength of temptation, and the like—will appear to him too refined and metaphysical to have any effectual influence for moderating his passion. The vehemence of such passions against sin would do very little prejudice to charity, if these passions were as equal and impartial when directed homewards as they are vehement against others. If men could as thoroughly and sincerely hate themselves as they do their neighbours, it would be a good help towards loving their neighbours as themselves.—*M. Laurin.*

FAITH.—True faith utterly disclaims all ground of pretension to justification and eternal life but on the sole footing of God's absolute grace and the Messiah's finished salvation.

The faith of God's people is a faith inseparably connected with holiness, and infallibly productive of practical obedience. Whoever has St. Paul's faith, will and must have St. James's works.

Little faith goes to heaven no less than great faith; though not so comfortably, yet altogether as surely.

QUERIES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE RELIGIOUS MONITOR.

Dear Sir,—If you think it for edification to give the following queries a place in the Monitor, and yourself or some of your correspondents publish a reply to the same, you will at least oblige one of your subscribers.

It is a duty frequently enjoined on church members, by the word of God, to pray for those who minister to them in word and doctrine. And it is a petition we frequently hear put up in the prayers of pious, religious persons, that the Lord would bless, strengthen, support, and encourage all those who have HIS COMMISSION to preach the everlasting gospel. But, as we are not at present to expect *immediate* or *extraordinary* commissions from the Most High, as of old, 1. Wherein does a divine commission consist, by virtue of which a person would be entitled to the prayers of the church as a minister? 2. Are all those who profess to preach the gospel entitled to the prayers of the church as ministers? B.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—Shadrach, and the Minutes of the Convention of Reformed Churches, which recently met in this city, may be looked for in the next number. We have taken notes of the debates, an outline of which may be laid before our readers. The letter in relation to a supposed error in the minutes of Synod was not received in season to be noticed in the present number.

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,
AND
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

NOVEMBER, 1839.

[For the Religious Monitor.]

ART. I.—*Terms of Communion.*

MR. EDITOR,

Sir,—Permit me, though not a member of your church, to show my opinion on the subject of your correspondent Abednego. With him I perfectly agree that something ought to be done for the young, for an intelligent union with the church. I have heard a remark made to this effect: that the church was like a sheet of water; the more it was spread, it was the more shallow. The Secession, and other churches of high distinction, are much more extended now than they were, say forty or fifty years ago. But do members possess the depth of knowledge in theological subjects, in distinctive principles, and in the history of the church; and are they as punctual in discharging the duties of religion as church members formerly were? Far from it. What, then, is the reason? This is an important inquiry.* There must, certainly, be blame somewhere. To three classes in the community, I think, blame attaches.

First, to parents, in not being at more pains to train up their children in the way they should go; in not instructing them in doctrinal knowledge; in the principles and history of the church. To do all this they solemnly vow in baptism; yet, how grievously are they neglected. If the Shorter Catechism be asked, and, perhaps, Brown's, this is almost all that is done. The whole is a matter of memory; the understanding is not informed, nor the judgment exercised. Parents are very culpable in respect of instructing and urging their children to the duty of prayer. In consequence of this neglect, and not asking them to officiate in family duties when they grow up, these duties are neglected when they come to be heads of families. One in this situation, knowing that family duty would be required of him, applied to me to pen him a prayer. This I refused; but directed him to proper books on the subject; and chiefly insisted that he should engage in the duty. Parents ought carefully to remember that families are the proper nurseries of the church.

Second. To ministers, also, much blame often attaches, in the

admission of unqualified persons. There is often an unwarrantable stretch of charity. Bashfulness is admitted as an apology for not answering; they are supposed to know more than they can express; whereas, I believe, in nine cases out of ten, it is sheer ignorance. I may mention an instance: a woman applied for admission to communion; a preacher was appointed to converse with her. She was most grievously destitute of knowledge. To the question, Why did she wish to join the church? she had the simplicity to say, "Because her husband was joined." He reported her as totally inadmissible. A minister conversed with her, and admitted her; no doubt, upon the common principle of charity. Very lately, in a Presbyterian church where I was occasionally present, a man was admitted to communion for the first time, and had five children baptized, who, I believe, never asked a blessing or made a prayer in his house. Certainly to that man the question was not put, Did he observe family worship in his house? a question that ought always to be put to applicants who have families. The minister that admitted this man, preached the duty of family religion, clearly and forcibly; but surely something more is necessary than a doctrinal exhibition of the duty. If neglect be a delinquency, delinquents ought to be dealt with accordingly. The neglect of discipline is a great corruption in the church. An old writer has justly observed, that where government and discipline are neglected, doctrine and worship will soon be corrupted. Neglect, I apprehend, often arises from the mercenary principle of avoiding offence, which might lead to the loss of members. Certainly, by the admission of unworthy members, sessions contribute to the prostitution of ordinances, and the condemnation of the individuals. There is sometimes a culpable lenity towards the more wealthy, while others, in inferior circumstances, are more rigidly treated; of which, the following instance may be mentioned: a minister and elder were on a parochial visitation; the poor were asked if they observed family worship, but, to the wealthy, no such question was put. One poor man, being asked if he observed family worship, promptly answered, he did not; and, upon being remonstrated with, and the duty urged, he continued, peremptorily, to refuse; giving, as his reason, the want of time; wages being low, it took all his time to gain a living for his family. On going out, the minister asked the elder, What shall we do with this man? Says the elder, I know nothing ye can do with him, if you do not rank him with the rich folks. A waggish, though, certainly, a very cutting answer.

Third. Blame attaches, also, to applicants themselves. If they really act from conviction of duty, they will consider it neither unnecessary nor burdensome to know the truth, but will cheerfully inform themselves on doctrinal subjects, the nature of the ordinance, the subordinate standards, and the distinctive principles of the church. But, if they seek union to the church from custom, or for name, attention to these things will be very irksome, and attended to, if at all, with great partiality and reluctance.

Your correspondent proposes the plan of a "compend of doctrine." Of this I cannot see the least utility. No better compend can be issued than the Confession of Faith, and Catechisms. Let parents and ministers instruct children and applicants: frequent catechising will do more for informing the minds of youth than merely reading

either systems or compends; not, by any means, that I would discourage reading, but urge it; and the more reading is accompanied with examination, the more rapidly will improvement be made. I know nothing better to be read than catechetical systems, such as Erskine's and Fisher's, usually called "The Synod's Catechism." Brown's, also, and Willison's are very good. In regard to the "Church's History," and, especially, the "Church's Testimony," it is taken for granted they are not more prolix than necessary to render the subjects sufficiently intelligible. Then, let applicants be urged to study them, and be acquainted with them, previous to admission; there will not then be ground for the complaint that the promise of prosecuting the subjects after admission is violated. The terms of communion specified by Abednego are sufficiently simple for an intelligent union. To fritter these down is advantageous neither to the church nor applicants themselves. Ministers were wont, formerly, to meet often with applicants, previous to admission, and inform them on different subjects, chiefly the nature of the ordinance; and inquire particularly as to their own personal and family religion and evidences of grace, (a practice still continued in the true Reformed Dutch Church.)* Very different, now, is the practice of many, which is little more than urging the duty of commemorating the death of Christ. For a number of Sabbaths previous to communion, sermons were preached, (in my own hearing,) called preparation sermons; if properly so called, I must confess I had not discernment to see it, as there was nothing on the nature of the ordinance, the character of communicants, or the consequences of unworthy communicating. I could not avoid the conclusion that the acquisition of new members was the chief object. Very differently minded, certainly, was an old clergyman, who said, "A throng of undiscerning communicants would make a thronged hell." Fearful the consideration that ministers should be accessory to ungodly persons' eating and drinking damnation to themselves. Let ministers encroach a little more upon their own secular time, and employ the diligence of their fathers in the church, in instructing applicants; and if they have not such large congregations as others, they will have more intelligent and steady members.

SHADRACH.

ART. II.—*Lectures on Esther.*

LECTURE FIRST.

Now it came to pass in the days of Ahasuerus (this is Ahasuerus which reigned, from India even unto Ethiopia, over a hundred and seven-and-twenty provinces,) that in those days, when the King Ahasuerus sat on the throne of his kingdom, which was in Shushan the palace, in the third year of his reign, he made a feast

* This practice is still followed, so far as known to us, in the Associate Church to a certain degree; not, however, to any thing like the extent which its importance demands. We justly refuse communion with the General Assembly, as we believe, on scriptural authority, among other causes, for her lax admissions to communion; and yet the practice of some of her ministers may tinge the cheek of some among us with the blush of shame. We knew one minister in that church who devoted one evening in each week, for the period of three months, exclusively to the instruction of applicants, previous to their admission to the Lord's table. An example worthy of imitation.—EDIT. REL. MON.

unto all his princes and his servants; the power of Persia and Media, the nobles and princes of the provinces, being before him: when he showed the riches of his glorious kingdom and the honour of his excellent majesty many days, even a hundred and four score days. And when these days were expired, the king made a feast unto all the people that were present in Shushan the palace, both unto great and small, seven days, in the court of the garden of the king's palace; where were white, green, and blue hangings, fastened with cords of fine linen and purple to silver rings and pillars of marble: the beds were of gold and silver, upon a pavement of red, and blue, and white, and black marble. And they gave them drink in vessels of gold, (the vessels being diverse one from another,) and royal wine in abundance, according to the state of the king. And the drinking was according to the law; none did compel: for so the king had appointed to all the officers of his house, that they should do according to every man's pleasure. Also Vashti the queen made a feast for the women in the royal house which belonged to King Ahasuerus.—*Esther i. 1—9.*

THE book which bears the name of this distinguished female stands intimately connected with its two predecessors, and forms an appropriate supplement to them. The writings of Ezra and Nehemiah are chiefly confined to the affairs of the Jews who returned to their native country, and bring down the narrative of these from the edict of Cyrus to the settlement of their civil and ecclesiastical polity by Nehemiah, comprehending a period of about a century.

The returned captives, however, formed but a small portion of the posterity of Jacob, and we feel a desire to be acquainted with the condition of those who remained behind their brethren, or who were scattered over the extensive territory of the Medo-Persian empire. That God should protect and bless those who obeyed his command by leaving Babylon, who favoured the dust of Zion, and took pleasure in gathering her stones from the rubbish in which they had long been buried, we were led to expect; but we might have thought that their countrymen who lagged behind, who preferred slavery or an ignoble ease in a foreign land to the city of their fathers' sepulchres, and the privileges of the house of God, would have been deprived of the special protection of Providence, as unworthy of the name of Israelites, and that they would have been left to reap the native consequences of their own choice, and to bear the indignities and oppression to which strangers and captives are ordinarily subjected by their conquerors and masters. God, however, deals not with his people according to their weakness and folly, but saves them for his name's sake. Accordingly, we learn, from this book, that those who were scattered in the lands of the heathen were cared for, as well as those who were gathered into the holy land, and that they were marvellously preserved when a hellish plot had been laid for their utter extermination.

The watchful care which God exerts over his people in times of danger, is the chief lesson which we are taught by this portion of sacred history; but it is not the only lesson which it supplies. It lays open to us the wonderful manner in which he who "declares the end from the beginning" provides beforehand for the execution of his purposes, for defeating the schemes of his adversaries, and rescuing those who put their trust in him. It shows how easy it is for him to put down the mighty from their seats, and to exalt them of low degree; how slippery is the path of ambition, and how deceitful the gale of prosperity, which raises its votaries aloft that it may dash them with greater severity to the ground; and how much more safe it is to put our trust in God, and walk humbly with him,

These, with other important instructions which may afterwards present themselves, are impressively taught by this interesting fragment of sacred history.

We are not left at any loss as to the writers of the greater part of the books of scripture; but this, though an important circumstance, is still *but* a circumstance, and not essential to their genuineness and authenticity. The books of Judges, Kings, and Chronicles, in the Old Testament, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the New, do not contain in their bosom the names of their penmen; and the name of the person on the title is not always that of the writer. Thus, the Book of Ruth is so designated, not because that female wrote it, but because it contains a narrative of an interesting period of her life; and, perhaps, the same thing may be said of the Book of Job.

The Book of Esther records certain astonishing events in the life of that illustrious woman, but it does not follow from its title that it was composed by her. The supposition that it was written by her cousin Mordecai, carries with it, in my mind, no small degree of probability. He was not only a witness of the transactions, but acted a principal part in all the scenes which are described. It is impossible, or, at least, difficult to account for the manner in which he acted respecting Esther, in encouraging her to offer herself as a candidate for the royal favour, instructing her to conceal her country and her relationship to him, together with other circumstances which will appear in the sequel, without concluding that he was consciously under supernatural direction. "By faith Moses, when he was born, was hid three months of his parents, because they saw he was a proper child." And what was said of them may be applied to Mordecai, with this addition, that he seemed to combine the faith of that pious couple, with the presentiment which, at an early period of life, agitated the breast of their son. What I mean is, that he seems to have possessed the gift of prophecy, or at least an extraordinary spirit, similar to that which fell upon those who were raised up as "Saviours" to Israel, to avenge their cause and deliver them from their enemies. Who, then, more likely to have been employed by the Spirit of God in penning this book than he? In chapter ninth, verse 20th, it is said: "And Mordecai wrote these things, and sent letters unto all the Jews that were in all the provinces of the King Ahasuerus, both nigh and far." This relates more immediately to what had been done at Shushan, and to the appointment of an anniversary feast in commemoration of their deliverance. But what more natural than that he should afterwards commit to writing the facts which led to an issue so felicitous to his countrymen, and so grateful to himself and his royal relative? Some, however, have supposed that it was written by Ezra, others by Joachim, the son of Joshua the high priest, and others by the Great Sanhedrim.

It is of more importance to inquire into its canonical authority. In the first place, it was received and acknowledged as canonical by the ancient church of the Jews, to whom, as the Apostle tells us, "were committed," as a sacred deposit, "the oracles of God." Accordingly, it formed a part of the sacred volume, referred to by our Lord when he said, "Search the scriptures," and by the Apostle when he said, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is

profitable." In the threefold division of the Old Testament made by the Jews, it formed a part of the Hagiograph. Besides, in the regular observance of the feast of Purim, we have a standing proof of the authenticity of this book. The later Jews, who have always guarded against the introduction of spurious or apocryphal books, and exerted greater jealousy over the purity of their inspired canon than Christians, not only acknowledge Esther as canonical, but have held it in great veneration, assigning it a place next to the Pentateuch. In their public service, besides the five books of Moses, they make use of other five, which they call *Megilloth*, namely, the Song of Solomon, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther. The Song they read on the Passover; Ruth, on the feast of weeks, or Pentecost; Lamentations, on the fast in commemoration of the destruction of the temple by the Chaldeans; Ecclesiastes, on the feast of Tabernacles, and Esther on the feast of Purim. And as they give to these five books the name of *Megilloth*, or "volumes," so they call Esther, *Megillah*, or "the volume," by way of eminence. The book of Esther was also acknowledged as inspired by the early Christian church, and is expressly mentioned in the catalogue of the Council of Laodicea.

In stating the internal evidence, it may be proper to contrast it with the apocryphal additions. In the Romish Bibles, nearly seven chapters are added, and the contrast between them is both striking and instructive. The book itself is extant in Hebrew, the additions are in Greek. In the former, every thing corresponds with the time at which it professes to have been written; in the latter, persons and events are mentioned that did not exist until the Persian empire was overthrown. The narrative of events in the former is simple, natural, and consistent; the narrative of the latter is confused, and abounds with repetitions, anachronisms, and even contradictions. So that it would seem as if Providence had permitted these additions to be made, in order to set in a clearer light the antiquity, genuineness, and intrinsic value of the book itself. As there is nothing in it which is faulty, contrary to truth or to good manners, inconsistent with other parts of scripture, or unworthy of an inspired pen; so, on the other hand, it is excellently adapted to the confirmation of faith and hope, the consolation of the afflicted, the repressing of pride and vain-glory, and the cherishing of humility and confidence in Divine Providence.

The objections to its canonical authority may be easily answered. First, it is objected, that "some of the early Christian writers have not acknowledged it." I answer, some of the early Christian authors have acknowledged apocryphal writings which were never held sacred by the Jewish church. The reason why some of the fathers did not acknowledge it, was because the Jews, in order to reduce the number of their books to the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet, joined two books together: for example, Ruth to the books of Samuel, and Lamentations to the Prophecies of Jeremiah, and the Book of Esther was one of these.

It is objected, secondly, that "the name of God is not to be found in this book." The occurrence or formal mention of the name of God in a book will not prove it to be divine, and the omission or absence of that name will not prove it to be uncanonical or profane.

This book is only a part of sacred scripture, and borrows light from others. The Spirit, who searcheth all things, is the best judge when and where, and how often, to mention "the dreadful name of the Lord our God." And what though the name of God is suppressed, provided his works, and wonders, and benefits are announced and celebrated? "Though the name of God be not in it, his finger is," says a pious commentator.* The hearts of the two disciples "burned within them" while Christ was talking with them, though they knew not that he was with them. The heart of the intelligent reader of this book may be made to burn with admiration and gratitude at the displays of the Divine wisdom, and power, and goodness which it exhibits, though the Divine name strike not his eye. And what if this suppression was intended to guard us against superstition, and to recall our attention from words and names to things and deeds? Had this book been spurious, it is not likely that it would have wanted the sacred name. It is worthy of remark, that, in the chapter which commences the Romish additions, the name of the Supreme Being is mentioned in the very first verse:—"Then Mardocheus said, God hath done these things; for I remember a dream," &c. And the same name occurs no less than eight times in the course of five verses.

A third objection is, that "this book is not quoted or referred to in the New Testament." All the undoubted books of Old Testament Scripture are not quoted or named by our Lord and his Apostles, and there are books quoted in the New Testament which are not divine. But there are probable references to it;† and in Hebrews, ix. 34, Paul seems to refer to the deliverance wrought in the days of Esther, when he speaks of those who "by faith escaped the edge of the sword."

Lastly, it is objected, that "there is no reference to Christ in it." But this objection would apply also to the Book of Ecclesiastes and Judges. Augustine has said, "Whatever is contained in the prophets was written either of Christ or on account of Christ." This book contains an account of the conservation, and fills up a gap in the history of that people, "of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever."

In entering on the exposition of the book, the first thing which invites inquiry is the age or period in which the events here recorded took place. "Now it came to pass in the days of Ahasuerus (this is Ahasuerus which reigned from India even unto Ethiopia, over a hundred and seven-and-twenty provinces,) that in those days when the King Ahasuerus sat on the throne of his kingdom, which was in Shushan the palace, in the third year of his reign, he made a feast," &c. That this prince was one of the kings of Persia is evident, for his palace was in Shushan, or Susa, and the whole narrative refers to the manners of that people. But interpreters are divided as to the particular monarch that is meant. The most probable opinion is that it was Artaxerxes Longimanus, the son of Xerxes. Notwithstanding the disasters of his father, his kingdom

* Matthew Henry. The above is the ordinary phrase which the author employed when quoting the language of this commentator, to whose well-known Exposition he manifested, towards the close of his life, a decided and increasing attachment.

† Compare Esther, ii. 6, with Matt. i. 11.

was not greatly diminished. The favour he showed to the Jews under Ezra and Nehemiah is more easily accounted for on the supposition of his having married a Jewess.*

Some idea may be formed of the extent of his kingdom from verse second, in which his subjects are numbered, not by souls, but by provinces. "He reigned from India even unto Ethiopia, over a hundred and seven-and-twenty provinces." How many millions of souls must have been under the dominion of this single man! Such a sovereign has it in his power to do much harm, but he can do little good; for how is it possible for one man to take cognizance of the affairs of such an immense territory? An overgrown empire, like that of Britain, which boasts that the sun never sets on her dominions, carries within it the seeds of its own dissolution, and ultimately sinks by its own weight.

We are next introduced to a gorgeous feast, which the king gave, first to his princes, and then to all his subjects in Shushan. The splendour of the entertainment corresponded with the dignity of the monarch and the wealth of his dominions, of which it was intended to be an image and demonstration, "When he showed the riches of his glorious kingdom, and the honour of his excellent majesty." The scene, which was "in the court of the garden of the king's palace,"—the quality and number of the guests, "the power of Persia and Media, the nobles and princes of the provinces," and "all the people that were present in Shushan the palace, both great and small,"—the period of the entertainment, which extended to six months and seven days,—the gorgeous and costly character of the decorations, the variegated hangings of the pavilions in which the banquet was held, "being fastened with cords of fine linen and purple to silver rings and pillars of marble," and the couches on which they reclined being "of gold and silver upon a pavement of red, and blue, and white, and black marble;" while the guests, each of them raised for the time to a state of regal dignity, "drank royal wine in vessels of gold, according to the state of the king, the vessels being diverse one from another," that is, never used above once, but replaced by new ones as they were emptied—altogether presents an exhibition of worldly magnificence to which modern times can hardly afford a parallel.

Yet, amidst all this pageantry and ostentation, so well fitted to gratify his vanity, do we suppose that the heart of the monarch was happy? No, my brethren; our Lord has told us that "a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things that he possesseth." Only conceive what a weariness it must have been to the king to have kept this feast for so many days! What sacrifices of comfort does the world exact from its votaries! And how much real wretchedness and desolation of heart may be found lurking in the bosoms of those "who are gorgeously apparelled, and live delicately in king's courts!" "Better," says the wise man, "a dinner of herbs where love is, than a stalled ox and hatred therewith."

And where now is Ahasuerus, with all "the riches of his glorious kingdom, and the honour of his excellent majesty?" They

* The objection to this view, arising from the apparent anachronism, Esther ii. 6, may be solved by supposing that the person who was carried into Babylon with Jeconiah was not Mordecai, but his great grandfather, Kish the Benjamite, v. 5.

have passed away, and nothing is left of them but the record before us, which is given only to introduce the history of the deliverance wrought for Israel with which it was connected. "The fashion of this world," like an empty pageant, "passeth away." "All flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away. But the word of the Lord endureth for ever."

Two circumstances, however, characterized this entertainment, which deserve commendation—the absence of all compulsion in drinking, for *the drinking was according to law, none did compel*—and the delicacy displayed by Vashti the queen, who, instead of joining in the general debauch, "made a feast for the women apart in the royal house which belonged to King Ahasuerus." The public respect thus paid by heathens, and these, too, in the highest station, to the rules of temperance and modesty, is a reproach to many in a Christian land, who, while they make beasts of themselves with intoxication, compel others to follow their example; a barbarous custom, which modern politeness has almost discarded from good society, though, we fear, it still prevails to no inconsiderable extent, and, under the much abused name of hospitality, is ruining the morals and shortening the lives of thousands. "Wo unto him that giveth his neighbour drink, that putteth thy bottle to him, and makest him drunken." "Let your moderation be known to all men: the Lord is at hand." "Take heed lest your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness, and that day come upon you unawares."

ART. III.—*Puseyism and Socialism in England.*

IN these eventful times, the Christian's solemn duty is to stand on his watch-tower—to descry the approach of the enemy—and to give warning of coming danger. Prophecy clearly informs us that before the much-desired downfall of mystical Babylon, the Man of Sin will increase in power, ancient error will be revived under new forms, and a deluge of immorality will threaten to sweep away the foundations of civil society, and to lay waste the heritage of God. There are too many portentous signs in the moral hemisphere at present, to leave us any doubt that "perilous times" have already come, and that an hour of greater temptation is rapidly approaching. It is not the extraordinary efforts of the abettors of Popery to spread their soul-ruining system that is the chief object of dread; the apostacy of Protestants, manifesting painful symptoms of a return to the ancient superstition, and the diffusion of principles that would relax entirely the bonds of moral obligation; these speak a loud alarm to a secure generation. They declare that the knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus has, in a great measure, ceased from among a people high in their profession and blessed with most abundant privileges; that, consequently, a vast portion of the community is prepared to embrace any system of lies and delusion, however hateful and destructive; and that a tide of practical ungodliness has set in, which, if not arrested by divine mercy, will speedily sweep

away the strongest bulwarks of the nation's safety, and draw down upon the land the fearful visitations of Divine indignation.

We are led to these reflections by noticing the alarming spread, in England, of the two systems whose titles we have given at the head of this paper, the former of which has been properly designated *Protestant Popery*; and the latter being one of the boldest and most bare-faced attempts that has been made in modern times to displace the truths of revelation by unmasked infidelity, and to outrage the decencies of life by systematic profanity and licentiousness. For the present, we purpose merely to inform our readers of the principles and extent of these systems, reserving an exposure of their enormities till a future occasion.

Puseyism, which has been likewise termed *Oxford Popery*, originated in the University of Oxford, celebrated for its advocacy of the slavish doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance, and ever distinguished as the strong hold of High Churchism. Dr. Pusey, one of the chief writers of the system, is regius Professor of Hebrew, and canon of Christ Church. He is aided, in his crusade against almost all the distinguishing doctrines of Protestantism, by the Rev. J. H. Newman, Fellow of Oriel College, and by Dr. Keble, also of Oriel College, and professor of poetry and Vicar of Hursley, Hants. The first public appearance of this party took place in 1833, when they began to publish "Tracts for the times," original and extracted, generally upon some head in theology controverted between Protestants and the Church of Rome. In these, many of the worst errors of Popery are apologized for, and sentiments avowed and defended, with a great parade of learning and much dogmatism, that are diametrically opposed to the tenets of the most eminent of the English Reformers, and to the doctrinal formularies of the Protestant Churches. At first these writings attracted little notice, and met with but little support; but, during the last two or three years, they have spread with astonishing rapidity throughout the English Church. Their principles are avowed by many of the dignitaries; they are advocated by such powerful and widely circulated periodicals as the *British Critic* and the *British Magazine*; and disguise it as the friends of evangelical truth in the Church of England may, the influence of the Oxford tract writers is all but sovereign in the Episcopal Church in these countries. This is deeply to be deplored, for the doctrines and spirit of the Oxford Divines are essentially Popish, and were their system to prevail, the Protestantism of England would become wholly extinct. Thus they speak of the Church of Rome as their elder sister, whose blemishes are to be named with special tenderness, and deeply lament Protestantism as a great mistake, while they denounce all who are out of the pale of an Established Church, and nearly in direct terms deny to them all possibility of salvation. They represent the grand doctrine of justification by faith as without foundation, and as the offspring of fanaticism; salvation, according to them, comes not by faith through hearing the word, but by means of the mystical virtue of the sacraments administered by a properly qualified clergy. They are the strenuous advocates of baptismal regeneration; and they claim exclusive apostolical succession for the bishops and clergy of the Churches of Rome and England, while they attempt

to denude the ministers of the Church of Scotland, and of all classes of dissenters, of all claim to ministerial authority, or of a commission from the Great Head of the Church. In the writings of some of these authors, prayers for the dead seem to be regarded as proper, and in the poetry of Kelce there are invocations to the Virgin Mary, and to other departed saints. It is unnecessary to expose the manifold errors of such a system. To any unprejudiced person, who takes the Divine word as his rule of faith and practice, and who is acquainted with the history of the reformation, it must be completely evident, that the design of these writers is just to lead the Church of England back to the camp of Rome. They have drunk deep in the school of Jesuitism, and their attempts are the more dangerous, that they are distinguished for a certain mystic pietism, and are loud in their perpetual boasting of the purity and apostolicity of English Episcopacy. The methods by which they purpose to carry forward their design to sap and undermine the foundations of Protestantism are admirably calculated to compass their object. In the "Life and Remains of R. H. Froude," whom they almost canonize, some of the means which they intend to employ for the propagation of their system are detailed: 1. They intend to edit magazines, and purpose to veil their dogmas under a form of words, which shall be sufficiently expressive, without, however, startling *old prejudices*. 2. They mean to agitate, and itinerate, and employ every means which are likely to lead the lower orders to embrace their creed. 3. They design to educate poor scholars whom they may proselyte, and aid others over whom they may exercise authority. Dr. Pusey has already, himself, commenced the execution of this part of the design. 4. They purpose to employ a new theological vocabulary, in order to avoid alarming old associations and recollections, while they are all the while infusing their deadly poison. 5. Wherever one of their proselytes obtains a parish, he is gradually to change its ritual into conformity with that of Rome; he is to disseminate from the pulpit, and by personal intercourse, letters, &c., the dogmas of Oxford. 6. They are to write for the public in every form in which publications can be made available, but especially biography. These plans are laid with consummate wisdom, and they have been hitherto prosecuted with extraordinary vigour and success. It is high time that the evangelical party in the Church of England should arouse themselves to conflict with this insidious and powerful foe within their own communion. The future destinies of the English Establishment depend on the issue of the contest; may the Lord raise up, within the pale of the English Church, men animated with the spirit of her Jewells and Scotts, and Herveys, and Romaines, who, in a cloudy and dark day, may rebuke specious error, and triumphantly vindicate the grand principles of our common Protestantism!

The principal agent of "Socialism" or "Owenism," as it has been also called, is Robert Owen, who, a number of years ago, made attempts, at New Lanark in Scotland, at Orbiston, and in the United States of America, to found establishments, in which many of the fundamental institutions of society were attempted to be entirely changed. These institutions were generally supposed to have an unfavourable aspect towards Christianity; but their founder cau-

tiously concealed his designs for a time, lest he should excite opposition throughout the community, and in some of them, such as New Lanark, the accredited ministers of the gospel were allowed to preach occasionally to the people. Now, however, Owen and his followers have completely thrown off the mask, and they are at present employed throughout England, in the most undisguised and wicked attempts to set aside the scheme of divine revelation and to subvert Christian morality. Owenism aims at sweeping away all the existing forms of religious belief, and substituting for them a groveling system of science, falsely so called. Even theism itself is not spared. Prayer, and all other forms of religious worship, are the objects of scorn and contempt. The very being of a Great First Cause is reduced to a matter of uncertainty. Native depravity and personal responsibility are boldly denied. The Bible is virulently opposed, and spoken of as having been written by very ignorant men. The doctrine of salvation through Christ is caricatured and repudiated. Marriage is denounced as a state of deceit and immorality; and to the reproach of human nature, there are female apostles at present travelling throughout England, who unblushingly declaim against marriage, as the cause of the crimes and miseries that afflict the sons and daughters of men, and offer plausible pleas for the indulgence of unrestrained licentiousness. In Owen's "Book of the New Moral World," the principles of this hateful system are developed, and by numerous small publications, its destructive poison is diffused to a great extent throughout the community. It is lamentable to have to relate that this pestiferous system, utterly opposed to Christianity, and aiming to license the most hateful immorality, has numerous advocates, who travel about propagating the sentiments of Owen throughout the large towns and manufacturing districts of England; and that, in December last, they boasted of fifty-one branches of the "Association of all classes of all nations," of which at least two were in the west of Scotland, and that their disciples are increasing by hundreds and thousands. It is reported in the newspapers that Owen, the author of this pernicious system, was presented, the other day, to the Queen, at a levee, by the Prime Minister. Such facts loudly call upon all that fear the Lord, and dread his coming indignation, to sigh and weep for the abominations that are done in the land.—*Belfast Covenanter*.

ART. IV.—*Abolition of the Helvetic Confession of Faith.*

SWITZERLAND has recently been the theatre of movements, solemnly affecting to the friends of truth. The same unholy warfare against scriptural and long-received principles, which has been too successful in other quarters, is now violently waged in Switzerland, once renowned among the nations of Europe for the purity and extent of its reformation. Licentious freedom of speculation in religion, combined with liberalism in politics, is carrying on a sapping and undermining process against the fundamental principles of well-ordered society, civil and ecclesiastical; and in the instances to which we particularly refer at present, the attempt has been openly

made, which has unhappily been successful, to abolish the venerable Helvetic Confession, as a symbol of religious profession, throughout a part of Switzerland. The following extract of a letter from Dr. Malan, of Geneva, which has appeared in some of the London Journals, will give the best idea of the course which has been pursued in this melancholy affair:—

How solemn are the present times, and what will they bring forth for the world and the church? Every where there reigns a spirit of agitation, of turmoil, and of a liberty, which, in the judgment of wisdom, is that proud license of which the scripture speaks, when it represents men as exclaiming one to another, "Our lips are our own, who is Lord over us?" Psalm xii. 4. The most venerable institutions, those even which have secured the happiness of many generations, are esteemed as old and useless customs, while folly and ignorance despise the ancient foundations of fair-sighted prudence and profound wisdom. Radicalism insinuates itself more and more into the very bosom of human society, and in its feverish appetite for destruction, points its attacks even at the monuments of the piety of our ancestors, even at those sacred buttresses which they have planted around the sacred work of the reformation. Confessions of Faith pronounce the condemnation of unbelievers, and therefore it is against them that the world directs its boldest and best sustained blows.

That of reformed Switzerland, that Helvetic Confession of Faith which the deputies of the evangelical cantons drew up at Basle in the year 1536, conjointly with the theologians of Strasburg and of Malhouse, and which they "presented," as they say, "to all the faithful and the worthy for their examination and judgment;" this fine Confession, which was approved by Luther, and to which, during more than three centuries, the orthodox church of the canton of Vaud subscribed, and which preserved, in the academy and the pulpits of this beautiful country, the expressions and the symbols of the Christian faith; this Confession is at last abolished; a decree of the Grand Council, on the 23d of January, 1839, suppressed it. The faithful of this canton, who have become so numerous during the last few years, have foreseen this calamity. Many voices, even from the bosom of the clergy, had been raised to affirm that the Bible was sufficient to rule the faith of the church, and that it was at least useless, and often dangerous, to impose another yoke on the consciences of the ministers of truth. It was answered, "That the Confession of Faith, far from being a yoke, was quite, on the contrary, an aid, a support for the friends of pure doctrine; that this Confession, in asking of those who acknowledge the Bible if they believed it, only put in practice the word of the prophet, that, 'two cannot walk together except they be agreed,' (Amos iii. 3;) that no church, no society, even of this world, could subsist without having foundations for its existence, and rules for its maintenance; and, in short, that since the Helvetic Confession of Faith was only the faithful impression of the doctrines of the gospel of grace, it could not be but for the honour of that gospel that this declaration should be maintained." But the die was cast, and it had become important to a certain party in the nation that this barrier should be removed,

and the same Confession of Faith, which the people had received of old with their own assent, and under the pious influence of which their children had been brought up in the path trodden by their fathers, has been suppressed, annihilated, without the participation, and, almost, it may be said, without the knowledge of the people. One hundred and twenty-four citizens were present at the council; fifty-seven raised their hands to God that the public Confession of their Faith should descend to their children, but sixty-seven raised it, with authority, that it should be abolished; and thus a majority of ten suffrages, in 1839, have annulled this noble monument of the deep knowledge and tried piety of those witnesses of the truth, who, three centuries ago, and in the same town of Lausanne, overturned Popery, and rebuked the licentiousness of reason, by the same declaration of the sacred scriptures which the Confession recalls, and the Divine authority of which it asserted.

A happier result had been hoped in this city, (Lausanne,) where the contagious poison of a neighbouring city, fallen from her ancient faith, has appeared to be repelled. The Church of Geneva had abolished this same Confession in the last century, but she did it secretly. Lausanne had protested against this defection on many occasions; especially when her pastors refused to participate in the Genevese jubilee of the reformation in 1835; and behold! the same blow that Rationalism struck in Geneva at the Reformed Confession, that is to say, at the truth of salvation by grace, is even struck in Lausanne! Alas! "Will the Lord cast off his altar, and abhor his sanctuary?" (Lam. ii. 7); "and must the fine gold become dim?" (Lam. iv. 1.)

But if this sorrow, if this calamity afflicts a country which the Lord has blessed above many others, let attention be given to events passing at the same time in another canton, which, also, not long since, has been visited with the chastisement of God. While the Pays de Vaud abolishes the Helvetic Confession of Faith, in half the half canton of Bale Campagne, fathers of families unite themselves in numbers to demand, in a petition addressed to the Grand Council, "That in the law which will fix the ecclesiastical reports, a Confession of Faith shall be recognised and adopted as the basis of these reports, and that this Confession shall be that which was drawn up shortly after the reformation, according to the revealed Word of God; such as our beloved Redeemer and Saviour Jesus Christ and his holy Evangelist and Apostles have left us, and which was published in 1534 by the government of the Canton de Bale, as conformed to the holy scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, which was received as such by our ancestors, and which has been since then preserved among us without alteration, as a precious heritage." Such is the language, and such the earnest solicitations of pious families, while elsewhere, not far from them, are others destroying, with a cool indifference, the treasure which they have so much at heart to preserve! At least among them is not the Lord justifying the faith of the parents in their children? It is He who, in spite of the agitation of the people, and all their earthly decisions, can comfort his church, and establish her in that truth which the world rejects, because it hates it.

ART. V.—*Occasional Hearing.*

BY A RULING ELDER.

PERHAPS there is not another principle peculiar to the Associate Church, the truth of which is so universally *denied* and obstinately opposed by *all* denominations of Christians, as our principles on what is termed occasional hearing. That it is sinful for us to hear ministers of other denominations preach, is considered by the generality of professing Christians to be more the principles of a narrow-minded, selfish, contracted policy, than the dictates of sober reason or the sublime truths of the scriptures. And hence it is that they who carry out, by a consistent walk, this truth of their profession, have so much obloquy and contempt poured upon them by those who affect to hold more liberal and more enlightened principles. But, were we opposed, and had we the finger of scorn pointed at us by Christians only of other denominations, the reproach could be more easily borne: but it is a fact that cannot be denied, that many of our own people, from whom we might have expected better things, have fallen into this popular error of the times, and make common cause with others in opposing this truth of our profession. How consistent with their profession the conduct of such is, let *them* answer. Among these, however, it is believed that there are a few serious, though mistaken persons, whose belief and practice a correct view of the subject would alter.

It is from this conviction that the writer has been induced to offer the following arguments, to prove that occasional hearing is sinful.

By occasional hearing he would be understood to mean the hearing of any minister preach with whom we do not hold visible communion. And in attempting to prove this, he would propose the following method:—

First. Prove that ministers who hold and teach error should be suspended from the communion of the church, and from the exercise of their office.

Second. Prove that it is inconsistent and sinful to hear our own ministers preach, while under suspension.

Third. Prove that ministers of *all* other denominations stand in the same relation to us as our own do while under suspension. And,

Lastly. Answer some objections that are frequently urged against this doctrine.

In the first place, I am to prove that ministers who hold and teach error should be suspended from the communion of the church, and from the exercise of their office. In proof of which I offer the following arguments:—

The office of the ministry is of divine appointment; and is not to be assumed from light and trifling motives, nor to be laid aside for secular advantage, or, according to the world's views, for more honourable employment. And as the office itself is divinely appointed, so the duties of it are particularly marked out in the scriptures. That part of a minister's commission which has a more direct bearing on the point in question is given in Matthew, 28th chapter, and the last two verses, "Go ye, therefore, and teach all

nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." And, according to Mark, the last chapter and 15th verse, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." Here the form in which ministers are to dispense the ordinance of baptism is expressly laid down; and what they are to teach "all nations" is pointed out by the general expressions, "whatsoever I have commanded you," and "the gospel." And these will comprehend all that is taught in the scriptures—all that man is to believe and practise. And accordingly as ministers obey this command may they expect to enjoy the blessing of the promise added: "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Now, there is no truth more obvious, or generally admitted by professing Christians, than that if any minister should presume to alter this form of baptism, it would be in direct disobedience to Christ's command; and his conduct would be justly considered as deserving the highest censure. But even such an innovation in this ordinance would be no more a disobedience to our Saviour's commands than would be the teaching of error, whatever might be said of the difference of the degrees of guilt. For, whoever preaches error is not only teaching what Christ commanded them *not*, but that which is opposed to all his commands, and that has a tendency to subvert every truth of the gospel. For no error is consistent with any truth, but is either directly or indirectly opposed to every truth of the scriptures, both in their letter and spirit. And should any individual who holds but *one* erroneous doctrine, undertake to clear his profession of inconsistency, retaining this, he would be obliged to give up one truth after another, until not a solitary one would remain in his creed.

But further; it is through a belief of the truth that we enjoy the blessings of salvation, and that the work of sanctification is carried on in the souls of believers. "God hath, from the beginning, chosen you to salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth; sanctify them through thy truth, thy word is truth." Now, as every error is opposed to truth, in its nature, so, as a natural consequence, it must be opposed to truth in its tendency. And, therefore, instead of having a saving and sanctifying influence on our hearts, it will have the opposite effect. And as the inclinations of the depraved heart exactly coincide with the dictates of erroneous principles, the probability and the danger that they will preponderate over truth and lead those who hold them into sinful ways and false hopes are very great. And hence the teaching of error is more fatal in its consequences and more sinful in God's sight than the generality of professing Christians seem willing to admit. We should justly reprobate the conduct of that quack who obtained his living by administering medicines which, instead of curing his patients, had only a tendency to increase and strengthen the malignancy of their disease. But how much more blame-worthy are those ministers who are generously supported by their hearers, that they may preach to them the gospel, and yet delude them with error, the only tendency of which is to lead them still farther from the path of life and to unfit them

still more for heaven? This looks like asking a fish and receiving a serpent.

From this brief view of the subject it is evident that those ministers who teach error are chargeable with the sin of disobeying and opposing Christ's commands, of deceiving their hearers, and of doing what in them lies to retard the work of their sanctification. All sin continued in is censurable; "Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart: thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbour, and not suffer sin upon him." "Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear." And if it be our duty to deal with members for indulging in sin, it is our duty to rise, in our dealing with them, from one degree to another, according as the obstinacy of the offender may require. But the sin of holding and teaching error cannot be supposed to be repented of; for the knowledge of sin must precede repentance. And as habitual impenitent sinners ought not to be continued in communion, therefore those who teach error should be suspended from the communion of the church, and so, of necessity, from the exercise of their office.

These arguments might seem sufficient on so plain a question; but as the doctrine to be proved, namely, that occasional hearing is sinful, depends entirely on the truth of our first proposition, and as the scriptures are full on this point, I shall adduce a few of the many texts that might be quoted in proof of it, to wit: that ministers who hold and teach error should be suspended from the communion of the church and from the exercise of their office.

In the second epistle of John, 10, 11, we have this command: "If any come unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: for whosoever biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." By this we are not to understand that we are here forbid to perform the common acts of hospitality to such, for this would be opposed to the whole tenor of scripture. "If thine enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat: and if he be thirsty, give him water to drink." But the meaning of the command is, that we are not to receive such in the character of a minister, as the phrase "bringing not this doctrine" evidently implies; nor yet into communion, as is implied by the expression, "receive him not into your house." For this cannot reasonably be understood as excluding such from the privilege of hearing: else it will follow that some may hold such errors as should exclude them from hearing the truth preached; which, it is presumed, none will plead. Now, if we are not to receive such erroneous persons either as preachers or into communion, if ever they were members, they are now virtually suspended: the thing to be proved.

Again, in the second chapter of Revelation, where John is writing to the churches of Asia, after commending the church of Pergamos, for several things in it praiseworthy, and directing the epistle to the angel [the minister] of the church, he says, (verse 14th,) "But I have a few things against thee, because thou hast them that hold the doctrine of Balaam; so hast thou, also, them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitanes, which thing I hate." Here it appears that the church of Pergamos had tolerated in their

communion certain individuals who held different errors; for the charge brought against them is that they *had them there*. And the threatening added, in case of impenitence, shows the heinous light in which God views the sin of tolerating error; (verse 16th.) "Repent; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will fight against them with the sword of my mouth." Now, in case this church *had* repented and set about the work of reformation, how could they have prevented these erroneous individuals being there? The force of suasion, though it ought first to be thoroughly tried, but too often, in such cases, proves ineffectual. And then, notwithstanding, these erroneous persons would yet have continued in their communion; and the charge could have still been brought, that they *had them there*. Now, as the charge brought against the church of Pergamos was *not* that these individuals *were* erroneous, but that they tolerated them in their communion; and as the weapons of the church are not carnal, but spiritual, the only means by which it was competent to the church of Pergamos to have prevented these individuals being there, was to have deprived them of the privileges of the church until they should abandon their errors; which would be suspension.

But what is written to the church of Thyatira is, if possible, still more to the point. John, by the direction of the Holy Spirit, after commending this church for several things, as he had done the church of Pergamos, adds: "Notwithstanding, I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman, Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and seduce my servants to commit fornication," &c. Here the charge brought against the church of Thyatira is, that they suffered certain erroneous teachers in their communion, who were called Jezebel, from a similarity of sentiment or wickedness of practice with that wretched woman, who was so notorious in her day for her opposition to the true worship of God. But how could they have prevented these individuals from teaching and seducing? They surely had as good a *natural* right to teach *their* principles as the minister of Thyatira had to preach his; and yet this church is blamed for suffering them to teach. They certainly could not have imposed silence on them; and if they had, without the civil authority, they could not have enforced it; and so, they might have continued teaching and seducing still. The only means, then, by which they could have freed themselves from this charge would have been to reject them from teaching in *their* communion, until they should renounce their errors and amend their ways; which would be suspension, both from communion and from the exercise of their office; which was the thing to be proved.

From these texts it is abundantly evident that those who hold or teach error should be suspended from the communion of the church; and, if officers, from the exercise of their office. But perhaps it may be objected, that although the texts quoted prove that those who hold the errors therein mentioned should be suspended from the communion of the church, they by no means prove that ministers or members should be suspended for every error they may hold or teach.

To this I reply, that the objection, at least, grants that there are some errors for which those who hold them should be suspended

from the privileges of the church; and the reason why they should be suspended is obvious, these errors are opposed to truth in their nature and tendency, and, consequently, sinful. And so all error is opposed to truth, else it would not be error; and, therefore, all error is sinful. And we are not to suffer sin upon our neighbour.

But, further, all Christians will admit that the scriptures are a perfect rule of faith and practice. Now, it has been proved that there are at least some errors for which those who hold them should be suspended from the communion of the church; and if there be others for which those who hold them should not be suspended in like manner, and the scriptures be a perfect rule, then all the errors which would subject those who hold them to suspension are particularly mentioned, or, some principle, some rule of judging is therein given, by which we can decide, with absolute certainty, to which of these two classes any particular error belongs. To illustrate this idea: under the ceremonial law, of the creatures that might be eaten, some were, to the Israelites, clean, while others were unclean. Therefore, a specific rule was either given, by which they could determine, with infallible certainty, to which of these two classes any creature belonged, or else one of the two classes was particularly enumerated. Thus, with regard to the beasts, those that chewed the cud and divided the hoof; and of the fishes, those that had fins and scales were, to the Israelites, clean, while all others were unclean. Here, then, was a mark—a rule given, by which all might be able to distinguish the clean from the unclean. But, with regard to the fowls, no such rule was given, but the unclean were particularly mentioned. Now, with respect to error, it is presumed that there are few, if any, so blind to reason and revelation as to assert that all the errors, all the “damnable heresies,” which would justly subject those who held them to the censure of suspension, are particularly mentioned in the scriptures. The only alternative, then, is, if the objection be well founded, that we find some rule—some principle of judging given, by which we can determine, with absolute certainty, to which of these two classes any particular doctrine belongs. And here it would be sufficient to deny that any such principle can be drawn from the scriptures, and leave it with those who bring the objection to produce a scriptural warrant for the position they take, were it not that the popular and unceasing cry of essentials and non-essentials might seem to some of our superficial thinkers to be exactly the rule sought. It may not be improper, therefore, to examine this idea a little, before I dismiss this part of the subject. To the doctrine of essentials and non-essentials it may be objected, that it does not obviate the difficulty in the least, unless either the one or the other were enumerated in the scriptures, or some principle given by which we could most certainly distinguish to which of these two classes any particular truth belonged. It is true that the scriptures inform us that “He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.” From this text it is certain that a belief on the Son is *essential* to salvation. And all those who have this belief will eventually be saved, let their mistakes of doctrine be what they may. But the belief here spoken of cannot be merely a consent of the understand-

ing that He who suffered and died on the cross was the Messiah, the Saviour of the world; for this devils, and many of the reprobate certainly believe. It can, therefore, only mean appropriating faith. Now, this faith, I apprehend, is not always produced in the minds of believers by precisely the same principles; although there are some radical doctrines which all must hold. For, as no two persons are or can possibly be placed in precisely the same circumstances, so their knowledge and experience must necessarily differ. And some truths that may have been instrumental in the conversion of one individual, another may have been saved without the knowledge of. So that truths which have been essential to some may, in some sense, not be so to others. And if to this we add the consideration that the Holy Spirit is sovereign, and works by what means he pleases, and that "God hath chosen the weak things of this world to confound the mighty; base things and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are; that no flesh should glory in his presence," the distinguishing of truths into essentials and non-essentials will appear not only unwise, but exceedingly dangerous. And hence we may see the folly and the wickedness of those ministers who withhold some truths from their hearers, which they consider improper to be taught, when, for aught they can tell, these very truths might be necessary in some individual's case, to give them a consistent view of the plan of salvation, and might, by God's blessing, lead them to discover their interest in the Redeemer.

[To be continued.]

ART. VI.—*Proceedings of the Associate Reformed Synod of New York.*

FROM the published minutes of this body, which met in August last, at Springfield, we make the following extracts:—

"The committee in reference to the visitation of immigrants in the city of New York, reported, and the report was accepted, and the resolutions appended to it were adopted.

"The committee to whom were referred the memorials from the churches in New York city, in relation to the immigrants, report that they have examined the subject as fully as time and opportunities would allow. They find that the substance of the memorials is:—1. A statement, that the congregations under the care of Synod might be enlarged, and the bounds of Synod extended by new congregations were suitable exertions made for giving information to the immigrants who arrive in the city of New York and other ports where churches of our denomination exist. 2. A request that Synod would appoint agents, or committees, who shall reside in said ports, whose duty it shall be to correspond with the various sections of our church, to obtain information for the direction of immigrants; and also to visit all vessels arriving from Great Britain and Ireland with passengers, and proffer them their advice.

"The Synod, as such, being comparatively unacquainted with the state of things in the ports where foreigners arrive, your committee

are decidedly of the opinion that the object contemplated can be more effectually accomplished by the action of the churches situated in said ports, and therefore submit for adoption the following resolutions:—

“*Resolved*, 1st, That Synod cordially recommend the object proposed in the memorials which have been laid before them.

“*Resolved*, 2d, That the whole subject be referred to the sessions of the churches in the various ports referred to, that they may appoint suitable and efficient committees, or agents, for the objects above mentioned.

“All which is respectfully submitted.

“WM. M'AULEY, Chairman.”

“The report of the committee for improving the version of the Psalms was presented, as follows, and accepted:—

“The Committee appointed to improve the version of Psalms, beg leave to report, that, owing to the peculiar condition of the church and other causes, they have not made any further progress in their work since the last report. But as the action of Synod on this subject has been misrepresented by those who watch for our halting, it is deemed proper by the committee to state, in behalf both of themselves and of the Synod, who, by unanimous vote, assigned them this work, that it was no part of the design to abandon, in any respect, the principle of a scriptural psalmody, nor even to make any very material alterations in the present version. Some verbal alterations, to render the version more metrical, and a very few changes of the phraseology, which the committee believe to be nearer to the original Hebrew, but all which must, of course, be approved by this and sister churches who have approved of the design, before they can be adopted and used, are all that have yet been accomplished. It was also proposed that some different metres be added to the present, on the plan already acted on in the present version, as in the 25th, 45th, 67th, 70th, 100th, 102d, 136th, and 148th psalms. The whole design, if accomplished, would be in strict accordance with the principle of a scriptural psalmody, and after the model of the existing version; and there exists no reason for the slightest jealousy or alarm on this subject. Your committee are aware of the difficulty of touching, in the slightest degree, the existing forms of sacred things, with which all the solemnity and interest of the Christian mind are associated, and would themselves deprecate any thing of this kind, that is rash or uncalled for by the interests of truth and holiness. But, in the lapse of centuries, every living language is subject to changes which require a corresponding alteration in the books of devotion. The language of the first English books would be almost unintelligible to the present generation; and the principle of unchangeableness in the forms of devotion in a living language would, in process of time, reduce the church to the exploded system of worship in an unknown tongue.

“All which is respectfully submitted.”

“It was moved and seconded that the Synod now resolve itself into a committee of the whole, for the further consideration of the subject of psalmody. The following amendment was proposed and adopted:—

“*Resolved*, That the committee be discharged; and that the consideration of the subject be deferred to the next meeting of Synod.

“The subject of slavery being called up, the following preamble and resolution were proposed and adopted:—

“Whereas, our churches generally are not presently agitated with the discussion of the subject of slavery; and whereas, it does not appear that an expression of the Synod would be of use to any, and might be injurious to the peace of some of our churches,

“Therefore, *Resolved*, That whatever may be the private opinions of members of this body, there does not appear to be a providential call for a discussion or a judicial expression on the subject.”

The Synod appointed their next meeting at Newburgh on the third Thursday of June next.

These extracts have suggested a few thoughts, some of which will doubtless occur to our readers:—

1. We have wondered who they are that are so lost to a sense of Christian obligation as to *misrepresent* and *watch for the halting* of their brethren of the Associate Reformed Synod of New York! Such conduct cannot properly belong to good men. It is characteristic of the baser sort, who are enemies to the truth. We are, also, at a loss to account for the peculiar *sensitiveness* of the Synod on this point. Public bodies of men are not, generally, much concerned respecting the misrepresentations of the malicious, while conscious of the soundness of their views and the integrity of their motives. It is, indeed, the common lot of church courts to be misrepresented, especially when faithful; but these misrepresentations are, perhaps, no real injury. For, while they deceive only such as are willing to be deceived, they, sooner or later, recoil upon the heads of their authors in such a way as to vindicate these tribunals. The present editor of the Monitor has more than once asserted, that while the Associate Reformed Synod of New York required their own people to use a scripture Psalmody in their *own churches*, some of their ministers were in the habit of using human compositions when preaching in other churches. This assertion has been highly offensive to some. But it is a well-attested, historical fact, which has not been denied, and the declaration of which ought not to be taken as an offence. The recent editor of the Monitor also asserted, “that the constitution of the Associate Reformed Church allowed their 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.” For this assertion of an historical fact he was, also, compelled to bear no small quantity of uncivil treatment. To speak truth of the acts of public men is, however, a right which will not be easily surrendered.

By the adoption of Dr. M'Carroll's report, in 1838, the Associate Reformed Synod virtually decided, to use the language of Mr. Mar-

tin, "that the inspired Psalms may or may not be used in the worship of God throughout the churches of Christ, according as circumstances dictate;" and this report is still LAW in that church. It has neither been repealed nor modified by the recent meeting. The Doctor's report was made in opposition to a resolution directing their ministers either to use the scripture Psalms or to omit singing in public worship when officiating in the churches of other denominations; and in relation to this resolution, the Doctor uses the following language, which was judicially adopted by the Synod:—"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." What can be the meaning of this language? Plainly this: 1. The Confession of the Associate Reformed Church permits the use of some parts of some versions other than the authorized one. 2. That there are some Psalms in the books used by other churches, the use of which is in accordance with the Confession of the Associate Reformed Church, i. e., there are some Psalms in the collections of Dwight and Livingston, not one of which even pretends to be a version, that may be used in accordance with the Confession of the Associate Reformed Church; for the controversy arose from the practice of her ministers officiating in the General Assembly and Reformed Dutch Churches. Thus we have a judicial enactment of the truth which we have so long maintained! Now, in what light are we to regard their loud professions of attachment to a scriptural Psalmody? In our humble opinion, judicial enactment, followed up by practice, is the best evidence we can possess of the real sentiments of any public body.

2. Our next difficulty is with the phrase, "the principle of a scriptural Psalmody." According to the rules of sound and candid criticism, the language of a public body must, if possible, be interpreted in consistency with their avowed principles. Now, if we understand this phrase according to their enactment on the same subject, it can mean nothing more than a Psalmody not positively heretical. In this sense, many of Watts' Psalms are scriptural; Erskine's Sermons and Gospel-Sonnets are generally scriptural; but neither are the writings of Erskine or Watts SCRIPTURE. There is an ambiguity in the use of the term scriptural which clearly admits the introduction of human compositions, and which is so understood and acted upon by many in that church. Had they said the inspired *Book of Psalms*, to the exclusion of all others, it would have been explicit, but inconsistent with their enactment. But the use of explicit terms would, in the language of Doctor M'Carroll, "endanger the harmony, and even 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." So, then, it appears there are some, at least, in that church who cannot, *in conscience*, be restricted to the use of the inspired songs of Zion. And this sentiment is, also, a judicial enactment. Alas! for their design not "to abandon, in any respect, the principle of a scriptural Psalmody," while they cannot conscientiously be *restricted* to its use! Is this becoming in men set for the defence of the gospel? Is it creditable to the discernment and faithfulness of watchmen on Zion's walls? Is it honouring to the house of God, which is the pillar and ground of the truth? It seems they would delude the advocates of an exclusive use of the inspired Book of Psalms into the belief that no others shall be used, and the advocates of a human Psalmody into the belief that they are with them in principle. We ascribe to them no such motives; we speak only of what appears obvious to us on the face of their proceedings; proceedings which we know are opposed and deprecated by some of her ministers and many of her people.

Away, then, with this tampering from the churches of the reformation. Leave those things which have even the appearance of *pious frauds* to Papists. They have a better claim to them, and they are far more suitable to their character. This church, however, had its origin in compromise; and its career has been, in a high degree, vacillating. Commencing with a forced union of a few ministers belonging to the Associate and Reformed Presbyterian Churches, under the disapprobation of both these bodies, it added at least three distinct denominations to the churches of the reformation, and was, eventually, almost swallowed up in the General Assembly. They had declared it to 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." "Nor shall any composures *merely* human be sung in any of the Associate Reformed Churches." But they did not say that it is the will of God that the Book of Psalms be used to the *exclusion* of all others. This naturally led many of her ministers and people to the conclusion that it was equally the will of God that human compositions be sung in his worship; for such compositions cannot be justly called *merely* human compositions, many of their sentiments being derived from the word of God. How natural, then, that so many of her ministers and people should fall into the General Assembly, and carry with them their valuable library, which has been recently recovered by process of law, after a lapse of about twenty years! And this is what Dr. McCarroll denominates "a happy mean between the extremes of latitudinarianism, on the one hand, and excessive strictness on the other." But this happy mean, or medium, has ever been found running into the extreme of latitudinarianism; and, probably, will continue to produce the same result till the end

of the world. If, then, this body truly laments the sad divisions which mar the beauty of the visible church; if she desires to see them healed, let her hold more unequivocal language, and pursue a more steady course of ecclesiastical policy than she has hitherto done since the day of her birth.

The exclusive use of the inspired Book of Psalms in the worship of God is a point which can never be yielded by the friends of a covenanted reformation. It can never be opened as a subject of discussion in any proposed plan of union. It must be assumed as an incontrovertible point in the basis of union and Christian communion. It is undoubtedly one grand dividing line between pure and corrupt churches, and involves the fundamental principle between Popery and Protestantism, namely, human invention and divine institution. It forms no part of our present design, to go into this argument. The truth, on this point, has been stated and defended by Anderson, M'Master, Gordon, and Summerville; books which ought to be read by every person professing the Protestant religion. An edition of Mr. Summerville's excellent book has been recently published by Mr. D. H. A. M'Lane, a student of theology in the Associate Church; and we take this opportunity respectfully to urge it upon our readers to purchase a copy and peruse it attentively. We can assure them they will never have occasion to regret the time and money thus expended.

3. Their attention to immigrants is highly commendable; a duty obligatory upon all men, especially such as profess the name of our Lord Jesus Christ; and we fear that the members of our own communion are, to some extent, guilty of neglect in this respect. Yet we have no knowledge of any connexion between this church and any of the transatlantic churches. To what denomination of Christians in Europe do they belong? Or, with what denomination are they ecclesiastically connected? We ask for information. For we had always supposed their ecclesiastical existence purely American. Still, it is their duty to "entertain strangers." And we trust that, in the performance of this Christian duty, no advantage will be taken of strangers; for instance, we cannot believe they will represent their church as maintaining a scripture Psalmody in the sense in which this language is understood in Europe.

We have no objection to an improved version of the Book of Psalms. We are not, however, likely to see such a version very soon. But when such a one is presented for the adoption of the Reformed churches, if living, it shall receive our cordial support. But we have no affinity of sentiment or feeling towards any version which may be made on the principle of "*merely* human compositions," "the principle of a *scriptural* Psalmody," and "the happy mean between latitudinarianism, on the one hand, and excessive

strictness on the other." Where, in the whole compass of revelation, is excessive strictness in maintaining the truths of God's word condemned? Does not the whole tenor of revealed truth point a different way? Does not the astounding inquiry respecting all human inventions, of every name and character, "Who hath required this at your hand?" still stand unrepealed; and will it not stand to the end of the world?

4. That the action of this Synod on the subject of slavery is according to the Divine will, can hardly be maintained. Is it not the universally acknowledged duty of gospel ministers to "declare the whole counsel of God?" And are they not bound to do this judicially, as well as ministerially? Slavery is a violation of the moral law, or it is not. And this the Christian church is bound to declare. "Ye are my witnesses." And if she refuse to declare the whole law, God will not hold her guiltless. These are principles so obvious that it would be paying the understanding of our readers a poor compliment to dwell on them. How, then, can a refusal to declare this law, on the ground that it "might disturb the peace of the church," or on any other ground, be justified? The resolution implies that the Associate Reformed Church has never yet learned whether slavery be indeed a sin! that her ministers may have *private* opinions on the subject, but what good or evil can these do, so long as they are kept in concealment? Do men light a candle and put it under a bushel? This state of things is to be regretted; for we have no confidence in any permanent reform till the visible church learn to declare the whole moral law as the only and universal rule of man's obedience.

We intend nothing personal in these remarks. For many in the Associate Reformed Church we have a high personal regard. But this must not deter us from speaking the truth respecting her public acts.

ART. VII.—*General Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America.*

As there are two ecclesiastical bodies in the United States, both claiming the name standing at the head of this article, it appears necessary to add something further, that we may be understood. But what that addition ought to be is not so easily determined. The other Synod, we believe, denominates this one "*A New Light Synod*;" "the excinded party;" "a compromising few, who have deserted their distinctive principles," &c. This Synod designates the other *Pro-re-nata* men; but lest the reader should be still in doubt, we add that the Synod of which we now speak is that one of which rs. M·Master, Wylie, and Black are members.

It is truly a mournful state of things, when the appellations assumed by ecclesiastical bodies fail not only to convey any definite idea of their religious principles, but even to designate their identity. General Assembly; Reformed Presbyterian Church; Associate Reformed Synod, &c., have lost all meaning! And we have a new party, of some half dozen suspended and deposed ministers, labouring to make *themselves* believe that they are the true Associate Synod of North America; should they succeed, by their unremitting diligence, in the work of self-delusion, we, like our unfortunate neighbours, may be robbed of our *cognomen*, and find ourselves unable to distinguish our own identity by the good old name inherited from our ancestors, and honestly maintained, from our youth upwards, without the addition or diminution of a letter. Venders of spurious wares are not ignorant of the importance of a name; being destitute themselves, they are compelled, by a kind of necessity, to assume their neighbour's; and, it seems, good men must be content to suffer this loss with becoming patience and fortitude.

The Synod in question held its meeting at Pittsburgh, in August last, and was opened with a sermon by the Moderator, Rev. John Black, D. D., from Matt. xviii. 20. Rev. Gavin M'Millan was chosen Moderator, Rev. J. N. M'Leod continued Stated Clerk, and Rev. George Scott, Assistant. In addition to the ordinary routine of business, much of the time of Synod was occupied in forming, or in executing plans already formed, for prosecuting the work of Foreign Missions. It appears they have sent out one missionary to Northern India, Rev. Joseph Caldwell, "an event which," the Board of Missions think, "is of such importance and prominence as to mark an era in the history of the Reformed Presbyterian Church." The large contributions in support of this object by the congregation in Pittsburgh under the pastoral inspection of Dr. Black, is an example which ought not to be lost on others.

Without attempting, in any manner, to settle the question in dispute between the two bodies calling themselves Reformed Presbyterians, we have no hesitation in saying that the views of this Synod respecting *civil duties* are much more rational and scriptural than those of the other Synod, or than the published views formerly entertained by themselves. In this we rejoice. The unscriptural tenets which have been imbodyed in the subordinate standards of ecclesiastical bodies, together with the omission of such as are scriptural, have done much to mar the peace of Zion and perpetuate sinful divisions. It is, therefore, a happy omen, to see these absurdities falling before the light of revealed truth: when they have all thus fallen, we may look for such a union of the church as the Lord will bless. The sentiments imbodyed in the following report will, probably, find a ready response in the minds of most of our read-

ers. It is not, however, for us to *reconcile* them with a book entitled "Reformation Principles Exhibited," which is still the avowed creed of this Synod:—

"The committee on discipline reported on the memorial of J. B. Campbell. Accepted, adopted, and is as follows:

"The committee to whom was referred the memorial of John B. Campbell respectfully offer the following report:—

"This paper is respectful in its form and important in its matter. That professing Christians should, in the strife of party politics, so far forget what is due to the law of their God and to their own character, as to employ their influence to elevate to places of authority those who are destitute of the requisite intellectual and moral qualification that fit for the right discharge of official duty, is matter of deep regret, and of decided disapprobation. It is trusted that but few in the communion of our church have been so recreant to their known and hallowed principles upon this subject; and that these few, if such there be, who, in a moment of excitement, have been thoughtlessly hurried into such a course, need only to hear the voice of truth and duty admonishing them of their error, to avoid it in future. The adoption of the following resolutions is respectfully recommended:—

"1. That the exercise of the elective franchise in the commonwealth, without due regard to the requisitions of the moral law, is inconsistent with Christian obligation and character.

"2. That to enter into the violence of mere party politics is unbecoming the Christian and the patriot.

"3. That the principles and administration of this church require that care be taken of the interests of personal and social morality in civil, as well as in ecclesiastical relations and transactions; and that the elevation of worthless men to stations of eminence in civil life is utterly at variance with the known principles of our profession. 'He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God.'"

ART. VIII.—*Associate Reformed Synod of the South.*

THE Synod of the Associate Reformed Church in the South, of which I am a member, though she has been long struggling for existence, owing to the death and emigration of ministers, and emigration of private members, and want of a school of the prophets, is beginning to look forth as the morning. The King of Zion has still left us a remnant of ministers and people, and, by his good hand upon us for a few years past, our church begins to put on her beautiful garments. She consists of three presbyteries, First and Second of the Carolinas and Georgia, and the Presbytery of Tennessee. The first has five ordained ministers, pastors of two or more congregations, and four students of divinity; the second has eight ordained ministers, seven of whom are pastors of two or more congregations, two licentiates, and three students of divinity; the third has six ministers, five of whom are pastors of congregations. The synod has had a literary institution in operation under her care for three years, which appears to grow in importance, designed to aid, primarily,

young men in their preparation for the holy ministry. At our last annual meeting, a theological seminary was endowed, for the first time, with a permanent professor. The cause of foreign missions has occupied a portion of the synod's attention for two meetings past.

THOMAS TURNER.

It is gratifying that a denomination of Christians exists in the southern states, with the prospect of increasing, which maintains a number of important articles of revealed truth that have been abandoned by all other religious associations in that region of country. But it should be mentioned as an historical fact, that this body has received large accessions from the ranks of the Associate Church since the exclusion of slave-holders from her communion by an act of Synod. It appears, the Christian church at the south must recognise the right of man to enslave his fellow man, as the price of her existence! Christianity was not revealed to men, thus to be made the pliant tool of the arrogant and oppressive powers of this world. It breathes peace and good will to men. It breaks every yoke. It recognises the soul of the poor lashed and branded African as of equal value with that of his haughty oppressor. And we say, with all solemnity, God forbid we should ever recognise either the slave-holder, or his apologist, or abetter, as innocent. Such men may, if they think proper, as some have already done, order their subscription to the Religious Monitor discontinued, with the laconic reason, "Too much abolition for me;" yet we will not cease, while life and health are continued, to expose the enormous wickedness and resist the arrogant spirit of slavery, in all ways competent to us, and on all suitable occasions. Sooner than prostitute the pages of a periodical which professes to be devoted to reformation principles, to the gratification of such as are involved in this, the greatest of all our national sins, we would cast in our lot, for the few remaining days of this vain life, with the slave himself. We are not warm on this subject; we have considered it well, and speak only "words of truth and soberness," in a plain way. There has been too much temporizing with this sin; too much regard for money wrung from the labour of others, without a fair equivalent; too much yielding to that truculent spirit which will become rich by trampling human rights in the dust, in defiance of the Almighty. It is time, therefore, for those Christians who prize the salvation of the soul more highly than riotous living, to clear their skirts from all participation in this sin. Let them not be put off with the common cry, that our brethren of the south are a high-minded, hospitable, noble race of men. The Romans, who inflicted ten successive, horrid persecutions upon the primitive Christians, were all this. Let us not be told that the slaves are in a better condition than the labouring population of the north; that they are contented; would not leave their masters, &c. Their manacled limbs; their bodies

scarred with whips, knives, rifle-balls, teeth of dogs, and hot irons, furnish a sufficient answer to this plea; to say nothing of the frequent separation of parents and children, husbands and wives—nay, the total abolition of the marriage relation, and their penal enactments against the communication of knowledge to their miserable victims. But we rest not our objections to slavery on its abuses merely; as it exists in this country, it is utterly repugnant to the law of God. The spirit of the Christian religion is a consuming fire to American slavery. But we have been so long familiar with this sin, that we are unfit to form a correct judgment respecting it. Even infidels of other nations regard slavery as a perfect anomaly in the moral world, and a monster in the political. Their opinions may well put to shame multitudes in this land who call themselves, and are called by others, Christians. Knowing, then, as we do, from the word of God, that slavery, if persisted in, must terminate in national ruin, and, it is to be feared, in the eternal misery of many who are involved in it, we should be unworthy the support and confidence of a Christian community, and treacherous to the profession we have made, did we not faithfully warn our countrymen to avoid the approaching danger by breaking every yoke and letting the oppressed go free.

This question, which now agitates the American people, will probably terminate either in a deluge of blood, or universal emancipation, or both. For it draws deep, involving the great foundations of the social fabric.

The condition of the degraded African is only a feather in this great controversy. The insatiate spirit of slavery cannot be glutted with its three million victims. It requires of the white man,

1. An unconditional surrender of the freedom of speech and of the press.
2. It denies to the oppressed the poor privilege of petition and complaint.
3. It annihilates the sacred rights of conscience.
4. It withholds the right of personal protection from the violence and outrage of superior brute force.
5. It reverses the apostolic injunction, he that will not work shall not eat, and declares that he that will work shall not, but he that will not work shall, eat.

If these principles do not involve both the present and future happiness of men, it would be difficult to say what those principles are which affect their happiness. Would it not be well for those who say "stop my subscription"—"too much abolition for me," to inquire whether they do not, in fact, injure themselves most? Whether they are not defying the Almighty? Nay, whether it would not be more consistent in them to renounce even the *name* of Christian, before they address such a note to the conductor of any free press?

ART. IX.—*The seat of Spiritual Mindedness in the Affections.*

THE greatest contest of heaven and earth is about the affections of the poor worm, which we call man. That the world should contend for them is no wonder. It is the best that it can pretend to. All things here below are capable of no higher ambition than to be possessed of the affections of men. And as they lie under the curse, it can do us no greater mischief than by prevailing in this design. But that the holy God should engage in the contest, and strive for the affections of man, is an effect of infinite condescension and grace. This he doth expressly; my son, saith he, give me thy heart. It is our affections he asketh for, and comparatively nothing else; to be sure he will accept of nothing from us without them. The most fat and costly sacrifice will not be accepted, if it be without a heart. All the dispensations of his will, by his word; all the designs of his effectual grace, are suited to this end, namely, to recover the affections of man to himself. So he expresseth himself concerning his word. "And now, Israel, what doth the Lord thy God require of thee, but to fear the Lord thy God, to walk in all his ways, and to love, and to serve the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul?" And as to the word of his grace, he declares it to the same purpose. "And the Lord thy God will circumcise thy heart, and the heart of thy seed; to love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul."

And on the other side, all the artifices of the world, all the paint it puts on its face, all the great promises it makes, all the false appearances and attires it clothes itself with, by the help of Satan, have no other end but to draw the affections of men to itself. And if the world be preferred before God, in this address which is made to us for our affections, we shall justly perish with the world to eternity; and be rejected by him whom we have rejected.

Our affections are all we have to bestow; the only power of our souls, whereby, if we may, we give away ourselves from ourselves, and become another's. Other faculties of our souls, even the most noble of them, are suited to receive in to our own advantage; by our affections we can give away what we are, and have. Hereby, we give our hearts to God, as he requireth. Wherefore to him we give our affections, to whom we give ourselves, and all that we have; and to whom we give them not, whatever we give, we give nothing at all.

In what we do to or for others; whatsoever is praiseworthy in it, proceeds from the affections wherewith we do it. To do any thing for others without an animating affection, is but a contempt of them; for we judge them really unworthy that we should do any thing for them: to give to the poor upon their importunity, without pity or compassion; to supply the wants of saints without love and kindness, with other duties of the like nature, are things that can recommend us neither to God nor men. It is so in general with God and the world. Whatever we do in the service of God, whatever we undergo, or suffer for his name's sake, if it proceed not from the cleaving of our souls to him by our affections, it is despised by him. And however, on the other hand, we may be diligent and sedulous

about the things of this world, yet, if it have not our affections, we are not of the world. They are the seat of all sincerity, the life and soul of every thing that is praiseworthy; whatever men pretend, as their affections are, so are they.

Affections are in the soul as the helm in the ship; if it be laid hold on by a skilful hand, he turneth the whole vessel which way he pleaseth. If God hath the powerful hand of his grace upon our affections, he turns our soul to a compliance with his institutions, instructions, afflictions, all sorts of providences, and in mercy holds them firm against all storms of temptations, that they shall not hurry them on pernicious dangers. Such a soul alone is pliable to all intimations of God's will.

All others are stubborn and stout-hearted, and far from righteousness. And when the world hath the hand on our affections, it turns the whole industry of the soul to its concerns. And it is in vain to contend with any thing that hath the power of our affections in its disposal, it will prevail at last.

On all these considerations, it is of the highest importance to consider aright how things are in our affections, and what is their prevailing bent. Iron sharpeneth iron, so a man sharpeneth the countenance of his friend. Every man hath his edge, which may be sharpened by outward helps and advantages: the predominant inclination of a man's affections is his edge. According as that is set, that way he is sharp and keen, but blunt to all other things.

Now because it must be, that our affections are either spiritual or earthly in a prevailing degree; that either God hath our hearts, or the world; that our edge is towards heaven, or towards things here below; before I come to give an account of the nature and operations of spiritual affections, I shall consider some of these motives which God is pleased to make use of, to call off our affections from the desirable things of this world; for as they are such as cannot be neglected without the greatest contempt of divine wisdom and goodness, so they serve to enforce those arguments that are proposed to us, to set our affections on things above, which is to be spiritually minded.

First. He hath, in all manner of instances, poured contempt on the things of this world, in comparison of things spiritual and heavenly. All things here below were at first made beautiful, and were declared by God himself to be exceeding good. They were then desirable to men, and the enjoyment of them would have been a blessing, without danger of temptation; but since the entrance of sin, whereby the world fell under the power of Satan, the things of it in his management are become effectual means to draw off the heart and the affections from God. Being now in this condition, through the craft of Satan, God hath showed, by various instances, that they are all vain, and every way to be despised, in comparison of things eternal.

He did it most signally in the life and death of Christ. What can be found in this world, after the Son of God hath spent his life in it, not having where to lay his head; and after he went out of it on the cross? Had there been aught of real worth here below, certainly he had enjoyed, if not crowns and empires, which were all in his power; yet such possessions as men of sober and moderate

affections esteem a competency. But things were quite otherwise disposed, to manifest that there is nothing of value in those things, but only to support nature to the performance of service to God. He never attained more than daily supplies of bread out of the stores of Providence, and which alone he hath instructed us to pray for. In his cross the world proclaimed all its good qualities, and hath given to them that believe, its naked face to contemplate. Hence is that inference of the apostle, "But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, whereby the world is crucified to me, and I to the world."

Whither so fast, my friend? "What meaneth this rising so early and going to bed late, eating the bread of carefulness?" Why this diligence? Why these contrivances? Why these hoardings of wealth? To what end is all this care and counsel? Alas! saith one, it is to get enough of this world for me and my children; to raise an estate for them which may be a competency to give them some satisfaction in their lives, and some reputation in the world. Fair pretences! neither shall I ever discourage any from the exercise of industry in their lawful callings: but yet I know that with many this is but a pretence for a shameful engagement of their affections to the world. Wherefore, in all these things, have an eye to Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith: behold how he is set before us in the gospel, poor, despised, reproached, persecuted, nailed to the cross, and all this by the world. Whatever be your designs and aims, let his cross continually interpose between your affections and this world. If you are believers, your hopes are, within a few days, to be with him for evermore. To him you must give an account of yourselves, and what you have done in this world: will it be accepted with him to declare what you have saved of this world; what you have gained; and what you have left behind you? Was this any part of his employment? Hath he left us an example for any such course? No man can set his affections on things here below, who hath any regard to the pattern of Christ, or is in any measure influenced with the power of his cross.

What he did forego and trample on for our sake, that ought not to be the object of our affections; nor can such affections prevail in us, if he dwell in our hearts by faith.

He hath done the same in his dealings with the apostles, and generally with all that have been most dear to him, and instrumental of his glory in the world. He had great work to do by the apostles. The laying of the foundations of the glorious kingdom of Christ was committed to them. Who would not think that he should provide for them, if not principalities or popedoms, yet at least archbishoprics and bishoprics, with other good ecclesiastical dignities and preferments? Hereby might they have been made meet to converse with princes, and had been freed from the contempt of the vulgar; but Infinite Wisdom did otherwise dispose of them and their concerns in this world; for as God was pleased to exercise them with the common afflictions and calamities of this life, which he makes use of to take off the sweetness of present enjoyments, so they lived and died in a condition of poverty, persecution, and reproach. God set them forth as examples as to other ends, namely, of light, grace, zeal, and holiness in their lives, so to

manifest of how little concernment to our own blessedness, or an interest in his love, is the abundance of all things here below, as, also, that the want of them all may consist with the highest participation of his love and favour. "For I think that God hath set forth us the apostles last, as it were, appointed to death. For we are made a spectacle to the world, and to angels, and to men. Even to this present hour we both hunger and thirst, and are naked, and are buffeted, and have no certain dwelling-place, and labour, working with our own hands: being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we suffer it; being defamed, we entreat: we are made as the filth of the world, and are the offscouring of all things to this day." And if this consideration be not of weight with others, undoubtedly it ought to be so with them who are called to preach the gospel, and are the successors to the apostles. There can be nothing more absurd, nothing more opposite to the wisdom and will of God, in his dealings with those first and most honourable dispensers of it, than for such persons to follow greedily after secular advantages and honour.

God continues to cast contempt on these things, by giving always incomparably the greatest portion of them to the vilest men, and his own avowed enemies. Those monsters of men, Nero and Heliogabalus, had more power over the things of this world than ever had the best of men. Look on all the principal treasures and powers of this world, as in the hands of one of these monsters, and there disposed of by Divine Providence, and you may see at what rate God values them.

At this day, the most noble and fruitful parts of the earth are given to the great Turk, with some other eastern potentates, either Mahometans or Pagans, who are prepared for eternal destruction.

Doth not God proclaim herein, that the things of this world are not to be valued or esteemed? If they had a real worth in themselves, would the holy and righteous God make such a distribution of them? Who would set his heart on those things which God poureth into the bosoms of the vilest men, to be a snare to them here, and an aggravation of their condemnation for ever? It seems, you may go and take the world, and take the curse, death and hell along with it; and what will it profit a man to gain the whole world and lose his own soul?

He doth continue to give perpetual instances of their uncertainty in the utter disappointment of men that have had expectations from them. The instances so multiplied as that most men in the world, unless they are like the fool in the gospel, who bade his soul take its ease for many years, because his barns were full, live in perpetual apprehensions that they shall speedily lose whatever they enjoy; or are under the power of a stupid security. By these ways doth God cast contempt on all things here below; discovering the folly and falseness of the promises which the world makes to allure our affections to itself.

Secondly. God hath added to their vanity by shortening the lives of men to so uncertain a season as it is impossible they should take any solid satisfaction in what they enjoy here below. So it is expressed by the Psalmist. "Behold thou hast made my days as a hand-breadth, and my age is nothing before thee."

God hath reduced the life of man to the small pittance of seventy years; casting what may fall out of a longer continuance into travail and sorrow. Besides, that space is shortened with the most, by various and innumerable incidents. In these seventy years, consider how long it is before men begin to have a relish of the things of this life; how many things fall in to make us weary of them before the end of our days; how few among us, not one of a thousand, attain that age; what is the uncertainty of all men living, as to the continuance of their lives to the next day; and we shall see that God hath left no such season for their enjoyment as might put a value upon them. And when, on the other hand, it is remembered that this man, who is of such short continuance in this world, is yet made for eternal blessedness or misery, which state depends wholly on his interest in things above, they must forfeit all their reason, as well as bid defiance to the grace of God, who give them up for things below.

Moreover, God hath openly and fully declared the danger that is in these things, as to their enjoyment and use; and what multitudes of souls miscarry, by an inordinate adherence to them! For they are the matter of those temptations whereby the souls of men are ruined for ever; the fuel that supplies the fire of their lusts, until they are consumed by it.

Men, under the power of spiritual convictions, fall not into sin, fall not eternally, but by the means of temptation. That is the mire wherein this rush doth grow. For others who live and die in the madness and wildness of nature, without any restraint from the power of convictions, need no external temptations, but only opportunities to exert their lusts. But those who by any means are convinced of sin, righteousness, and judgment, fall not into actual sin, but upon temptations. Whatever it be which prevaileth on a convinced person to sin, that is temptation. Wherefore, this is the great means of ruin to the souls of men.

Now, though there are many principles of temptation, many causes that actually concur in its efficacy, as Satan, and other men, yet the matter of almost all ruinous temptations is taken out of this world, and the things of it. Thence doth Satan take all his darts; thence do evil men derive all the means whereby they corrupt others, and thence is all the fuel of sin and lust taken. And which adds to this evil, all that is in the world contributes its utmost thereto. "All that is in the world is the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life." It is not a direct formal enumeration of the things that are in the world, nor a distribution of them under several heads; but it is so of the principal lusts of the minds of men, whereto all things are subservient. Wherefore, not only the matter of all temptations is taken from the world, but every thing that is in the world is apt to be abused to that end. For it were easy to show, that there is nothing valuable in this whole world, but it is reducible to a subserviency to one or other of these lusts, and is applicable to the service of temptations.

When men hear of these things, they are apt to say to unclean persons, drunkards, oppressors, proud, ambitious persons, it may be so; but as to them, they use the things of this world with a due moderation, so as they are no snare to them. But if the affections

of men are set upon them, one way or other, there is nothing in the world but is thus a snare and temptation.

Lastly. Things are so ordered in the wise dispensation of God's providence, that it requires much spiritual wisdom to distinguish between the use and abuse of these things—between a lawful care about them, and an inordinate cleaving to them. Few distinguish aright here; and therefore in these things will many find their great mistake at the last day.

Some make their own inclinations the measure of what is lawful; some the example of others; some the course of the world; some their own real or pretended necessities. They confess that there is an inordinate love of those things and an abuse of them. But their care, love, and industry, are all allowable.

Hence we may have men approving of themselves as just stewards of their enjoyments, whilst others judge them hard, covetous, earthly-minded; no way laying out what they are intrusted with, to the glory of God, in any due proportion. Others, also, think not amiss of themselves who live in palpable excesses, pride of life, sensual pleasures, vain apparel, feastings and entertainments, in direct contempt of the rules which our Saviour gives.—*Dr. Owen.*

[It is hoped our readers will not do themselves the injustice to pass over the preceding extract without a reading.]

ART. X.—*Letter to the Editor respecting a supposed Error in the Minutes of Synod.*

DEAR BROTHER,—On looking over the Minutes of Synod there appears to be an evident blunder committed, somehow, by the clerk,* in the minute of the committee's report on the Carolina Presbytery's Report of 1838. In the last resolution of that report, as it stands, all slave-holders are suspended from the privileges of the church; but, as amended and adopted by Synod, it should read, (after the above words,) "and are hereby PEREMPTORILY ordered to appear at the bar of the next Synod, to answer for their conduct." This I distinctly remember, and am sure the amendment was nearly in the above language. It is but justice to these suspended brethren that some intimation of this inaccuracy be made in the Monitor, to cut off all ground of cavil against the Synod's procedure, as harsh and precipitant. They ought to know as well the Synod's determination to pursue one uniform and undeviating course of discipline toward all slave-dealers, as her tenderness in hearing and

* We do not well see how the clerk could commit a blunder in the report of a committee which was transmitted to the publisher in the hand-writing of the committee, or how he should be any more responsible for the omission of the amendment than any other member of Synod, unless directed by Synod to insert it. We believe it is customary with the clerk to hand back reports to committees for the insertion of any amendments which may be made by the Synod. The omission is, therefore, as likely to be on the part of the committee as the clerk, and more so. It was, however, an oversight, in the hurry of business, which ought to attach no particular blame to any one. It is, probably, scarcely necessary to add, that the report stands, in the printed minutes, precisely as it is in the manuscript now lying before us.—*EDW. REL. MON.*

considering any *palliatives* to the contrary, if such be possible for sin. I have not the least apprehension that these southern brethren, who, I believe, are deeply implicated in the crime themselves, will, ultimately, pay any regard whatever to the decision of Synod; still, let the church preserve her purity, and purge out every thing that "is contrary to sound doctrine," and not "according to the glorious gospel of the blessed God." We dishonour the Great Head of the Church by retaining in communion those who barter and trade "in the persons" of men, and upon whom He has denounced judgment, "he shall die." Thus, whilst the Synod are perfectly justifiable in suspending these men, with all their coadjutors in crime, yet they should be shown all due tenderness until they evidence a determined obstinacy to persist in adhering to their criminal and iniquitous claims.

I should be glad to see some notice taken of the above mistake and correction in your next Monitor.

Yours, with great respect.

ART: XI.—*Correction, Explanations, &c.*

THE number of the Monitor for July contained the following statement:—"We have received information which may be relied upon, that one entire congregation, which had been led astray by the separatists from the church, have petitioned Presbytery for restoration to their former standing," &c. This statement was made on the authority of a letter addressed to us by a brother in the ministry, which stated that he had seen the petitions, one from the congregation, another separate one from an elder, to the same purport. The letter said nothing respecting publicity; but the fact communicated was one of public interest, which led to its insertion. We are persuaded that this was not a *wilful*, but inadvertent mistake on the part of our informant. The following statement is from a member of the Presbytery of Albany:—"You must have received incorrect information respecting the Newark congregation; I believe it is only a *minority* of what was the congregation that have expressed their adherence to us, though we have presbyterially recognised them as 'The Associate Presbyterian Congregation of Newark.'"

It is a rule with us to communicate no facts to the public, as such, without personal knowledge or a responsible name; it is hoped, therefore, that none will be hereafter communicated but such as their authors are ready and willing to substantiate. We have not the least inclination to suffer any thing farther on this score. If erroneous statements are communicated, the errors must rest with their authors; our own protection and that of our readers require

this much at our hand. The present matter, however, is, in our estimation, one of no very great consequence.

In our Prospectus it was stated, "No remarks can be admitted respecting individual cases of discipline. We cannot go beyond the record, or such comments as are authorized to be published, by the church courts." In answer to several queries on this point, we reply, that it was not supposed that this rule would deprive either ourselves or others of the liberty of repelling the false and malicious attacks which might be made, either upon church courts or individuals, by such as have become objects of necessary discipline. To our mind, these two things are sufficiently distinct.

It is not desirable to discuss the proceedings of ecclesiastical courts not of a general and public bearing, in the pages of a periodical. Imperfect, irresponsible, one-sided views of these things would not be for edification, could do no good, but might be productive of great mischief. The statement, by us, of a well known principle of church government, with a mere *hypothetical* expression of opinion on a question of order, respecting a complaint against the Presbytery of Stamford, has been misapprehended. Of that case we know nothing respecting the facts, and have expressed no opinion on its merits, for we have formed none. The Synod is not responsible, either directly or indirectly, for any thing which may appear in our pages, not authorized by itself. Neither would it be suitable for the editor or his correspondents to speak freely of any matters affecting her proceedings, other than her religious principles and published acts; by these only ought she to be spoken of in the pages of a periodical. The Monitor is the creature of individual and private enterprise, and its support is derived from such persons as judge it useful. These remarks are made for the benefit of a few individuals who appear to imagine that our work is, in some indefinable way, connected with the Synod, or exerts too much influence on her proceedings. It is quite too powerless for such an undertaking, were it so disposed; and none who have the honour, dignity, and consequent usefulness of our Synod near at heart would thank us for opening our pages to a premature discussion of any matter lying on her table not directly affecting her public profession. An attempt to prejudice a cause, almost uniformly disappoints the expectation of those who engage in it. This was one of the radical errors, from the beginning, of those who have recently gone out from us. These remarks, it is hoped, will prove satisfactory to the writers of several articles which have not found a place in our pages.

ART. XII.—MORAL STATE OF FRANCE. *Contempt of Life and Contempt of Death among the French.—Causes of this state of things.—Examples.—Consequences.*

WE learn from the history of mankind that life has been regarded of little value, and even insignificant, at all times when religion has lost its influence upon the mind. Thus, to quote but a single example, recollect with what levity and indifference the citizens of Rome lavished their lives under the reign of the emperors. Open Tacitus, and other historians of those profligate times; you will see that human blood was there shed, without the least scruple, in the performances of the circus, in the revels of a feast, in popular tumuks. Man braved death for the most contemptible reasons; he killed himself in a bath, or in coming away from a frivolous theatrical show, while laughing, while discussing a question in rhetoric, without any serious feeling, any thought consonant to the solemn majesty of death.

In the reign of terror of 1793, France presented a similar scene. Executioners and victims, all despised life and death: the one cut off the heads of their fellow men with perfect indifference, not taking even the pains to find any pretext for condemnation; the others went to the scaffold with a cold insensibility; laughing, singing patriotic songs, reciting a scene in a comedy, jesting, uttering blasphemies, each according to his caprice, at the dreadful moment when their life was about to be ended by the axe of their enemies.

At the present day, the same things occur; and I shall have occasion to cite frightful examples in the course of this letter. The French, at least very many of them, look upon life as nothing, and run to meet death without reflection, without fear, even without emotion, as they would go to a party of pleasure; they dispense with life as carelessly as a traveller throws off his cloak when he arrives at the door of a hotel.

What is then the principal cause of this contempt of life? It is *infidelity, materialism*. Many Frenchmen disbelieve a future existence; they suppose that man is merely a machine, so arranged as to last for a certain time; this machine is worn out by years; it then breaks; man dies, and all is over! Death is an eternal sleep! All is buried, all is annihilated in the tomb! No judgment of God; no eternity! Such is the horrible and detestable doctrine which, invented by sophists, has found in France too favourable a reception.

Now mark the result. If man is a machine destined to eat, to labour, to sleep some years; if he has no account to render after death; if annihilation awaits him in the grave, it is clear that he is always sufficiently prepared to die. His work is always done; let him die to-day or to-morrow, or in ten years, it is the same in his view; he needs no preparation to fall into annihilation! The Christian, or even the sincere deist, the man who believes in rewards and punishments beyond the grave, cannot reason thus. The present life is for him an indispensable means for preparation; it is necessary for his sanctification: A disciple of Christ knows

that he must be conformed to the image of God by faith in the Saviour; on this condition alone will he be admitted to heaven. Hence, every day, every hour is to him infinitely precious, because it contributes to ripen his soul for the eternal happiness of the elect. He will, therefore, prize life.

True, the Christian is disposed to sacrifice his life and despise death. But he does so in a totally different sense from the materialist; he boldly mounts the scaffold when forced to choose *between life and duty*. He then weighs the price of the life he must forfeit with the obligation imposed on him, and chooses readily, freely, with full knowledge of the case, death rather than apostasy or violation of the law of his God. He goes with a firm step to the grave, fixing his eyes on heaven. Glory, glory to the martyr who presents his head to the sword of the executioner, not from levity of mind and stupid insensibility—not to seek a base repose in annihilation, but to remain faithful to his Master and his heavenly Father! It is noble to die in such a cause! Mankind bow with respect before the intrepid confessors of Jesus Christ, who seal their faith with their blood.

But what a vast difference between this manner of despising death and that of the materialist; who, I repeat it, gives his life for the slightest cause, without being able himself to say what has prompted him to die! He is not influenced by religion or by patriotism, or any duty whatever, but by mere fancy, a momentary ill-humour, a fit of bad passion. Examples are numerous, and I shall be embarrassed to choose them.

First, *suicides*. Every morning the journals relate the deplorable end of several unhappy persons who have opened, with their own hand, the door of the tomb. But do you suppose these men who kill themselves have long and seriously meditated upon death, before seizing the pistol or the poison to consummate their suicide? Do you suppose they have weighty reasons for resolving to die? No, it is commonly the effect of a little impatience; some slight derangement of their calculations; a sarcastic or mortifying word which they have heard; a trifling dispute; want of work, a slight accident—whatever you can imagine most puerile and frivolous; for such things they throw away their life as too heavy a burden! they hide themselves in the grave, as children run away from a phantom! Lately, one of our most celebrated comedians killed himself: why? because he had heard a hiss! yes, a single hiss! And he was the father of a family! He had not scruple to leave behind him a widow and four unfortunate children; he did not scruple to plunge into the dark abyss of eternity, in order not to feel the pain which a slight mark of disapprobation at the theatre had caused him! Sometimes a young man, a child, takes his own life, because he has received a reprimand from his parents; or a woman kills herself, because she has been disappointed in love; or an old man, because he can no longer enjoy the pleasures of youth. It is estimated that there are, in France, at least three or four thousand suicides a year!

If these men had any religious sentiment; if they believed, even confusedly and obscurely, in a future life, a Divine judgment, eternal rewards and punishments, surely they would not kill them-

selves! Before taking the weapon to consummate their suicide, they would reflect on the terrible consequences of this crime; they would, at least, delay the deed, and to-morrow they would perceive that their despair was but an idle whim; a dream of their diseased imagination; a momentary pain. No, they would not kill themselves! But as religion does not restrain them; as they believe only in annihilation, they despise life, and quit it as easily as they quit a gaming table; they despise death, and go to it as readily as they would go to attend the opera.

Second example: *mobs*. When a mob occurs in Paris, you see immediately flock together labourers, young men, children, who take muskets and expose themselves to fall under the murderous bullet: why? They know nothing of political affairs; they have no idea of the organization of a government; no great absorbing thought animates them; they would even be unable to tell what they want and would demand, if they should be victorious. What, then, leads them to confront death? Nothing, or almost nothing. They sport with death, without attaching to it the least importance; their pulse beats no quicker in the midst of carnage; their brow is calm, their looks careless; still more, they try to jest during the struggle, and mingle bursts of laughter with the groans of their companions who fall by their side mortally wounded. The combat is to them a pastime, a recreation, an agreeable diversion from the monotony of life. Perhaps they will breathe in two minutes their last sigh, and leave in the streets disfigured bodies, sad objects of mourning to good citizens, and which will extort from their weeping mothers cries of despair. But they heed it not; like the Roman gladiators in the amphitheatre, they shed their blood to afford a horrid amusement and to draw forth the applause of the multitude!

It is hardly necessary to remark to what imminent dangers such a moral state exposes France. The man who sets no value upon his own life is master of that of others; being willing himself to die, he can commit any crime unchecked by the restraints of law; for, after all, the greatest punishment which society can inflict upon a criminal is death; and when death itself does not terrify, what defence remains for the public safety and the life of the citizens?

If there are in a country thousands of men who fear neither divine justice nor human justice, they will ever be ready to make attempts against the peace of society. Such attempts will be to them a matter of no serious consequence, and they will renew them on every favourable occasion. Are they conquered? very well! they die, and what of that? Sooner or later they must die; and as they need no preparation to return, as they believe, to annihilation, they lift the standard of revolt, singing some merry song. Where, then, is the power of the government? what dread is there of its sword? Suppose that a large part of the population should be led by materialism to the sentiments I have mentioned, is it not evident that the constitution could not long subsist, and that every thing would soon fall into anarchy?

This contempt of life and of death produces disastrous effects even in commercial business. Many men reason as follows: "I

am about to engage in a hazardous speculation; to venture my fortune in a sort of lottery; one of two things will happen: either I shall gain, in a short time, a large property, or I shall lose all. In the first case, I shall have a magnificent house, and display a dazzling luxury; in the second case, if I am ruined, one resource remains—I will blow out my brains with a pistol! On, then! and no false scruples! to be rich at once or to die!" And as they say, so they do. Suicide is one of the chances which enter into their calculations when they speculate; it is one article in the account of profit and loss. They form gigantic projects, adventurous enterprises, reckoning on a quick death if they do not succeed. And this explains why so many persons in moderate circumstances expose all they possess in hazardous speculations. What becomes, then, of honesty, prudence, confidence in commercial business? If these speculators valued life and believed the doctrine of the soul's immortality, they would be cautious; the prospect of suicide would not enter into their calculations; but, being materialists, they are under no moral restraint.

Others reason still more shockingly, if possible. I knew a person (a student in medicine) who said, coolly, and without the slightest feeling of shame: "I intend to give myself up to all my passions; I intend to enjoy myself in every possible manner, and to live in a continual revel. True, I shall not last long; my body will be worn out and grow old prematurely; my purse will be exhausted; soon I shall be the subject of great natural infirmities, with not a copper in my pocket. But it is all the same; this kind of life may last *one or two years*; I ask no more after this; a bullet through the head will rid me of an existence of which I shall be weary!" What shocking reasoning! This man had voluntarily reduced his whole earthly life to one or two years, and anticipated suicide with the stupid indifference of the savage who offers his head to the scalping-knife of his enemies.

We have seen (incredible fact!) the same doctrine advanced before the courts by an assassin, who was a man of some education. This wretch, named *Lacenaire*, gravely told the court that he had made a sort of *algebraic equation* between the advantages and the dangers of crime: "I knew well," said he, "that by killing others, I exposed myself to perish on the scaffold; but what is the punishment of the scaffold? it is a momentary pain: *and then comes annihilation*. I foresaw what has overtaken me; but, mean while, I have enjoyed the fruit of my assassinations, and I persist in maintaining that I made a good calculation. Since I have fallen into your hands, condemn me and cut off my head; you are my enemies, and I am yours: we shall be even. I do not at all regret having killed several persons, to seize what belonged to them; I would do it again, if I could." Thus spoke *Lacenaire* at his famous trial, and all France shuddered at this monstrous theory of murder, and at this shameless language. But why be astonished? *Lacenaire* was a materialist who carried his principles into practice. He consented, beforehand, to lose his life, if he might procure, by assassination, some physical enjoyments; he lived without God in the world; he had no conscience; he regarded a future life as a fable; what, then, could hold him, since he had broken

through the restraints of the laws, by losing the fear of death? Infidelity reaps what it sows.

Contempt of death is seen among us on memorable funeral occasions. When an illustrious citizen descends to the tomb, the people accompany him to his last home. There were, at the funerals of General Foy, Benjamin Constant, Manuel General Lamarque, a *hundred thousand* persons, and perhaps more. You would presume that, in this great mourning of the country, the multitude were attentive, respectful, serious, and that they showed some veneration for the bones of extinct generations, when they entered the grave-yard. Alas! no. The sight of human graves awakens no solemn reflections in this people. Even there, over thousands of graves, the French bring their political quarrels, their hatreds, their plots; and they disturb the majestic silence of the tomb by furious outcries against their adversaries. The republicans chose, for example, the funeral of General Lamarque to stir up a revolt against the government; and hardly were the mortal remains of the celebrated lieutenant of Napoleon committed to the earth, when blood was spilled in the streets of Paris! There seemed to be a disposition to sacrifice to him, as among the Pagans, a holocaust of human victims! This fact occurred only a few years ago, and the same scenes would be repeated on a similar occasion; this indifference to life and this contempt of death having lost nothing of their pernicious influence.

This trait in our national character is also observable in common conversation. If the death of a friend or relative is announced, the news excites no seriousness, no expressions of pious feeling. He is dead, says one, in a tone of levity; Well! this is the lot of all. Has he left a vacant office? a large fortune? Who was his physician? will he have a monument? he has made his successors wait long enough. And after these inquiries carelessly put, the conversation reverts to the theatre, novels, the fashions of the day. Oh! majesty of death! Oh! terrors of the grave! what have become of you? The infidel has reached the same goal with the Christian, but by a wholly opposite road. He can exclaim, in the language of scripture, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" because he throws to the winds the last fragments of his faith, as the Christian can utter these words, because he is assured of a happy eternity.

I will not pursue farther these sad details. Enough has been said to show how necessary is the Christian faith to nations, to families, and to individuals. Reflect on this contempt of life and death which prevails in France; weigh the consequences which must follow; behold society without protection, the laws without force, the most sacred rites without any solid security, crime without restraint; consider all the evils which must attend such a state of things; turn your eyes to the dark prospects which this demoralization is preparing for us, if Christianity does not revive in this country; and you will understand what a nation is, and what it can become, when it forgets its God, when it denies its Saviour.

G. DE F.

ART. XIII.—*The true ground taken on the subject of Psalmody.*

A WRITER in the *Christian Magazine* for July, 1839, page 242, speaks thus:—

“It was not only the privilege, but it was, by divine ordinance, the duty of the church to sing, in worship, the sacred songs contained in the Book of Psalms.

“It is called by our Lord ‘the Book of Psalms,’ (Luke xx. 42,) a name which denotes not only the poetic style of the compositions contained in that book, but also the manner and end of using them, that is, that they were to be used in connexion with music in praising God. This name, employed to designate that portion of the Holy Scriptures, was expressive of its peculiar nature and use, and would naturally lead to the inference that it was the will of God that those psalms, and THOSE ONLY, should be sung in his worship. Of similar import is the title which this book has in Hebrew, *sepher tehilim*, that is, *the Book of Hymns or Praises*, which plainly points out that the sacred book so named, or the prescribed forms it contains, were to be used in offering praise to the Lord. Those are the best hymns which were ever composed, and it is the will of God that the best should be sung in his worship to the praise of his great and holy name. The compositions which, in their import and entire structure, proceeded from divine inspiration, must be elevated in perfection, as well as in authority, far above the best of human compositions. It is not pretended that other than the former were authorized or used under the Old Testament; why, then, under the New Testament dispensation, should they be set aside, and human hymns be preferred to the divine, and substituted in their place? Will any one say that hymns constructed by uninspired men, under the present dispensation, are better than the hymns or psalms given of old by inspiration of God? If they are not better, why should they have the preference? Why should unlicensed imitations be allowed to usurp their place? Are they better than the originals? The ancient canonical psalmody is suited to the church now; if it were not, if a better were needed, there would have been some intimation in the Bible that it would be given. But there is not the least intimation of this kind given. But on the supposition that better psalms and hymns were needed than those which were unquestionably sung by the church for many hundred years, extending down through the whole period of our Saviour’s personal ministry in the earth, even on that supposition we must be confident in the conclusion that, as inspiration was necessary in making the sweet psalms then used, so plenary inspiration would be, at least, equally necessary in making psalms more perfect than those.”

ART. XIV.—*Synod’s Bible Society.*

IN conformity to a vote of Synod, we insert again the Constitution of her Bible Society, which was adopted in 1831. (See *Rel. Mon.* vol. viii. p. 20.)

“ Resolved, That the Synod adopt rules for their regulation in procuring and distributing copies of the Holy Scriptures, with the Psalms in metre.

“ In pursuance of this resolution the following rules were adopted, viz :

“ 1. The session of every congregation, whether settled or vacant, is desired to take measures, as soon as practicable after the adoption of these rules, for the raising of moneys, which shall be expended by the Synod in the procurement and distribution of the Holy Scriptures with the Psalms in metre.

“ 2. Every session shall be at liberty to raise moneys, either by an annual collection in the congregation, or by subscription from church members and others, or by both these methods, or by any other which may seem best calculated to promote the object in view.

“ 3. Every session complying with these regulations shall appoint a treasurer, whose duty it shall be to receive the funds collected, and forward them to the treasurer of the Presbytery. These treasurers shall also act as depositaries.

“ 4. The treasurer of the Presbytery shall receive all moneys collected within its bounds, and shall forward the same, as ordered, to the Synod, and the Synod shall, if required, transmit the amount in Bibles, deducting one-fourth part, which shall be left entirely at its own disposal.

“ 5. The Synod shall spend some time during each of its annual sessions in regulating such matters as are contemplated by these rules—the moderator presiding.

“ 6. The Synod shall appoint a treasurer to receive and pay out all moneys; and a depositary to take charge of the Bibles and answer all orders for the same.

“ 7. The Synod shall appoint an executive committee, consisting of five members of the church, whose duty it shall be to procure Bibles as ordered by Synod, and place them in the hands of the depositary: said committee shall also have the power to draw upon the treasurer above mentioned for such funds as may be at his disposal: and it shall be the duty of the committee to report annually to Synod.

“ 8. All persons, sessions, or societies not in communion with the Associate Church shall be entitled to receive Bibles to the amount of their contributions at first cost; and such individuals as are unable to pay shall receive copies gratis.”

ART. XV.—*Pious Sayings of Good Men.*

THE IMMUTABILITY OF JEHOVAH.—“ As in dividing to the nations their inheritance, and bounding their habitations, there is a Divine Providence which governeth the world, so, by continuing them in possession, on removing them at his pleasure: and this (oftentimes) by very unlikely means, and overruling things accordingly: Seir being given to Esau, and Ar to the children of Lot, (Deut. ii. 4, 9;) and their term not being expired, the Lord inclines them to let Israel pass through, and to give them meat for their money; whereas the Amorites, who were destined to destruction, ‘He hardens their heart, and makes them obstinate,’ (Deut. ii. 30:) that they deny them passage, and come out against them in battle. So, when he would translate the Chaldean monarchy to the Persians, he enfeebles the one, but stirs up the other’s spi-

rits, and girds them with strength, (Jer. ii. 11.) How oft doth the Scripture repeat, 'That the Lord reigneth.' (Ps. xciii. 1, xcvii. 1.) 'That he putteth down one and setteth up another. (Ps. lxxv. 7.) 'That he doth according to his will in the armies of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth, (Dan. iv. 35.) How evident is this in the humbling of Pharaoh, Nebuchadnezzar, and others! His providence reacheth to all manner of persons, times, and things; it circumscribes them; it leaves not the least thing to a contingency, even ravens, sparrows, and lilies; yea, the hairs of our head are all numbered, and under the conduct of the providence of God. (Matt. vi. 26.) See also 2 Chron. xx. 5—30."—*Coles*.

"WHAT IS REAL FAITH?"—The late King of Sweden was under great impressions of spiritual religion for some time before his death. A peasant being once, on a particular occasion, admitted to his presence, the king, knowing him to be a person of singular piety, asked him "What he took to be the true nature of faith?" The peasant entered deeply into the subject, and much to the king's comfort and satisfaction. The king, at last, lying on his death-bed, had a return of his doubts and fears as to the safety of his soul; and still the same question was perpetually in his mouth, to those about him, "What is real faith?" His attendants advised him to send for the Archbishop of Upsal; who, coming to the king's bed-side, began, in a learned, logical manner, to enter into the scholastic definition of faith. The prelate's disquisition lasted an hour. When he had done, the king said, with much energy, "All this is ingenious, but not comfortable; it is not what I want. Nothing, after all, but the farmer's faith will do for me."—*Toplady*.

PULPIT ZEAL.—No man was ever scolded out of his sins. The heart, corrupt as it is, and because it is so, grows angry if it be not treated with some management and good manners, and scolds again. A surly mastiff will bear, perhaps, to be stroked, though he will growl even under that operation, but if you touch him roughly he will bite. There is no grace that the spirit of self can counterfeit with more success than a religious zeal. A man thinks he is fighting for Christ, and he is fighting for his own notions. He thinks that he is skillfully searching the hearts of others, when he is only gratifying the malignity of his own, and charitably supposes his hearers destitute of all grace, that he may shine the more in his own eyes by comparison. When he has performed this noble task, he wonders that they are not converted. "He has given it to them soundly, and if they do not tremble and confess that God is in him of a truth, he gives them up as reprobate, incorrigible, and lost for ever." But a man that loves me, if he sees me in an error, will pity me, and endeavour calmly to convince me of it, and persuade me to forsake it. If he has great and good news to tell me, he will not do it angrily, and in much heat and discomposure of spirit. It is not, therefore, easy to conceive on what ground a minister can justify a conduct which only proves that he does not understand his errand. The absurdity of it would certainly strike him, if he were not himself deluded.

A people will always love a minister, if a minister seems to love his people: therefore you were beloved at Olney.—*Cowper*.

REPENTANCE.—True repentance is the tear of faith. Repentance is one of those graces, without which there can be no salvation. It is an essential prerequisite to spiritual peace on earth; and absolutely necessary as a preparative for the eternal happiness of heaven.

CONTROVERSY, properly conducted, is a friend to truth, and no enemy to benevolence. When the flint and the steel are in conflict, some sparks may issue, which may both warm and enlighten.

TRUTH is the only seed from which real holiness or happiness can grow; and unless seed be sown, we cannot expect a crop.—*A. M. Toplady*.

The most important truths cannot be too early learned, nor the journey that leads heavenward too soon begun. The enemy is awake while we slumber, and if we neglect to cultivate the good seed, his tares will cover the surface.

The great essential to our happiness is the resolution to perform our duty to God as well as we are able; and when this resolution is deeply fixed, every action and every pursuit brings satisfaction to the mind.

AN IMPROVEMENT ON CHRISTIANIZATION.—A letter from the Rev. Mr. Spalding, missionary on the Columbia river, to his friends in Boston, and published in the papers of that city, states that unprincipled swindlers who infest that region to speculate upon the moral and physical destruction of the aborigines, are in the habit of imposing packs of cards upon the natives for bibles; and that he has even known a native who had become a believer in revelation to give a horse for a pack of cards to one of these villains, who imposed it upon him as positively the Word of God. This

is a refinement in villany, which, as far as our reading extends, no people other than those of Christian America have ever attained.

"Little sins are pioneers to hell. The backslider begins with what he foolishly considers trifling with little sins. There are no little sins: there was a time when all the evil that has existed in the world was comprehended in one sinful thought of our first parent; and all the evil now is the numerous progeny of one little sin."—*Howells*.

"Never will I admit that our religion has in it any secret doctrine from the hearing of which the illiterate laity are to be excluded. The notion of the incompetence of the common people to understand the whole of the revealed doctrines is false and abominable. It is the very principle upon which the sacred text was for so many ages kept under the lock and key of the dead languages."—*Bishop Horsley*.

"Christ's sheep are not to be debased into the state of animals so called. They are of the same species with their shepherds, under Christ. They have not only eyes but understandings of their own; and the directions of the Chief Shepherd, the Great Shepherd of their souls, lie open to them in writing. The assistance, and advice, and warnings of the shepherds under Christ, may be of great use to them in many cases, but they are to be led, and not driven. They are to be led to the food prepared for them by Christ, and not driven to rank and unwholesome weeds instead of it. The greatest respect he ought to pay them, and, therefore, the only true regard due to them, is to compare their instructions with the doctrines of Christ, and either to receive or reject them, as they are agreeable or disagreeable to his word. Without this comparison of men's doctrines with the divine rule, he may be of such or such a particular denomination or church, but he is not, in that neglect, truly nor uniformly a Christian, because he forgets his close relationship to his only Lord and Master. It would be a deplorable consideration, indeed, if the great and important points of Christianity, those upon which men's eternal salvation depend, could not be judged of without learning, or were to be determined for men, not by their own capacities, but by the decisions of others, called learned men, who are constantly differing and wrangling with one another."—*Bishop Horsley*.

"Why is man for ever seeking after pretences to wander from home, when all the while the poor soul within him, buried in flesh and blood, wants its proper relief, begs his attention, and being known, would infinitely reward his curiosity."—*Adam*.

"Want felt and help desired, with faith to obtain it, is prayer; and without these qualifications, whatever is called so is nothing but self-deceit and lying to God."—*Ibid*.

"I may still look at the brazen serpent; I may look at Christ."—*Ibid*.

There is no labour so certainly effectual and so largely productive as that which is expended in the work of the Lord.

The love of Christ should constrain you to *live unto him*, and not merely to speak well of him.

The viciousness of the wretched, so far from exempting us from obligation to supply their urgent necessities, is an additional reason why we should endeavour to do them good, win their confidence, and save their souls.

Few men had ever more natural courage than Luther, and yet he was often heard to say, that even to the latest part of his life, he never could conquer his fear when he mounted the pulpit. — *Mason*.

ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.—At a meeting of the Associate Presbytery of Philadelphia, on the 25th of September, Mr. Joseph T. Cooper was ordained to the office of the holy ministry, and installed pastor of the Second Associate Congregation of Philadelphia. Sermon by Rev. John G. Smart. Rev. William Easton presided, put the formula of questions to the candidate, and offered up the ordination prayer. The charge to the minister was delivered by Rev. C. Webster, and to the people by Mr. Easton.

At a meeting of the same Presbytery, at the same place, held on

the 30th of October, the Rev. David Anderson, a minister from the United Secession Church in Scotland, was admitted to the fellowship of the Associate Church, and is now labouring in the vacancies under the care of Presbytery.

Mr. Thomas Simpson, also, was admitted to the study of theology, and directed to proceed to the seminary at Canonsburgh.

DR. M'CRIE'S LECTURES ON ESTHER.—We have copied the first of these excellent lectures into the present number, not knowing whether the book is generally in the possession of our subscribers. If it is found acceptable, we will give the whole work in the Monitor. A lecture in each number would soon take up the whole, and as it will occupy but little room in each number, those who possess the work will readily excuse its insertion for the benefit of such as have it not. We should like, however, to hear the views of correspondents.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The Convention of the Reformed Churches.—We had the promise of a copy of the minutes of this convention in season for the present number. That promise has not been fulfilled; but a satisfactory excuse for its non-fulfilment has been forwarded to us. This is the reason why the minutes of that convention do not appear in the present number. The reader will also perceive that a sketch of the discussion should be preceded by an authentic record of their proceedings.

Will not some of our contributors furnish something on the following topics? The duty of the church to adhere exclusively to the inspired Book of Psalms as the matter of her praise. The kingly office of Christ, including its bearing on magistracy and civil duties. The causes of division in the visible church. On the question, Is it practicable to unite the different ecclesiastical bodies in the United States which have adopted the Westminster Confession? If so, how is this to be effected? If not, why? On the divine appointment of Presbyterian church government in opposition to Episcopacy, on the one hand, and Independency on the other. On the present state and future prospects of the Jews, drawn from the eleventh chapter of Romans, as the basis of discussion. An exposition of the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians. For an essay on any one or all of the above subjects, which shall be judged worthy of insertion, to make not less than seventy nor more than one-hundred pages of the Monitor, the publishers will pay \$25 each, the author to retain the copy right. And if *one-half* of our subscribers who are indebted for four volumes and upwards will make payment on or before next meeting of Synod, this sum shall be doubled. If *three-fourths* will pay, it shall be increased to \$100 for each essay. Of this class of subscribers we have on our list upwards of one hundred. How they justify themselves we know not?

The circular of the committee of Synod respecting the funds was not received in season for insertion in the present number.

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,
AND
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

JANUARY, 1840.

ART. I.—SCHISMATICS.—*The Notes of a Sermon transcribed for the Religious Monitor, at the request of some who heard it preached.*

Rom. xvi. 18. "For they that are such, serve not the Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches, deceive the hearts of the simple."

THE sin and danger of divisions and offences in the church, and the importance and necessity of unanimity, had been much insisted on in preceding parts of this epistle. (Chap. xii. 5, 6.) Our Lord Jesus Christ, the great Prophet of the church, declared there would be offences, and indeed, that there *would be need* for them; at the same time also, he pronounced a wo on the world on account of them; but especially on the individual by whom they should come. (Matth. xviii. 7, and Luke xvii. 1.) What this *need* is, and the design of Providence in permitting them, seem to be pointed out, Cor. xi. 19—"That they that are approved may be made manifest." But this does not lessen the sin in those who are either the authors or abettors of them; nor does it diminish the vigilance, which it is the duty of the church and her friends to exercise, in guarding against them. In the preceding verse, the apostle has laid down a most effectual rule for preventing divisions and offences in the church, and guarding against their evil consequences, viz. "Mark and avoid those who cause them." This rule, if properly observed, would never fail of remedying the evil. It is the result of infinite Wisdom. Human wisdom can never devise a better. [For a discourse on this subject, see R. Monitor, August, 1830.]

In our text the apostle gives a description of some distinguishing marks of those who cause divisions and offences in the church, so that the church and those who love the peace and the prosperity of Zion, may the more readily recognise them, in order that they may be marked and avoided, and that their baleful influence and mischief may be the more successfully opposed. For let it be remembered, that it is not merely the doctrine and practical conduct of such that are to be marked and avoided—but the individuals or persons themselves, as Dr. Scott justly remarks, "as persons infected with a contagious disease."

Before entering on the main scope of the passage, we must premise a remark or two. 1. The divisions which take place in the church, and the offences or stumbling-blocks which are laid in the way of the simple, are in almost all cases to be ascribed to those within the church, and most generally to her public teachers. Some shall come into the church for the very purpose of dividing and destroying her. "For I know," says the apostle, "after my departure, shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock." (Acts xx. 30.) And again, (Gal. ii. 4,) he speaks of "False brethren, unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty, which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage." But, alas! the authorship of these evils is not confined only to such. How often do we find the offspring of the church, the children born within her pale, and brought up on her own knees, among the number of her troublers! "Also, of your own selves," says Paul to the elders of Ephesus, "shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." (Acts xx. 30.) The tendency of opposition from without, is to make the church more united; but that from within, rends and divides. 2. The success of such is not always confined to those of like minds with themselves—they too often "deceive the hearts of the simple." The term *simple* is here used in its primitive signification. "For one," says Cruden, "who is harmless, innocent, and free from deceit." Such are most easily deceived with the smooth words and fair pretences of false and deceitful men. "The simple believeth every word." (Prov. xiv. 15.) Being free from guile themselves, they are not aware of the snares which are laid for them by the crafty and deceitful. By the good words and fair speeches of the persons described in our text, their *hearts* are deceived, their affections are beguiled, before they are aware of the wickedness and deception practised upon them. But to proceed with the main design of our text—the description of those who cause divisions and offences in the church.

The description here given by the apostle may be considered under two general heads.

II. They are described by the end or object they have in view—to serve their own carnal purposes. This object is set forth in a two-fold view.

First. Negatively. "It was not to serve the Lord Jesus Christ." This is mentioned to show what the great and only chief object of all who make a profession of religion should be; and this is the main object of every true disciple. It may appear strange that any should desire to enter the church of Christ, and especially the ministry, with any but pure motives. But it is lamentably true, many do. Judas became a disciple, probably with no other design, on his part, than that he might carry the bag, (John xii. 6,) and indulge more successfully his covetous and avaricious spirit.

Some think they can serve the Lord Jesus Christ and their own belly, or their carnal purposes, both at the same time. But our Lord has declared, no man can serve two masters at once. (Matth. vi. 24.) Others think, they can more effectually gain the latter object by professing the former. They profess to serve Christ in order to accomplish their carnal purposes. Simon the sorcerer desired to be a

disciple that he might have the gift of working miracles and conferring the Holy Ghost by the imposition of his hands, in order that he might sustain the reputation of being some great one, of which he seemed most ambitious. (John viii. 8.) And others again, with the very design of destroying the church and the cause of Christ. Thus the Cuthean Samaritans professed to seek and serve the God of Israel, and wished to join with Ezra and Nehemiah and the other children of Judah and Benjamin in re-building the temple unto the Lord God of Israel. (Ezra iv. 2.)

But the apostle here seems particularly to intend such as profess to serve Christ, and under pretence of serving him, gain admission into the church and into the ministry, while in reality they are not serving him at all, but some selfish and carnal purpose.

1. Such as make a profession and labour in the ministry with great zeal and industry, to gain the applause and admiration of men, do not serve Christ. "If I pleased men," says Paul, "I should not be the servant of Christ." (Gal. i. 16.)

2. Such as labour to serve a sect or party in the church, or to build up a particular sect or denomination, merely because they belonged to it, are not serving Christ. Many may, and it is to be feared do, labour with zeal and industry with no higher object. The Pharisees would compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when they had proselyted him, he was twofold more the child of hell than themselves. (Matth. xxiii. 15.) Surely this was not serving Christ or his cause.

3. With the same class may be ranked such as will creep, or insinuate themselves into houses, to lead away and beguile the unwary and the weak. (2 Tim. iii. 6.)

4. Some of the same class are found even to preach Christ; but it is that they may more effectually "deceive the hearts of the simple;" or "out of envy and strife." (Philip. i. 15, 16.)

5. Those also seem especially intended, who are "ambitious of being at the head of a party in the church," or to give name to some sect, and in order to accomplish this purpose, "will speak perverse things, that they may draw away disciples after them." Acts xx. 30.)

Lastly. They do not serve Christ who follow, aid, countenance, or encourage such as cause divisions and offences in the church, according to the rule that he that biddeth God speed, or countenanceth another, in an evil thing, makes himself a partaker in the sin, and is equally guilty in the sight of God. (2 John, 10, 11.) The same rule is recognised with respect to another class of immoralities, "He that takes pleasure in those that do them," is classed with the perpetrator of the crime. Rom. i. 32. In this way many may ignorantly involve themselves in the greatest sins.

Second. Affirmatively. "To serve their own belly." A low object, truly. The term *belly* here, may be understood to include any carnal, gross, worldly, or sensual desire. Those who mind earthly things chiefly, who make their profession of religion and attention to moral duties subservient to the gratification of sensual and carnal propensities, are said to make a god of their belly - (Philip. iii. 19.) False prophets and false teachers, by whom "the way of truth is evil spoken of," are charged "with making merchandise of men through covetousness." (2 Pet. ii. 1, 3.) Such are enemies of the cross of Christ, and their end is destruction.

1. Some make religion and the office of the holy ministry the means of gratifying a pampered appetite. They profess the one and serve in the other, in order to live in ease and luxury; for in some places and in some ages, the office of the ministry has been subservient to these objects. Thus it was with the sons of Eli. 1 Sam. ii. 12, 16. This has most frequently been the case when the civil and religious influence were united.

2. Others serve a carnal appetite, who, like the dishonest but sagacious steward, could not or would not dig, and was ashamed to beg directly, will either make a profession of religion or aspire to the office of the ministry, with no higher object than to gain a living in this world. It was declared, concerning the posterity of Eli, that they should beg to be put into the priest's office, that they might eat a piece of bread. 1 Sam. ii. 36. Such will cling to the office for sake of its emoluments, after they have forfeited and lost their right to perform its duties. There is no motive for which persons may enter the ministerial office, more pointedly condemned, than that of gain. "A bishop must not be greedy of filthy lucre." (1 Tim. iii. 3.) "A bishop must not be given to filthy lucre." And again—"There are many unruly [persons who will not submit to the necessary and wholesome rules of church discipline,] and vain talkers and deceivers—whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake." (Tit. i. 7, 11.) (See also 1 Pet. v. 2.) These repeated and strong warnings against it, would not have been given, if this were not an object for entering on and continuing the exercise of the ministry. How unlike him who laboured night and day without having where to lay his head, and finally suffered on the cross for the salvation of souls!

"There are "greedy dogs" as well as "dumb dogs." (See Isa. lvi. 11, 12, and Mic. iii. 11.)

3. Such is the object of those who assume to themselves the administration of divine ordinances contrary to the rules of Christ's house, and profane or pollute them. Such were the prophets reproved by the message of the prophet Ezekiel, (chap. xiii. 19.) "And will ye pollute me among my people, for handfuls of barley and pieces of bread?" saith JEHOVAH.

II. Those who cause divisions and offences in the church, and who ought to be marked and avoided, are farther described in our text by the means which they practise to accomplish their object, viz.—*by deceiving the people by good words and fair speeches.*

We have seen what is the grand and ultimate end or object of such—to serve their own carnal purposes, but a subordinate end is necessary to the accomplishing of this main end; *the people must be deceived.* If their true character were manifest they could not "serve their own belly," because they could not "lead away disciples after them." Our inquiry now is, how do they avail themselves of these means to accomplish their main object? We answer:

1. By flattering those who hear or employ them. Thus did Ahab's prophets flatter him to his own destruction. (2 Chron. xviii. 5, 12, 27.) And Micah, the LORD's prophet, because he told the truth, was treated as an enemy. "Am I, therefore, become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?" (Gal. iv. 16.) Such also are the prophets who speak smooth things and prophesy deceits. (Isa. xxx. 10, 11.)

2. By promising peace to their followers in pursuing wicked and divisive courses. (Jer. xiii. 16, 17.) "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Harken not unto the words of the prophets, that prophesy unto you: they make you vain: they speak a vision of their own heart, and not out of the mouth of the LORD. They say still unto them that despiseth me, * The Lord hath said, Ye shall have peace, and they say unto every one that walketh after the imagination of his own heart, No evil shall come upon you." They do not censure for immorality. (See also Jer. viii. 10, 11, and xxviii. 1, 4, 15, 17, and Ezek. xiii. 16.) Such hold out to their deluded followers prospects of peace, while they are causing them to trust in a lie. They induce them to believe that their troubles will be settled and their conduct approved, until they have led them so far out of the way of rectitude, that they do not fear their returning to it. And while they are crying peace to the people, they themselves will be biting with the teeth of malice and slander. (Mic. iii. 5.)

3. They deceive the simple, by assuming the appearance of meekness, piety, and love. Outwardly they appear in sheep's clothing, while inwardly they are ravening wolves. (Mat. vii. 15, 21.) They do this with so much art and address that they would deceive, if it were possible, the very elect. (Mat. vii. 24.) Such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. And no marvel, for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light: therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness, whose end shall be according to their works. (2 Cor. xi. 14, 15.) They will make long prayers. (Mat. xxiii. 14.)

4. Such study to suit themselves to the temper and spirit of those whom they wish to deceive. Do they find any weary of the restraint which the discipline of the church imposes, like Absalom they are ready to promise a remedy if they will only follow them. Do they find any ambitious of distinction and office in the church, they will show them that their prospects are with them, and thus lead away disciples after them. (Acts xx. 30.)

IMPROVEMENT.—1. From this subject we may learn that it is the duty of all to *serve Christ*. Col. iii. 24. "Ye serve the Lord Christ."

2. That the enemies of religion often profess it, and desire to take part with its friends, and creep into the ministry, in order that they may the more effectually oppose it, or serve themselves by it. (Ezra iv. 2. Acts xx. 3, 8.)

3. That to promote or encourage divisions in the church of Christ, is a great and most aggravated sin. Such take the side of Satan in the great controversy. (Mat. xi. 25. Mark iii. 25—ix. 45.)

4. That "good words and fair speeches," are the usual means to which schismatics resort to carry on their evil purposes against the church of Christ, and especially when their design is to serve themselves.

5. Let every individual for himself see that he is not among those who are deceived or led away by such as cause divisions and

* Jehovah is despised when the ordinance of discipline in his house is despised and contemned. He that despiseth an ordinance despiseth the author of it.

offences. For those who countenance or encourage them, make themselves partakers of their evil deeds. (2 John 10, 11.)

6. Learn the end of such, and in order to avoid it, avoid them. "For many walk of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ; whose end is destruction, whose god is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things. (Phil. iii. 19.)

Thus, my brethren, I have attempted to set before you a plain, but scriptural warning against an evil and a danger to which the church, in all ages, has been exposed. And if you have to pass through a trial in this respect, think not that some strange or new thing has happened to you. The church, in all ages, has been similarly tried. But betake yourselves to Christ, her Head. He that keeps Israel, slumbers not nor sleeps—He is almighty. Hence, no weapon formed against Zion can prosper. The "good words and fair speeches," of Zion's most persevering enemies are as easily defeated by Him, whose name is "Wonderful, Counsellor," as any other weapon they can form. Commit her cause, then, to Him. Fly to Him yourselves for protection in a day of rebuke and dismay. He is not only "The Rock of ages, on which His church is founded, but he is also the Shadow of a Great Rock in a weary land. In Him, then, and in Him alone, you are safe. Amen.

ART. II.—*Societyism.*

MR. EDITOR—I observe in your October number "Queries respecting voluntary associations," and the remarks under this head, containing a sweeping denunciation. When I read the article, I felt inclined to *show mine opinion*, but ere this reach you, it is probable some of your able correspondents will step in to the satisfaction of the querist and other readers. A mere sketch is all that time and circumstances will permit. To survey the whole field is beyond my capacity, having no proper knowledge of many of the societies named, and the practical operations of others more familiar in name, lie out of my view; I shall, therefore, confine my very brief remarks to the principle of societyism and the comparative injury and benefits of a very few of those societies named.

I would premise, that where an accusation is brought against an individual or society, the burden of proof lies upon the accuser, and the accused should be deemed innocent until full proof is made. In the present case, it is enough for societies to plead not guilty to the charge of unscriptural conduct. If there is evidence in the affirmative, let it be shown. If the 106th Ps. is relied on for proof, I doubt its application, unless there is a mingling in something sinful, as was evidently the case in the history referred to. I cannot, therefore, see that this is proof in point to condemn the general *principle*. But if it is intended to apply to particular cases in practice, it is admitted in all its force. The Masonic society, for example, is morally and radically wrong in its origin, profane, and even blasphemous in its exercises, and most deleterious in all its consequences; never doing good, *but evil—only evil, and that continually*. Now all this admitted in practice, still the question of principle remains unsettled.

I take the position, that whatever is morally right for an individual to do, may be lawfully done by a society, when the articles of association, and the practice under them, are consonant to the divine law. Let it not be said that this is begging the question; for the question before us respects not the goodness of the articles, nor the practice under them; but whether it is lawful to form a voluntary association of any kind. It is a Bible precept to *do good to all men*; but all the ways in which this good may be done are not specified. Something, then, seems left to human prudence within the bounds of the moral law. If, in compliance with this precept, we associate in order to do good more extensively, for "in union there is strength," and yet violate no moral precept, where can lie the evil?

Some years since, female benevolent societies were common in the Secession church. They associated for the purpose of raising funds to defray the expenses of missionaries from the Associate church in Scotland, or to aid in the education of young men preparing for the gospel ministry in this country. Some, but *not all*, belonged to the Secession church. They met—had prayers, and, *as iron sharpeneth iron*, so their countenances encouraged each other. Their contributions went into the synod's funds, for which thanks were voted by the synod, as their minutes show; and the writer knows, that from one congregation alone, there went into the synod's funds, from this source, some two or three hundred dollars. And I appeal to the most strict observer of Providence, if ever there was a time of greater *peace and prosperity* in the Secession church, than when she had the prayers and contributions of those pious females. This example is given as an argument in favour of the principle of voluntary associations, and so far as human authority is good evidence, here is the testimony of the whole synod of North America. If that synod could see nothing unscriptural in all this, no wonder that I cannot.

The next point is the comparative benefit and injury arising from the practice of voluntary associations. I begin with the female societies above named, and I hazard the opinion without reserve, that much good and no evil was the result of the labours of those associations.

With respect to Bible societies in general, I would say, they do good by circulating a correct and authorized translation; but they err by circulating such as are not duly authorized. To the church is committed the oracles of God, and the church is the proper judge of translations—the word of the Lord should *go forth from Jerusalem*. In particular, the American Bible Society erred greatly, when the board decided that it would be unconstitutional to publish Bibles with the Psalms in metre, inasmuch as a metrical translation of the Psalms might be considered of the nature of a comment on the holy scriptures. These were about their own words, and as we pass, it was a dereliction of principle, for Seceders, at least, to acquiesce in such a sentiment; yet it is true, that many of them did so, by continuing members, to the neglect of judicious regulations, made by the synod of their own church, to furnish the very article requested of the American board, that is, the scripture Psalms in metre.

All missionary societies formed in the common way, who commission and send forth preachers, err, in that they usurp the authority of the church. This should be done by the *laying on of the hands of the Presbytery*.

The writer was once a zealous labourer in the Colonization Society, but he now entertains serious doubts, whether upon the whole it ever did any good; and he is now firmly of opinion, that at present, it is doing serious injury—as it lulls the consciences of many asleep, both in the slave states and the free, and rivets the chains of the oppressed. It furnishes a retreat for time-serving ministers and other such professors of religion.

With respect to anti-slavery societies in Europe, little can be said. I know they exist in France, in Hayti, (in Upper Canada, British America.) I will not be confident, but am under the impression that they existed in England at the time the slave trade was abolished; but it is well known that they were very numerous there, and the grand means of abolishing slavery in the West Indies, where the condition of hundreds of thousands was changed from that of slaves to free men in one day—no longer considered goods and chattels, but rational creatures, with liberty to worship and serve their Maker according to His revealed will. Every man allowed to have *his own wife, and every wife her own husband*, and the parents at liberty to *bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord*. What an important change! In all this, I can perceive no injury, but incalculable good.

Is it possible to discover any injury done to New York or Pennsylvania, when slavery was abolished there, by means of anti-slavery societies; but who is so blind as not to see the immense good accomplished? One of those societies flourished as early as 1785. "John Jay the first, and Alexander Hamilton the second president." Another in 1789, Dr. Franklin, president, Dr. Rush, secretary. Thus, men of that day, most renowned for wisdom, were not ashamed to be found at the head of institutions, now looked upon by many as odious, and the morality of their formation questioned. Then it was honourable, now it is odious. Then secretary Rush could act unmolested at Philadelphia, now secretary Lovejoy can be murdered with impunity by a mob at Alton. It is impossible to account for this difference of circumstances in any other way, than the increasing influence of slavery, and a prejudice as inveterate as it is unwarrantable.

As to the vast number of anti-slavery societies now in the full tide of experiment in this country, it is impossible to say how their labours may terminate; but the path of duty is clear; let them persevere and trust to Providence for a favourable result. They may be the *occasion*, but not the *cause* of excitement. Reproof of sin and attempts at reformation, have in all ages occasioned excitement; but this was no reason why the apostles should quit preaching the gospel of salvation to perishing sinners. Neither is it a reason why abolitionists should cease their exertions to save the nation from impending and awful calamities. The fruits of long anti-slavery labours in the West Indies were at last realized in one glorious harvest day. So Americans must toil and sweat, waiting in hopes of a like happy issue.

The very discussion of the subject is doing good—as for injury, I can discover none. To charge the mobocratic outrages of our day upon abolitionists, would be as unjust as to charge like conduct upon the prophets and apostles, so common in their day; for in all ages there are *lewd fellows of the baser sort*.

I cannot quite agree with the “Querist,” that those societies are “irresponsible to either church or state.” Individuals are held responsible for every transgression of law, either of the church or state, according to the capacity in which they act, and cognizance taken accordingly. But if there is no transgression of law, there can be no sin.

It is thought the church is every thing, and all that is necessary for moral reform. Be it so for the present—it is not intended to take any thing out of the hands of the church, but to aid in reformation. If the church, in all her branches, would show herself *fair as the moon—clear as the sun*, she would be *terrible as an army with banners*. But when most of her ministers never open their mouths respecting the most crying sin of the land, unless it be to extenuate or defend it, what can be expected from that source of reformation? Is it not strange that the church has to be stimulated to duty by the world, that abounding sin may be abolished? It is a lamentable truth, that the church and the free states sustain slavery!

It is, in many respects, a low time in Zion—Ichabod seems written on all the posts and pillars of the temple. It is a time calling for the earnest prayers of all, that the God of Zion would return in mercy and build up her broken down walls, and repair her desolations—and this is the desire of

A WESTERN CITIZEN.

ART. III.—*Farther Remarks on the Treatment of our Coloured Population.*

MR. EDITOR—Attention to pressing and necessary avocations has prevented me from pursuing my remarks on the treatment of our coloured population, as speedily as I desired. I shall now attempt, without farther delay, to bring the subject to a close. But before entering upon it, you will pardon me for making a few explanatory and other observations. This is a duty which appears to be imperiously imposed upon me, as the purity of my motives seems to have been called in question, and yourself and others think that I have manifested “temper” in my answer to Logan’s Interrogatories. If it be true, that while reproving others for indulging an imbittered spirit, I myself, before the lines were dry, or the traces erased from the tablet of my memory, was guilty of the fault reproved, it places me in no enviable attitude.

Why is it that we are so sensitive? Why is it that intolerance, like a noisome pestilence, is sweeping over our land, and desolating, and laying waste all our social relations? Is it not a fearful token that we are not sound in our social constitutions? The man who is hale and healthy in body, who is buoyant in spirit, and unsuspecting in temper, will bear much rough handling without betraying uneasiness; while, on the contrary, he who is covered with bruises,

biles, and ulcers, and whose temper is soured by indulging a fretful disposition, will scarcely suffer you to lay your finger upon him without writhing in agony. Amidst such intolerance, it was truly with a grateful heart that I cast my eye over your observations in the September Number. They were, indeed, an oasis in the desert, a verdant spot cheering to the pilgrim in his weary journey. How gladdening to see men, who by their talents and stations, are qualified to influence public sentiment, manifesting the liberality of the philanthropist and the meekness of the Christian. It is true, you smite me, and although I am not conscious that I deserve it, yet for your kindness I thank you cordially. Such smiting will not break my head. Reprove a wise man, and he will love you. Open rebuke is better than secret love. I have said that I am not conscious that I deserve your rebuke, but shall endeavour to profit by it, in the way of using vigilance and caution for the future, lest I offend.

Your friend thinks I manifest "temper." All I can positively say is, that I am not conscious of ever having entertained a hard thought, or indulged an unkind feeling toward Logan or any one else. True, I must acknowledge, that, like other sinful men, I am surrounded with infirmities. I find a law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and it is possible that an ardent constitutional temperament may have caused me to speak unadvisedly with my lips; but the idea of giving personal offence was not within the range of my thoughts. Truth has claims which are paramount to all others; but it does not require us to sacrifice the charities of social life. He who does not enter on its defence with all the ardour of his soul; he who will not use "words that glow," may not expect to enjoy "thoughts that burn." Every one accustomed to write or speak, knows that if a writer or speaker labours under a continued effort to repress the energy of his language, he will almost infallibly be visited with poverty of conception. Such is the construction of our minds—such the connexion of our ideas, that one train of thought flows as if these ideas were united by the ties of a common relationship; and he who plods upon the earth when he could soar above the clouds, is unfaithful to his trust. In religious controversy, as in all others, we ought to presume, that truth appears to our opponents in all the beauty, in all the strength, in all the loveliness that it does to ourselves, and is as capable of enlisting their understandings and engaging their hearts, as our own. How unreasonable, then, to object to the ardent zeal of those who are opposed to us when there is nothing disrespectful in their language!*

* There is much truth in these remarks, and readers should learn equally with writers to distinguish between bitterness of spirit and personal invective, and ardent zeal in the cause of truth. Some latitude of expression must be allowed. No man ever produced any thing worth reading while constantly trammelled with the fear that some word, which he deemed suitable to his subject, might be construed as too strong; unless writing rules of grammar for school boys, or some similar production. If the world impeaches the motives of Christians, it cannot be expected that it will admire their language. On this point, we have two classes of complainers: 1. Those who hate the meaning couched in strong expressions. 2. Those who like the meaning, but have fears that the manner will injure the cause. This class is in danger of paying too much deference to the enemies of the truth. A soft manner mingled with flattery may make hypocrites, not Christians. God's people, who love the truth, are not offended when it is maintained by the use of the strongest terms known to the English language, provided they breathe a Christian spirit—ED. REL. MOV.

Did I do injustice to Logan by misapprehending his meaning? I certainly understood from his "interrogatories," that he admitted that the Jews were authorized by the Divine law, to buy persons of the heathen, and hold them in involuntary servitude. Now, the question was, do we not disparage the Divine law, by insisting that such buying and holding are essentially sinful? I was led to put this construction on his language, not only by what appeared to be its simple import, but by that ceaseless effort which is made in some quarters to impress upon the mind a belief that the Mosaic dispensation was not only comparatively dark, but that it sanctioned the doing of things that were cruel and unjust. Whatever may have been the poverty of my reply, in point of argument, if my view of Logan's question was not altogether erroneous, I put it to the candid to say whether they will pronounce my language too severe. Be this as it may, it was no ground of offence to my opponent. I palpably misunderstood and put an unwarrantable meaning upon what he said, it was a good reason why I myself should stand abashed before an intelligent and sober community; but none that he should be offended.

I do hope that Logan will consider these matters more dispassionately than he appears to have done hitherto; for I do most solemnly declare, that my object is not a triumph over him, or any one else, much less a triumph obtained at the expense of truth. And here, I trust, he will pardon me for directing him to a point where he has evidently wronged himself. He asks why I complain of *misrepresentation*, when he quotes my very words, and then sets down as my words, "I am willing to see a person enslaved." To this I have two remarks to make. In the first place, I have complained little, and never have I spoken of *misrepresentation*, nor have I used any word which I supposed could, by any possibility, be tortured into an impeachment of the integrity, or understanding of those opposed to me in sentiment. In the second place—does not every body know, that we may quote an author's very words, and make him utter sentiments, not only contrary to those which he entertains, but to those which he has expressed. If I assert that I would be willing to see a person enslaved, rather than to see him put to a painful, lingering death, does another represent me fairly, when he leaves out the conditional part of the proposition? He cannot do so, unless the putting of a person to a painful, lingering death be regarded as a circumstance of no consequence. Here let me refer to a case which I presume has escaped the notice of few persons. The Bible says, in so many words, "There is no God." These are its very words. Now does the Bible teach the doctrine, that there is no God? It is just as certain, that the Bible teaches the doctrine, that there is no God, as that I have expressed a willingness to see a person enslaved.

Before I quit this subject, let me drop a hint to Logan, and to all others who may be disposed to put questions to people in a public manner on matters of general interest. It ought to be universally known, that this practice is not regarded as altogether respectful. The reason of this is obvious. It is not pleasant to be subjected to a teasing process, by the malignant or the curious, or even by the honest inquirer. When men choose to come before the public with

their reflections, they wish not only to select a subject, but wish to treat it in reference to particular results. Now, if it be courteous to interrogate men in a general way, it must be discourteous to refuse to answer. The consequence would be obvious. A person would be compelled to discuss subjects, which he, perhaps, had not examined very minutely, or be guilty of a breach of good manners. I might remark, that it is agreed on all hands, that there is no way in which a man is more likely to be entrapped in the snare of an artful antagonist, than by answering questions.

It is truly mortifying, that any thing should have taken place to render the declaration necessary on your part, that you would not suffer correspondents to abuse each other. I hope I shall be pardoned, situated as I am, for making a few general observations on this point, without excusing myself or implicating others.

What is the sum and substance of all that vituperation and abuse which religious controversialists of every grade and complexion are daily pouring on each others' heads? It is according to the interpretation of the Divine oracles, and in sacred language, summed up in two short words—Thou fool—thou hypocrite. The fool says in his heart, There is no God. The hypocrite professes to believe in God, but he serves him not. The first is wrong in head, the latter wrong in heart. Of the first it is said, "Fools shall not stand in his sight," and of the latter, "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers! how can ye escape the damnation of hell!" What awful language! and with what terrible majesty and authority is it spoken! What is the sentence pronounced on that mortal who usurps God's throne, judging the hearts and condemning the persons with whom he is associated? "But whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire." It would be consummate folly to attempt to add either force or perspicuity to such clear and emphatic declarations.

That the use of such language is impolitic, is equally as demonstrable as that it is awfully sinful. Does truth stand in need of such a defence? When we resort to the use of weapons which are clearly forbidden, may it not be naturally presumed that we are in possession of none that are lawful? Is it not an insult to our sense of natural justice, when we see a man act as prosecutor, as witness, as juror, and as judge in condemning those accused of crime? Is it not equally offensive to our sense of moral justice, when we see men instituting a court of conscience in their own bosoms, arraigning the motives and intentions of those around them, and pronouncing a sentence of condemnation against them? If we be in possession of facts, which we think the world should know, duty may require us to make them public, together with the evidence which proves them; but when it is clear that we are a party interested, nothing can exceed our folly when we proceed to condemnation. Whose prerogative is it to search the heart? "I, the Lord, search the heart, I try the reins, even to give to every man according to his way, and according to the fruit of his doings."

You think I would promote the interest of your periodical by dropping the controverted point. Your will shall be law to me on that point, so far as the nature of the case will admit.* I have

* We did not intend to restrict our correspondent. Our remark was offered as a suggestion.

heretofore only mentioned it incidentally as connected with the main business on hand, and it is perhaps not possible to inquire what is duty with respect to slavery, without adverting to it more or less directly. We are told that the relation of master is, in its nature, as sinful as living with a woman in a state of adultery, and that an entire separation is as necessary in the one case as in the other. Indeed, if the absolute sinfulness of slavery be admitted, I see not how the other consequence can be avoided. This, you at once will perceive, precludes all argument or inquiry on the subject, except what may relate to the most eligible mode of effecting the separation of the parties. If we tell them that the slave cannot be released from the fetters that bind him, except by the action of the commonwealth, that he can no more act as a freeman, and stipulate for wages, and recover his dues if he engage in commerce with a stranger, than he can with his master, still we are told the relation is sinful and must be dissolved, that duty is ours, and that consequences must be left to God.

I am at a loss to account for the sensitiveness which exists on this point. It would be ungenerous to attribute it to conscious weakness, and yet it is hardly compatible with that calm dispassionate composure, which entire confidence is sure to inspire. That people, who deem their property, their safety, and all that they hold dear, to be in danger, should, in such discussions, be tremulously alive, is not surprising, nor is it altogether unaccountable, that those who have imbibed strong prejudices against the coloured race, should rail out against the idea of mingling with them; but why people cannot discuss an abstract question which does not necessarily involve any of these consequences, nor any others connected with our interests, our prejudices, or our passions, is passing strange. It will not do to say it is a vital point as connected with the purity of the church and personal holiness. If it be so, such offenders ought to be expostulated with in all meekness, soberness, and firmness, and if found obstinate, the censures of the church ought to be inflicted on them. Be this as it may, it ought to be the desire of Christians who profess to walk together, to become thoroughly acquainted with each others' sentiments—for "How can two walk together unless they be agreed;" concealment is injurious to truth and dishonouring to Christ, and ought never to be practised. It has so much of hypocrisy mixed with it that we ought to avoid it as we do the viper in our path. It is usual for those who have prescription on their side, to regard themselves as the injured party when a division of sentiment takes place—but how people who were but yesterday of my opinion, can be outrageous with me to-day, because I think not as they think, is, to say the least of it, a little surprising. When we turn around, let the reason for our turning appear to us as justifiable as it may, we ought to be neither surprised nor offended if the world turn not with us. Let it not, however, be for a moment supposed, that I feel inclined to rebel against the authority of our church, or complain of those who have the direction of her course; for I hope, nay, I am sure, that they feel as little disposed to lord it over the conscience, as I do to submit to it.

Without admitting or controverting the sinfulness of slavery, it may not be amiss to submit a few plain propositions, which, if maturely considered, will lead men to think more logically on the subject. *By what* power or authority has the black man been consigned to perpetual bondage? By that of the commonwealth, unquestionably; individuals, as such, having no more to do with it than the inhabitants of another planet. Nine-tenths of our slaves descended to their present masters as a patrimonial inheritance. The law of the land and not an act of their own determined that they should be masters. Now as moral agents we are accountable only for actions in which we may exercise volition. Are individuals, as such, answerable for the unrighteous acts of the state? Without doubt they are not necessarily thus answerable. Do not the individuals who compose the commonwealth stand chargeable with the aggregate guilt resulting from its oppressive measures? Most certainly, but only such can be accounted guilty as sustain the ruling power of the state in its iniquitous course. Does not that master stand in the same position to a slave, who descended to him from his ancestors, as the kidnapper does to the man whom he feloniously steals from his country? This cannot be answered affirmatively, unless the master holds him *willingly*. From these plain positions, it would seem that a distinction ought to be made betwixt the master, who sustains the state in its iniquitous course, and he who stands in opposition to it.

These remarks have, perhaps, already exceeded the bounds that ought to have been assigned to them, but I feel as though I should treat Anti-Slavery with neglect, if I did not notice him. As you observe, he writes in a proper spirit, and says many good things. The great body of his argument, however, is not directed against any statement which I have expressed, or any position which I have attempted to maintain. I shall only notice one point, and that on account of its great practical importance.

He says, "It is just such characters as A. R. represents A. B. to be, that sustain slavery." Here I must surely have been misunderstood. If men would treat their slaves as A. B. is represented as treating his, they could not possibly be more useful to them, even in a pecuniary point of view, than indifferent hirelings, and the masters would have all the duties of guardians and protectors to perform, without remuneration. If such regulations could be enforced, it would prove the utter destruction of the system, and that, too, without delay. It is a fact, that few will deny who are acquainted with the south, that there are thousands of slave-holders who perform the duties of master, upon the very same principles, that their slaves perform their tasks—that of necessity. This is evident from the efforts which have been made, at various times, in different places, to free the slaves. To increase the number of this class, and to strengthen their hands, would seem to be a reasonable mode of abolishing the entire system, as it is generally acknowledged, that it is the slave-holders themselves that must do the work.

I think our author manifestly labours under confusion of thought. He speaks of freeing the slaves, at the same time deprecating the idea of leaving them subject to the action of law, in case of death,

or insolvency. He talks of their remaining in the employment of their former masters, while he intimates very plainly, that he regards slave-holders as no better than kidnappers. Whether he means legal or nominal freedom, he does not say; but it would seem from the general tenor of his suggestions, that one and the other mode was alternately prevailing in his imagination. The idea of a man freeing his slaves, and retaining them in his employ, can only be entertained by those who are satisfied with very loose thinking. How is it possible, for any one seriously to urge that masters may continue their slaves, after freeing them, in their employ, and yet shield them from their liabilities for the payment of debts, or descent to heirs, or even sale, as coloured persons running at large, without evidence of freedom, is more than I can conjecture. But Anti-Slavery thinks that bad as the people are in the south, these anticipated fearful consequences would not result to those who were freed, whether legally or otherwise, he has not informed us. Now it might be sufficient to reply, that he has much more confidence in the humanity and kindness of the southern people than I have, although I have never pronounced or thought them as bad as kidnappers. Among the Alpine hills, or Piedmont valleys of the south, where liberty is still fanned by freedom's breath, respect for the image of our Maker, as imprinted on the black man's face, may shield him from violence; but from the lessons of experience, which we have already had, we are warranted in saying, that in either the north or the south, the east or the west, it is, at best, only a cobweb security. Free them in the only way in which it can be done, and suffer them to remain where they are, and they must continue at the mercy of every vagabond who may choose to injure or insult them. I have already uttered such a sentiment as this, and it ought to be "iterated and reiterated," not only by the Monitor, but by every press throughout the land,—That, though substantial freedom be a precious boon, yet nominal freedom and substantial bondage is a curse rather than a blessing.

Our author, pressed on all hands, comes to the conclusion that if matters must come to extremities, let events take their course; it cannot possibly be worse than what we daily witness, as the legitimate fruit of the system of slavery itself. He thinks that such odious consequences might awaken inquiry, and be finally productive of benefit. Here he surely reasons in opposition to the plainest dictates of a sound understanding. If, through the prevalence of a monstrous vice, public sentiment becomes callous, is it likely to be awakened by the occasional perpetration of those very scenes which have blunted it? I, too, will inquire what might not be the influence of such examples? Assuredly, it would be any thing else than salutary. When worldly men, men who are every day virtually saying, "Who is the Lord that we should obey him?" see men who profess godliness, in effect visiting upon the heads of their defenceless dependents, the very worst evils attendant upon the foulest system of iniquity that ever disgraced the name of a community, that called itself Christian; will they not be hardened in sin, and blaspheme that worthy name whereby the Christian is called? Will such examples soften their hearts, and enlist their feelings in behalf of the pleading of such advocates? On the contrary, will

they not be more and more persuaded that whatever may be the pretensions of such to elevation of principle, and sanctity of life, they are nevertheless hateful deceivers, and selfish hypocrites?

We are here told that, "Reformation work is severe work, that it is like plucking out right eyes, and cutting off right hands, and that the innocent are often involved with the guilty." I feel the utmost respect for Anti-Slavery; I question not his piety, I question not the powers of his understanding, nor do I call in question the goodness of his heart; but is not this scripture woefully misapplied? If it were the cutting off of our own right hands, or the casting from us our own right eyes, I could let it pass most certainly without rebuke. But who here is the sufferer? Does he call upon the sinner to mortify his darling lusts,—to cease rolling sin as a sweet morsel under his tongue? No such thing. It is the suffering, unoffending African,—the frantic husband, the weeping wife, and the fatherless children whom he would dismember; while those whose darling lusts ought to be mortified remain unscathed? It may be said that masters in this case would be sufferers, but this I deny, as we are speaking with special reference to those who regard the freeing of their slaves as a privilege, and not as a sacrifice.

Many persons, foreseeing that to free slaves and suffer them to remain where they are, would only expose them to additional hardships, insist that it is the duty of their masters to transport them beyond the operation of those laws which oppress them. That such may be the requisitions of the law of love, under a supposed condition of things, may readily be admitted; but to assert it without any qualifying reservations, is saying more than can be successfully maintained. Man's circumstances change, but principles are immutable. If this doctrine had been preached at the promulgation of the gospel dispensation, who does not see that it would have involved consequences horrible to contemplate? The tenderest relations of life would not have been disrupted, but the Christian bondman must be transported to remote, and to him unknown regions, and cast among those of strange language, strange laws, barbarous in manners and customs, and aliens from the commonwealth of Israel. Has any one who advocates this course ever realized it in his own bosom and conscience? It is known, that notwithstanding all the unfavourable influences which bear upon the interests and feelings of masters and slaves, there is nevertheless in many cases a strong family attachment, something like that engendered by kindred ties subsisting between them. Now for one not only to consent to, but to drive from his house a member of his family, who must abandon every earthly tie, and take up his abode in a distant strange land, is a task which a martyr would shudder to exchange for the stake. We think it cruel that free people of colour should be compelled, through force of circumstances, to give a reluctant consent to be transported to the land from whence their forefathers came; but this does not unavoidably involve the disruption of ties which the law of God says shall not be broken.

Admit that they ought to be thus transported, who ought to do it? We are told that this is a duty which masters owe their servants. This does not clearly appear. It has already been shown that it is the commonwealth, and not the master, who has made the

black man a slave, and, consequently, if the master withdraws his claim upon him, he stands precisely in the same relation to him as any other member of the community. If it be asserted that for former services rendered by the slave, the master is thus bound, I reply, that the slave may or he may not have rendered unrequited service. If he has, he ought to be compensated according to his equitable right; but this implies not the most remote obligation to place him in a foreign country. Besides, has this man, whom we now contemplate as free, no right of volition? If he chooses, like the servant of old, to say he loves his master, his wife and his children, may he not have his ear bored, and serve him for ever?

What would be a reasonable conclusion drawn from the positions here maintained? If I have been at all successful, is it not plain that if the slave-holder treats his slaves according to the directions of the divine law, in reference to servants, and manifests a willingness to surrender them into the hands of the church, to be disposed of in such manner as it may deem best calculated to promote their spiritual and temporal interests, they ought not to be regarded as worthy of censure?

A. R.

ART. IV.—*Occasional Hearing*.—No. III.

BY A RULING ELDER.

HAVING proved the first two things proposed, I shall proceed to the third and last, which was—That ministers of *all* other denominations, stand on the same ground in relation to us, as our own do while under suspension. And if this proposition can be clearly established, I apprehend that the doctrine, that occasional hearing is sinful, will be fairly and fully proved.

But, before advancing the arguments to establish the point in question, it will be necessary to make some remarks respecting suspension, and those who may be its objects. Suspension is an act of discipline of divine appointment, and is expressed in scripture, by such terms, as, “withdrawing from,” not “having fellowship with,” &c.; and is the church’s declaring that the person or persons suspended, have been guilty of sin, either in principle or practice, which they have not yet forsaken, or, for which the church is not yet fully satisfied of their penitence; and that she cannot hold fellowship and communion with them, while they continue in their present condition. And the more common way by which this is effected, is, by church judicatories, excluding individuals from the privileges of the church. But it sometimes happens that the majority of the church are the offenders, and the minority cannot obtain a vote to exclude the guilty from ordinances: In such a case, however, they can do the same thing, by withdrawing from the majority, stating their reasons for so doing; which is virtually as much suspending of the others according to the scriptural meaning of the term, as though they had done it by direct vote. And, what is bound on earth, is only bound in heaven when it is in accordance with the requirements of the scriptures.

With regard to those who may be the objects of suspension, I would observe, it is only such as have made a profession of the Christian religion—those who have come within the pale of the visible church; for, saith the apostle, “What have I to do to judge them also that are without? do not ye judge them that are within?” Now all, or nearly all denominations of Christians acknowledge professors of other denominations to be members of the visible church, by receiving into their communion those who have been baptized in other denominations, without rebaptizing; and by receiving ministers and elders, who have been ordained in other denominations, without reordination. Having made these remarks, I proceed to prove the point in question, namely, that ministers of all other denominations stand on the same ground in relation to us, as our own do while under suspension.

When the Associate Church published to the world their Act and Testimony, they thereby publicly declared on what principle they would hold communion with professing Christians. All who accede to these principles, and have a walk and conversation becoming the gospel, we take into our communion; while we reject all who hold any principle opposed to the truths therein witnessed for; believing that on scriptural grounds, such persons could neither be received, nor continued in our communion. And by this, we virtually say, such persons, if professors, are suspended from the communion of the Associate Church; for observe, they do *not* say that they are not members of the visible church; neither do they say, that they will *never* hold communion with them. But they do say that they consider them members of the visible church; which is evident from the fact, that we receive without rebaptizing and reordaining those who leave the communion of other churches, and join ours. And they farther say, that they will hold communion with them, as soon as they accede to our principles; which is placing them on the same ground with those of our own ministers, whom we may suspend for error.

Again, if our Act and Testimony be a judicial act, declaring ourselves in communion with all churches who hold the truths therein witnessed for, the reverse will necessarily follow, that it is a judicial act, excluding from our communion, for the time being, all those who reject any of those truths, which is suspension, according to the definition given of the term.

But to illustrate this point still farther, let us suppose that a minister of the Associate Church falls into the errors of some of the surrounding denominations, say the Arminian errors, he would be suspended from the communion of the church; but farther, suppose that a minister from some denominations holding the Arminian errors, should make application to be received into the communion of the Associate Church, reserving the privilege to hold and teach his Arminian principles, he would be rejected. Now as both these individuals have been rejected from the communion of the church for the same sin, they must surely stand on the same ground. But all other denominations have been rejected from the communion of the Associate Church, whether they desire admission or not, on account of their errors, which are declared in our Act and Testimo-

ny to be sinful. Therefore, they also stand in the same relation to us as this suspended minister—the thing to be proved.

But again, let us suppose farther, that the individual in the first supposed case, should join after he was suspended the denomination whose principles he had embraced, this step would be a total rejection of the authority of the court who had suspended him, and would be but augmenting his sin. Now it has been proved that it would be sinful to hear such a minister preach, before he had taken this last step, and as this would be only increasing his sin, it cannot be right now. For it is presumed, none will plead that to reject the authority of a court disannuls its just decisions. Therefore, as it is still sinful to hear this individual preach, if ministers of other denominations stand in a different relation to us, than our own do while under suspension, then it follows that there are in other denominations, some ministers holding the same principles, and of equal standing among themselves, some of whom it would be sinful to hear, while others it would not, which is absurd, and would, if true, lead to inextricable difficulty and confusion.

But perhaps it may be objected that there must be some difference in the relation between us and our own ministers, while under suspension, and the relation in which we stand to ministers of other denominations, as, in case the former should return to our communion, they would be rebuked for their errors, while the latter would be received without any censure.* To this it may be replied, that this by no means proves that in the last case, they are not as really suspended as in the other, any more than in the case where two individuals are suspended for intemperance: in the event of their restoration, the greater offender is rebuked, while the other is only admonished,—if even that would prove that they both had not been suspended.

It is presumed that the above remarks conclusively show, that ministers of other denominations stand on the same ground, in relation to us, as our own do while under suspension, and all professors with whom we will not commune, are held in the same condition; and, therefore, the doctrine is established, that occasional hearing is sinful.

* It is the universal practice of courts in the Associate Church, as far as the writer is informed, to receive into our communion professors of other denominations, on their acceding to our principles, without requiring them to acknowledge their sin for their past errors, and without censuring them for this sin. But this, no doubt, is a dereliction of duty; and one, for which churches are frequently severely chastised. Now, if such persons made application who were guilty of some scandal, a different course would be pursued. For they who sin before all, must be rebuked before all. But how has it come to pass that this scripture rule is only applied to some kinds of sins? But farther, were applicants for admission, from other denominations, required to acknowledge their sins for their past errors, and to submit to censure for them, we would not have so many examples of individuals who had become offended, not at their principles, but at their ministers, session, or some members of the congregation, acceding to our principles in full, and then, in a short time, because some of these principles were preached, which in heart they never believed, take offence and return to their former profession, if not to one still more unsound.†

† An acknowledgment of sin for "past errors," is implied in the application for admission to our communion, whether the applicants come from the world or ano-

ART. V.—*Extracts from a Clergyman's Diary.*

A MERCY TO BE IGNORANT OF THE FUTURE.

It would be both sinful and foolish, to wish to know how long we shall live, and where, and how, we shall die. It is sinful thus to attempt to penetrate into what God has not revealed; to attempt to lift the veil which covers the counsels of Jehovah; to break through the clouds which surround the throne of Him who holds in his hand the keys of life and of death.

And it would be *foolish* to wish to know the moment when our numbered days will be closed in death. If the veil which covers our future prospects were instantly withdrawn, and all that would come upon us thrown open to our view, we would see reason to adore the wisdom and mercy of God in hiding the future from us under a dark and mysterious veil. If blessings were in store for us, we would be so eager to grasp them, as to forget present duty, and present mercies. If the sinner saw before him a long and prosperous career; that the sword might pass through a land, but should not kill him; that the pestilence might hurry thousands around him to their graves, but should not touch him; such an individual, with such knowledge, would be a curse to society. No crime that he would not commit, who thus knew, that for these crimes, death could not overtake him. He would trample on every law human and divine. He would brave the vengeance of God and man. He would neglect his duty, and destroy his soul. Again, if the believer saw before him days and nights of bitterness and sorrow; if he beheld overwhelming trials rushing upon him, and death following after, to close in a month, or year, the painful scene; fear and anguish would fill his soul; the dismal prospect would plant his pillow with thorns, and lead him sinfully to wish for death before his Father's work was ended.

AFFLICTIONS.

Afflictions, what are they but love tokens from my Lord, marks of his favour which he has put upon me; ornaments more precious

than profession, differing from ours. They are not censured for past errors, because our ecclesiastical jurisdiction does not extend beyond our own communion. We do not read that the apostles inflicted censure for past errors upon any class of applicants. They required *confession*, evidence of repentance, and a *profession* to avoid their past errors in future. Applicants from other denominations lying under charges of scandal, should be remitted to the body in which the offence was committed, to give the requisite satisfaction to the party more immediately offended. If, however, this be altogether impracticable, it is supposed our courts may proceed to require satisfaction according to the established laws of discipline, either of the body from which they came, or of our own body, or of both; should there be any difference between the laws of the respective bodies, not unscriptural.

Persons making application from unworthy motives, the case supposed by our correspondent, at the close of his note, if these motives can be discovered by sufficient evidence, (and a rigid examination of principles will generally develop their motives,) are to be promptly rejected, regardless of the source from which they may come, till they give sufficient evidence of repentance and reformation. The direction of the apostle to Simon Magus, is suitable to such persons.—EDIT. REL. MON.

than pearls, and gold; badges of sonship for which I bless him. "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory."

DEATH ENDS ALL THE HOPES OF THE WICKED.

The wicked man in this world may be wealthy, and honourable. With the rich man in the parable, he may be clothed in purple, and fine linen, and fare sumptuously every day. He may be able to say, exulting in hope of future pleasure, "Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years. He may have no pangs of conscience. It may be seared. As he has by his worldly life made it his interest that there should be no Judge, no hereafter, so he may try to believe, that the judgment is a jest, eternity a dream, and death an eternal sleep. As he has lived like a brute, only for this world, so like the brutes he hopes to die. Every day that rolls over him may find him revelling in wealth, and rioting in sinful pleasure. Every day may add to his gains till he can scarcely count his money, or compute the value and extent of his possessions. He may be looking forward to years of prosperity, and ease; when, in a moment, God will cast the fury of his wrath upon him. The arrow of death will reach his heart. "Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee. *This night*, devils commissioned as the executioners of divine justice shall demand thy soul, to be dragged away in its wickedness into the fire of hell. "Then whose shall those things be which thou hast provided?" Your heir may be a wise man, or he may be a fool. He may curse and not bless your memory for what you have hoarded up. But whether improved, or misimproved, these riches are gone from the dying man. For them he has offended his God. For them he has wasted his day of mercy. For them he has sold his soul. And now, when his eyes are closing in death, his body racked with pain, and his soul convulsed with agony while hovering on the brink of an unknown eternity; his splendid mansion, his full tables, his boundless wealth cannot stay the hand of the avenger. Die he must. Even now the hand of death is on him. His last pulse is beating, the shadow of death is over him, his last breath is dying away, the film of death has covered his eyes, the clammy dampness of death is felt on the lifeless clay, and he has sunk down with a fearful looking for of judgment and of fiery indignation to consume and overwhelm his soul. Before the corpse is wrapped in its winding sheet, before the friends have had time to tell his acquaintance the time of his funeral, before the body is laid in the coffin, and carried out to the grave, the soul is sentenced, and in the deep ocean of the wrath of God buried for ever. While the prophesier of smooth things is pouring forth perhaps false, and unwarranted, and delusive praise over his corpse; the soul has heard the voice of the God of the Bible, the Lord of judgment, "Depart, ye cursed," and is sinking in the abyss of wo. While the careless and worldly attendants on the funeral, full of their dangerous and unscriptural charity, are talking about the certainty of his salvation, or saying, "if he is not safe, alas, for thousands!" the soul has become the sport and prey of malignant fiends. A splendid shroud, a gorgeous coffin encloses, and a pompous funeral attends his lifeless clay; but

the flames of hell are the soul's winding-sheet, the prison of hell the soul's grave, in which it must lie and suffer for ever. The sword is drawn which will pursue it for ever. The flames are kindled which will burn over it for ever. How different from this the death of the Christian! He is not afraid to die. Believing in Jesus, relying on his infinite merits, washed in his atoning blood, covered with the spotless robe of his righteousness; the Christian regards death as one of his treasures; the valley of the shadow of death as the way to that blessed world, "where the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest. True it is, that God sometimes, to teach us his sovereignty in the bestowal of his grace, to show us that we are to judge of the state of the departed more from the holy principles, and devoted life, than from a death-bed, permits those who are dear to him to die under a cloud, to go down to the grave filled with fear, till the very moment that the glories of heaven burst upon the disembodied soul. Still, in whatever way the believer dies, his soul is safe. The hand of death, a messenger of mercy to him, has gently cut the thread of life, the spirit is free, the veil is drawn, eternity stands disclosed, the gates of heaven are open, and the heir of glory enters in. Well may he call the veil of death, what Jacob called the place where the angels met him, *Mahanaim*: for there the hosts of God, the glorious angels, will meet the child of God, encamp around him to defend him on his death-bed from the bands of fallen spirits, and bear in triumph the freed and ransomed soul to the throne of their Father, and our Father, of their God, and our God.

MAXTON.

ART. VI.—*Letter to the Editor*

FROM REV. A. WHYTE.

York Dist., S. C., Nov. 23, 1839.

MY DEAR SIR:—The Religious Monitor, for November, has just been received. Permit me, sir, to call your attention to the extraordinary communication, "respecting a supposed error in the minutes of synod." I cannot suppose you gave that communication, so much at variance with facts and the spirit of the gospel, your wonted attention; for its admission into the pages of the Monitor is contrary to the profession you have uniformly made. The admission of such an insidious attack upon the character of members of synod, in as good standing certainly, as your correspondent, appears to me most extraordinary. Has it come to this, that we are "suspended brethren," and receive the first intimation of it through the pages of a periodical? If the synod, as your correspondent insinuates, has really suspended us, why have we not received intimation of the fact, long ago, by order of synod, and through some respectable channel, instead of hearing it for the first time through the press, and resting upon the authority of, (to us at least,) an irresponsible letter-writer? I must think it was an oversight, on the part of the editor, in giving publicity to such a paper, and confidently trust, that, in the succeeding number, the proper corrective will appear.

With your correspondent I can have nothing to do. From the spirit he has manifested, I have no hopes of redress, through him. I do not wish to know more of him than appears in his letter; at the same time I do not know but one source, from which it could spring. Who, or what is he, to denounce judgment upon brethren in the ministry, as though he were invested with papal powers? Who is he, that pretends to the gift of prescience,—that usurps the prerogative of Jehovah, and declares with so much assurance, the course which will be pursued by the “southern brethren.” The “southern brethren” are prepared to act, when the period for action arrives; and if they could for a moment suppose, that your correspondent utters the language, and breathes the spirit of a synod of Christian ministers, they would not hesitate long as to their course; for with such spirits they have no sympathy, and will have no fellowship. Yours, truly,

ARCHIBALD WHYTE.

P. S. I think justice demands the publication of this brief notice, but if you deny me this poor privilege I have no redress. I hope however it will meet your approbation, and that you will give it a place in your next.

Remarks.—On this letter we have a few brief comments to offer:

1. It is admitted because it contains the *sign manual* of the writer, a circumstance, which, in our estimation, renders him only responsible. Had it been presented in the shape of an ordinary communication, its admission would, indeed, be “contrary to the profession we have uniformly made.”

2. A southern climate and familiarity with scenes of oppression, we fear, have exerted a deleterious influence on the amiable qualities, and suavity of manners, which formerly characterized our brother Whyte; and our prayer to God is, that he may not in the end, suffer loss through the pressure of these extraneous influences. This is to be feared; for nothing is more certain, than that the spirit of slavery first *blinds*, and then *inflames* the soul. It has produced this effect upon thousands, and the language of our brother's letter gives us a sufficient warrant to say to him, “Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed, lest he fall.” “When Ephraim spake trembling, he exalted himself in Israel,” &c. Hos. xii. 1—3.

3. This letter contains an *implied* admission that the writer is involved in the sin of slavery; an admission which we certainly had not anticipated. This admission is implied in the sentence,—“If the synod, as your correspondent insinuates,” &c. Our correspondent *insinuated* nothing. He stated a fact, that “all slave-holders are suspended from the privilege of the church.” How brother Whyte could regard himself as suspended, without considering himself a slave-holder, is more than we can fathom.

4. The remark of our correspondent respecting the apprehended course of our southern brethren, was not in strict conformity with

that charity, which "thinketh no evil," and "hopeth all things," unless he had evidence, not in our possession: that he possessed such evidence, appears highly probable, nay, almost certain, both from his own, and Mr. Whyte's letter.

5. With Mr. Whyte's grievance at an act of synod, at a want of intimation of that act, through some *respectable* source, the nature of that redress, of which he speaks, his style of remark, &c., are things with which we have no particular concern, the discussion of which would be in some measure contrary to the course we have marked out for conducting the Religious Monitor, and the final issue of which belongs to Mr. W. and the synod, the only parties with whom it should be left.

Finally, it is not anticipated that our correspondent will see cause to offer any reply. Our pages should be filled with more useful topics.

ART. VII.—*Distinctive Names in Ecclesiastical Bodies.*

THE name by which a religious body is designated, is a matter of minor importance; it is, nevertheless, necessary as a mark of distinction, as names among men. Sectaries, of the most erroneous character, attach great importance to a name; and, of course, assume very plausible and imposing names. The infamous Joanna Southcot, who gave out that she was the destined mother of the Saviour, had inscribed upon her church the designation—House of God; a more appropriate designation, certainly, would have been—The Synagogue of Satan. The same may be said of modern Arians, who designate themselves the Christians, as if that designation were to them exclusive property. It is certainly very unappropriate to them, since they deny in Christ supreme divinity, the only consideration that can entitle him to our esteem and worship. The same may be said, also, of the great Antichrist, which assumes the undeserved designation of Holy Catholic Church; while, at the same time, she is the most unholy sectary that ever disgraced the Christian name; and is, accordingly, designated by inspiration—"The whore of Babylon, and mother of harlots." As, in judging of a book, we are to look farther than its title; so, in judging of a religious denomination, we must look farther than to their ecclesiastical name. You justly observe, Mr. Editor, in your November No., p. 291, that names come to lose their original meaning by division and subdivision, by relinquishing original principles, and assuming others of an opposite character. In this way, a party comes to have nothing original but the name. Having changed their principles, they have no more right to the original designation, than the wife who has left her husband, and associated with another man, has to be called by his name. Such persons considerably resemble the seven women, Isa. iv., who are said to take hold of one man, saying, "We will eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel, only let us be called by thy name, to take away our reproach." In times of the Reformation in England, considerable legacies were left to the Presbyterian Church.

The Arians, to have a pretext for claiming these legacies, assumed the Presbyterian name. So, of late, the New England Congregationalists, though Hopkinsian, have assumed the name Presbyterian, that they might seem akin to the Presbyterian Church, with which they have been most improperly incorporated.

When a party in a church change their principles, and yet retain the original name, they must thereby mean to impose deception upon their hearers, pretending to be still the same, that they may be induced to follow them in their receding courses. Were they to assume a new name, or connect themselves with another religious denomination, however congenial to their own views, it would forcibly suggest the idea that there was a change of principle, which might induce them to demur, if not entirely abandon them. When a change is designed, integrity requires an open avowal; then people could not be imposed upon: being warned, they can think and judge for themselves. The conduct of Paul, in this respect, was most exemplary and worthy imitation: said he—"I speak as to wise men, judge ye what I say." He wished the truth to be known, and he made known nothing but what he believed to be the truth. You justly observe that they (the seceding party) rob the Mother Church of the cognomen, which they inherited from their fathers, and justly merited by holding fast their very principles. Those holding the original principles, are certainly the exclusive proprietors of the name, originally assumed when the church was first organized. This will hold good, though the seceding brethren were not apostatizing, but even advancing in religion. This was well illustrated by the fathers of the Secession Church, who, upon abandoning connexion with the community established by law, on account of errors in doctrine, and other corruptions, took the appropriate designation of Seceders, or Secession Church; for this was precisely what they were; and this designation can with propriety belong to none but those holding the original principles of that church.

Some years ago, a division took place in the Reformed Dutch Church. The minority, holding the original principles of that church, took the prefix *True*, as an appropriate distinctive appellation: a designation which their erroneous brethren, though the majority, could not claim. These observations are occasioned, Mr. Editor, by your remarks on the two bodies claiming the designation Reformed Presbyterian. You justly observe, that a new appellative is necessary to distinguish the two bodies. I know of no distinctive appellation more appropriate than those of *Old and New Light*. These designations are not entirely novel. They were used in Scotland long since on a similar occasion, when a division took place in the Burgher Church. A *New Light* minister, in conversation with one of his elders on the subject of party differences, said, "It is dark times." "O no," said the elder, "there is much *Old Light*, and a good deal of *New Light* getting up!" Certainly when an individual or a party view things in a different light from what they formerly did, they must have got *new* light on those subjects. Since, then, the seceding brethren wish still to retain the original name, which they have legally forfeited, they cannot consider themselves as nick-named, in having the designation *New Light* prefixed. They ought thus to designate themselves, both in speaking and

writing. Though, unless holding fast what they have already attained, or going on to perfection, this New Light, as a Scotch author has called it, can be nothing but "*old darkness.*" Any that would wish to have a view of the change of their principles, can have their wish fully gratified by reading the Newburg edition of Wylie's Sons of Oil. The contrast between that work and his Pastoral Letter is given in the appendix. The difference there brought to view, and other of their modern publications, compared with their former, fully entitle them to the designation of New Light. Then Old Light must belong, as a matter of course, to those holding their original principles.

Thus, Mr. Editor, I think I have furnished your *desideratum* of a cognomen, by which the two synods, without circumlocution, may be clearly distinguished.

Yours, &c., OLD LIGHT.

ART. VIII.—*How shall they preach, except they be sent?* Rom. x. 15.

MR. EDITOR—Unbelief, pride, and licentiousness, are the men of renown, the giants of our days; no precedent, or principle, or established order in church or state, is able to stand before them. Were it not that the Lord Christ, who is more of might by far, reigns, and hath an interest to support upon earth, we might well believe that the destruction of society was at hand. Christ puts forth his power for the protection of his interest, by his word and providence. The question at the top is a word from him—commanding many prominent agents to stop proceedings, and the people to cease from following them. How far a discussion of it may have this effect, remains with him to determine. We have, indeed, just reason to fear that his Holy Spirit hath ceased to strive with large numbers, in all the churches of the reformation. But, so long as the way is open, it is our duty to speak to men on this all-important subject. While I shall endeavour my best to answer the question, I ask the patient and serious attention of the reader.

The question implies its own answer in the negative. It is like other questions in the apostle's writings; for example—"How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?" plainly we cannot. And his meaning is as plain, that they *cannot* preach who are not sent. If a man choose a text of scripture, and profess to discuss it, it includes all that many understand by *preaching the gospel*. Although he maintain the necessity of works as a ground of justification, or affirm a universal atonement, or deny the divinity of our Saviour, still it goes by the name of *preaching the gospel*. The ravings of fanaticism, and the dry morality of a heathen, claim this appellation equally with God's ordinance. But I need not spend time to prove that the claim of none of these will be allowed. To teach divine truth as a science, is not to preach the gospel. This, indeed, cannot be done in the church without being *sent*, still there is something more belongs to the preaching of the gospel that does not strictly belong to this. And it is this; namely, *authoritatively* to declare the truth, as a message from God to sinners, and to make an

offer of salvation to them in *Christ's name*. Luke xxiv. 47: "And that repentance and remission of sins should be *preached in his name* among all nations," &c. It is manifest that none can do this in sincerity and truth but those whom Christ has *sent* to do it. If any man would take on him to declare authoritatively the way of salvation, and make an offer of it to sinners, as God's offer to them, whom Christ had not commissioned to do so, would he not be an impostor? Suppose a rebellion had broken out in some part of the states, and the government had it in contemplation to offer them terms of peace, and some man, who happened to hear of them, takes it upon him, without the consent or appointment of the government, to go and offer these terms to the rebels; every man of common discernment can answer how *he* is to be regarded, and whether the government is in any measure bound to stand by his offer. So it is in this case.

The notion under which the gospel ought to be received necessarily implies, that he who preaches it ought to have a mission from *Him* whose gospel it is. It is this: "Because, when ye received the word of God, which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth *the word of God*, which effectually worketh also in you that believe." 1 Thes. ii. 13. If it cannot be duly received, unless it be received *as the word of God*, it ought to be delivered as his word, or as a *word from him*. But none can bear a word from him unless *he send* them with it. The character every where given to the gospel implies that the preacher is one *sent* by the author of it. *First*, it is called a *word sent*. Acts xiii. 26: "To you is the word of this salvation *sent*." To the same purpose it is called *tidings*, ver. 32: "We declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which was made to the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same to us their children." Rom. x. 16. It is called "glad tidings of good things." The bearer of tidings was a messenger appointed for the purpose. *Second*, it is called *the word of Christ*. "If ye abide in me and *my words* abide in you," &c. John xv. 7. "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly," &c., Col. iii. 16. In Thess. ii. 13, and many other places, it is called "the word of God." If it is the word of God, then he that delivers it must first *receive* it from God, for this purpose. Gal. i. 11, 12. "I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man; for I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." The terms of office which belong to those who preach, necessarily imply that they must act under a commission from the Head of the church. Paul styles himself "a servant of Jesus Christ." Rom. i. 1. James says he is "a servant of God, and of the Lord Jesus Christ." Ch. i. 1. And Peter, "a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ." 2 Pet. i. 1. "Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ and brother of James." ver. 1. "And he sent and signified by his angel to his servant John." Rev. i. 2. This name belongs to all who preach the gospel, and Christ is their Master, and consequently they are employed and sent by him. The term minister is of similar import. It is one who serves or administers to the church's necessities, whether in temporals or spirituals, according to an *appointment*, according to the following texts: "Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but *ministers* by whom ye believed, *even as the*

Lord gave to every man?" 1 Cor. iii. 5 "Let a man so account of us as of the *ministers of Christ*," ch. iv. 1.

In the same place they are called "Stewards of the mysteries of God." If stewards, they must be first put into the stewardship (which is the same thing as commissioning them to preach;) and he who puts them into it "requires that they be found faithful."

Again, they are called ambassadors; that is, one who negotiates at a foreign court in the name of his prince. But, before one can be an ambassador, he must receive from his prince both *credentials* and *instructions*. So it is precisely in this case.

Let us hear the infallible authority—"And hath *given* to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and *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." 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, 20. Perhaps there is no text exhibits more fully and expressly the truth which I am endeavouring to illustrate than this. In perfect agreement with this, Christ says, Mat. x. 40, "He that receiveth you, receiveth me;" because he had said before, ver. 16, "Behold I *send you forth*." The importance and necessity of a divine appointment to preach the gospel will be seen in the most clear and forcible light in what the Scriptures declare respecting Christ's own appointment: for he was himself *sent*. He received his appointment immediately from the Father, and he was emphatically the minister of the gospel as none ever was. It is remarkable, too, that the Spirit of God has declared at the same place where Christ's call to office is proved, that no man can have the honour of office by taking it at his own hand. Heb. v. 4: "And no man taketh this honour to himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron." Not that no man has attempted to take it, for many have, both under the old and new dispensations; but they cannot in this way ever possess it. "So also Christ glorified not himself to be made a high priest; but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten thee." "As he saith also in another place, Thou art a Priest for ever," &c. Never was any mission so fully attested to the church as his was. Many of his *names* are taken from it, such as Shiloh, Messiah, Angel, Messenger of the covenant, and Christ. His conception in the womb and his birth were announced to the church by an angel from heaven, as one whom the Father had chosen and *sent*. When he was presented to the Lord in the temple, according to the law, the Holy Ghost pointed him out under this character to Simcon and Anna. At his baptism a public attestation was given to him, when the heavens opened, by the Father and the Holy Spirit. And he himself lays the greatest stress upon it. He urges his being anointed and sent of the Father, as the great reason why he ought to be received, and obeyed. He makes mention of it with a frequency that is truly remarkable. Take the following instance, John iv. 34: "My meat is to do the will of him that *sent me*, and to finish his work." Ch. v. 23, "He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father that *sent him*." Ver. 24, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that *sent me*, hath everlasting life." Ver. 30, "Because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father

which hath *sent* me." Ver. 36, "The works that I do, bear witness of me that the Father hath *sent* me, and the Father himself which hath *sent* me, hath borne witness of me." Ch. vi. 38, 39, "I came down from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of him that *sent* me. And this is the Father's will which hath *sent* me," &c. Ver. 40, "And this is the will of him that *sent* me, That every one which seeth the Son," &c. Ver. 44, "No man can come to me, except the Father, which *sent* me, draw him." Ver. 57, "As the living Father hath *sent* me, and I live by the Father," &c. Ch. vii. 16, "My doctrine is not mine, but his that *sent* me." Ch. viii. 16, 18, "For I am not alone, but I and the Father that *sent* me, and the Father that *sent* me beareth witness of me." Ch. xi. 4, "I must work the works of him that *sent* me while it is day." Ch. x. 36, "Say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and *sent* into the world, Thou blasphemest." Ch. xi. 42, "But because of the people which stand by I said it, that they may believe that thou hast *sent* me." Ch. xii. 24, "Jesus cried and said, He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that *sent* me." I forbear to quote a great many more texts in which the same thing is asserted. Is it then to be supposed for a moment, while a mission from the Father is so indispensable and important to *him*, who is Wisdom and Truth itself, who is holy, harmless and without guile, that fallen and apostate man may enter on the *same work without one*? Is man more capable and trustworthy than God? Christ himself has given us to understand, very plainly, that a divine mission from Him is as indispensable to us, as was a mission from the Father to him, or rather, that we must receive of the very same authority at his hand, and every one severally as he willeth. John xvii. he says, in his intercessory prayer, "As thou hast *sent* me into the world, even so have I also *sent* them into the world," ver. 18. And after his resurrection, ch. xx. 21, he addressed the same words to the disciples. "As *my* Father hath *sent* me, even so send I you." And when, in connexion with this, we consider that a short time after this, and before he ascended, he gave in form what was to be the terms of the commission, to preach his gospel to the end of the world, as follows: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen." Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. And as this was among the last things, or the very last which he did, we may warrantably conclude that the question is answered, that none can "preach, except they be *sent*." This was not, as any may see, meant exclusively for the Apostles; they were not to live to the end of the world, but this gospel was to be preached to the end of it, and here is the authority which Christ meant to be given and received to preach it till that time. That the church did act agreeably to this, till she began to "Leave her first love," and grow corrupt, is not to be doubted. What Paul says to Timothy, may be considered as representing her uniform practice for a long time. "And the things which thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." Tim. ii. 2. Long after this time we find the church of Ephesus commended by the Lord Christ for

calling pretenders to an account, and inflicting upon them merited censure. "And thou hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars," Rev. ii. 2.

In conclusion, on this question, it may not be improper to notice, that a Divine commission to teach or preach in the church was deemed as highly important under the law as it is under the gospel. Witness, for example, how particularly the commission of Moses is set down, *Exod.* chapter iii.—iv. And as an attestation of it to the people, and to Pharaoh, he was empowered to work two miracles. No less striking were the proofs of Aaron's call to the priesthood. Besides God's express intimation of his election to that office, he must be publicly and solemnly invested with it, before all the people. The space of time which was occupied with this was no less than eight days, and the account of it takes up wholly the eighth and ninth chapters of *Leviticus*. And when all this did not yet satisfy a number of them, the Lord farther attested his appointment in the most awful and incontestable manner—first by the destruction of Korah and his company, and Dathan and Abiram; second, by causing Aaron's rod to bud; and by causing the brassen censers used by Korah, to be made into a covering to the altar, that as long as the children of Israel should see them there, they might remember that it was a perilous undertaking, indeed, to approach God's altar, *without being sent*. The account of this also fills two chapters, the sixteenth and seventeenth of *Numbers*.

In a most solemn, and impressive manner, were the Levites also invested with their office. First, they were to be cleansed, then offerings were to be offered for them—farther the whole assembly was to be gathered, and they were to put their hands on the Levites, then Aaron was to offer them before the Lord, for an offering of the children of Israel, "That they may execute the service of the Lord," *Num.* chapter viii. When Joshua was to succeed Moses, he also must be called, and receive a charge. "And Moses and Joshua went and presented themselves in the tabernacle of the congregation."—"And he (the Lord) gave Joshua the son of Nun a charge, and said, Be strong, and of good courage, for thou shalt bring the children of Israel into the land which I swear unto them: and I will be with thee," *Deut.* xxxi." 15, 23.

As to the prophets, there was this rule to be observed. Any one claiming to have an immediate mission from God as a prophet, must both preach sound doctrine and work a miracle. If he did not speak according to the law, or if he enticed the people to idolatry, though he did *seem* to work a miracle, yet was he not to be believed, but to be laid hold of, as an impostor, and put to death. "If there arise among you a prophet—or dreamer of dreams, and give thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or wonder come to pass whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods, which thou hast not known, and let us serve them, thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet—and that prophet or dreamer of dreams, shall be put to death," *Deut.* xiii. 1, 2, 3, 5. "But the prophet that shall *presume* to speak a word in my name which I *have not commanded him to speak*, or that shall speak in the name of other gods, even that prophet shall die. And if thou say in thine heart, How shall we know the word which the Lord hath not

spoken? When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously," chapter xviii. 20.

If this question, and its answer, shall be deemed worthy of a place in your pages, I propose as soon as I can to send the following questions and their answers. How are men sent to preach? How may the people *know* when they are sent, and when not? In what light is the preaching of unsent men, to be viewed? Have we any warrant to expect a blessing upon such preaching? What is likely to be the effect of it? What is the spirit of the times? What is our duty?

ΔΙΑΚΟΝΟΣ.

ART. IX.—*Efforts of Calvin and Farel for the Maintenance of Discipline.*

BERTELIER, one of the factious, a man of the most abandoned impudence, who had been forbidden the Lord's table by the presbytery on account of his many crimes, entered the senate, and petitioned them to authorize the abrogation of his sentence. Had this request been granted, all the bonds of church discipline would undoubtedly have been broken, and all church order immediately dissolved. Calvin, therefore, with great earnestness and boldness, in the name of the presbytery, opposed it, and proved that the magistrate ought to be the avenger, not destroyer of the sacred laws, and he neglected nothing which so momentous a dispute required. The false clamours of those, who asserted that the presbytery, in some cases, usurped the power of the magistrates, triumphed; and a resolution was passed, on the question being brought before the grand council of two hundred, that the final decision, on all cases of excommunication, should be vested in the senate, with a power to absolve such as they thought fit. Agreeably to this decision, Bertelier secretly obtained letters abrogating his sentence, and confirmed by the seal of the state, from the senate, which did not at that time direct its attention to the careful investigation of this subject. Perrin, and his faction, expected that Calvin would either disobey the orders of the senate, and thus sink under popular tumult, or if he obeyed them, all the authority of the presbytery, and with it all the powerful restraints upon the wicked would, without difficulty, be afterwards broken for ever. But Calvin, having received notice of this resolution only two days before the administration of the supper, as usual, in September, uttered, during the sermon with uplifted hands, and in a solemn tone, many severe denunciations against the profaners of mysteries whose sacred character he described; and "for my own part," said he, (after the example of Chrysostom,) "I will rather suffer myself to be slain, than allow this hand to stretch forth the sacred things of the Lord to those who are lawfully condemned as despisers of God." This voice, wonderful to state, produced such an effect, even upon his unbridled enemies, that Perrin immediately gave secret orders to Bertelier, not to present himself at the table, and the sacred mysteries were cele-

brated with a surprisingly profound silence, and under a solemn awe, as if the Deity himself had been visible among them. But, after dinner, in the course of his explaining that remarkable passage in the Acts of the Apostles, where Paul bids farewell to the church of Ephesus, Calvin protested that he was not the man who either himself knew any thing about resisting magistrates, or taught others to do so, and exhorted, at considerable length, the people to persevere in the doctrine which they had heard. And in conclusion, as if it was the last sermon he would preach at Geneva, he said, "Since affairs are in such a state, permit me also, brethren, to apply to you the language of the apostle, 'I commend you to God and to the word of his grace.'" These words struck his abandoned enemies dumb, in a surprising manner, and the good were more seriously confirmed and admonished of their duty. Calvin, the next day, accompanied by his colleagues and the presbytery, deliberately demanded of the senate, and the council of two hundred, that their case should be determined by the people themselves, since the law, whose abrogation was then under consideration, had been made by the people.

The opinions of these two ruling bodies were changed after such observations, and it was resolved that the decree of two hundred should be suspended, the four reformed states of Switzerland consulted, and no alteration in the mean time should take place in the existing laws. Thus the storm being broken rather than quelled, the leaders of the faction endeavoured, from the concurrence of particular circumstances, to make it fall upon the head of Farel, which, contrary to all expectation, had been averted from that of Calvin. For Farel, who had suffered so severely from a violent disease in the month of March, visited Geneva as soon as the restoration of his health allowed. In his sermon, relying on the justice of the cause, on his age, and former influence, he reproved with great keenness the supporters of faction. They complained loudly that Farel had done them a serious injury, and on his return to Neufchatel they procured letters from the senate to the government of that state, for the purpose of allowing Farel to be summoned to Geneva, and to answer for himself on the day appointed. Farel came, and was exposed to considerable danger from the factious, who cried out, that he ought to be thrown into the Rhone for his conduct. A prudent, discreet, courageous young man, in the first place, frequently warned Perrin to use every exertion that the common father, as it were, of the city, might not suffer any injury. He was afterwards joined by one of his companions, another young man of integrity, who advised such as were friends of good order what measures they ought to adopt. The concourse of a great part of the city took place when Farel seated himself in the court. His accusers, astonished at this circumstance, and being now anxious for their own personal safety, earnestly entreated for the acquittal of Farel, after an audience had been given him. Thus nearly the whole of the year was spent against the wicked, in contending either for good doctrine, or wholesome discipline.—*Beza's Life of Calvin.*

ART. X.—*An Incidental Argument against Immersion.*

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN INSTRUCTOR.

SIR,—In reading the 47th verse of the 10th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, the other night, I was particularly struck with the expression, “*Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?*” To my mind it conveyed a powerful argument in favour of administering the ordinance of baptism by the application of water to the person, and *not* by putting the person into the water. The argument was all the more powerful that it was indirect, undesignedly introduced. The apostle does not seem in this passage, to have had any thought of a controversy about the mode of administering baptism: but satisfied that these Gentiles were partakers of the thing signified by baptism, he considers it unreasonable that they should be deprived of the sign, and asks, “*Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized?*” Now I ask could such language have been used with any degree of propriety, upon the supposition that they were to go to the water and be dipped into it? Does not the expression plainly intimate that the water was to be brought to them, and to be applied to them? I do not adduce this as the strongest argument in favour of baptism by sprinkling, nor would I rest the decision of a controversy upon an incidental expression. Nevertheless, I think it ought not to be overlooked. I do not know whether the idea is new to me or not; nor, if not, where I got it; but it never struck me so forcibly at any former period.

If you think the above worthy of a place in your interesting miscellany, it is at your service, from a
 CONSTANT READER.

ART. XI.—*Essay on Family Worship.*

By the Rev. W. H. Burns, of Kilsyth.

PART I.—THE OBLIGATIONS TO FAMILY WORSHIP, DERIVED FROM REASON AND SCRIPTURE.

IN the devout observance of the LORD'S DAY, all ages and all ranks are directly and nearly concerned;—the child, the youth, the adult, the gray-haired, the leaner on the staff of age, and the dying, who would enter on the saint's everlasting rest. The subject of this essay is one more immediately, though not exclusively, addressed to the heads of families, whose appropriate duty it is to erect an altar for God's worship in their dwellings; to appoint the time suitable for convening their households for the offices of social worship, and to conduct the service, Abraham-like—acting as the Prophet, Priest, and King, “*commanding their children and household to keep the way of the Lord.*” (Gen. xix. 18.)

As the *Sabbath* is ancient, co-eval with the creation,—so is family worship of great antiquity, co-eval with man's social and *domestic* relationship.

This is the first argument for family worship. God is not only the author of our being, and our happiness, as individuals; but of all our social and domestic relations and comforts. By him families are constituted; our times are in his hands; and he fixes the bounds of our habitations. He gives us houses to dwell in, he builds up families, and opens

up all the springs of domestic happiness. "Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it;" and except the Lord keep the citadel of the family, watching will be vain; early rising and late taking rest will be unproductive of real benefit. (Ps. cxxvii.) What then can be more undeniably and plainly incumbent upon heads of families, than to offer up, in the name and behalf of all the members, devout acknowledgments of the goodness of their common Parent and Benefactor, and to ask of the Lord the blessing which they in common need, and without which they can have no real comfort?

In a well-regulated family, the several members attend not merely each to individual comfort. They do not *eat* each his morsel alone, but in company. Why then should they be separated from each other in *religious duties*? why should they not make *this* not merely an individual and personal, but also a joint and united concern, which is, of all others, the most interesting and important?

In common and ordinary cases, have families a *head* and a *government*; and only in the most important concerns, shall every one do what is right in his own eyes? Shall there be here no concert, no order, no union observed? Shall the members of a family hold a concert together in regard to their temporal concerns, and hold none about their spiritual interests? Shall they join in petitioning, or using means for gaining any advantage for the common good from fellow-creatures, and no joint efforts be made, and no joint petition be offered to God, to the Father of lights, from whom cometh down every good and perfect gift, soliciting his favour, protection, and blessing? In religion alone shall the family interests be neglected, or left entirely to each member, to be sought or neglected? Within the precincts of a family, where there is no family worship—there may be—there frequently are, God's "hidden ones;" yea, there may be a *Joseph*, on whose account the Lord blesses and prospers the family, whose head is graceless and prayerless; but *as a family*, it is justly said of such, that it is *without God*—just as a *nation* which has no public recognition of God is an atheistical nation, whatever may be the character or the number of religious *individuals* in that nation.

The next argument I would bring forward, in urging upon *you* who are heads of families, the duty of family worship, is, that if it be not in so many words enjoined, it is undeniably implied in many scriptural injunctions; in examples and forms of prayer; in threatenings and promises. Every call to prayer, of which there are so many in the sacred Scriptures, such as "pray without ceasing;" "continue in prayer, and watch in the same with thanksgiving;" "with all supplication in the Spirit, watching thereunto with perseverance and supplication for all saints; is in fact addressed to families, societies, and churches, as well as to individuals; and this must be granted, unless it were meant to assert, that prayer ought *only* to be individual, and that there is no such thing as united social prayer. In short, if a family is at *any time* to be convened for prayer, the exhortation to frequency, and to abounding in the exercise, applies to it in a social and family, as well as in an individual capacity.

Farther, the prayer our Lord taught his disciples, running in the plural, "*Our Father*," and the petition, "Give *us* this day *our daily bread*," being plainly adapted for social, and particularly for *family use*, and *that daily*—all the other blessings asked, being equally suitable for every day use, affords a very strong argument for family prayer. And again, the "*showing forth* the loving-kindness of the Lord every morning, and his faithfulness every night," pronounced to be a good thing, (Ps. xcii. 2,) seems very plainly to refer to the morning and the evening sacrifices of the family altar. And the promise of our Lord, that "wherever two or three are met together in his name, he will be present," surely applies to the smallest meetings, such as a family, as well as to the greater assembly of his people. These are attractive passages, bearing on the subject, and should sweetly and cordially unite the members of families in one song of praise, and in fervent joint supplications at the throne of that God of whom the whole family in heaven and earth are named. We must, in faithfulness, bring forward also the reverse of this pleasing picture, and call upon you to mark well the threatening contained in Jer. x. 25, where it is said, "The Lord will pour out his fury upon the heathen that know him not, and upon the *families* that call not on his name." Will it be said, this passage applies to heathen idolaters, and not to those who know and acknowledge the true God? Surely, my dear friends, this will not screen *you* who have the true religion in your Bibles, and in your creed, but who have no admittance for the worship of the true God in a domestic and social capacity. The heathen may well rise up in judgment against *you*, lukewarm professing Christians, who have no household worship, while *they* have their *Lares* and *Penates*—their gods of the house and the hearth—against you who have every other social enjoyment, and who regularly meet to eat and drink together, but seldom or never to worship God. But unwilling to end any one part of this address with threatening—desiring to allure you to that which is at once duty and privilege, I would remind you of the "dwellings of the righteous, wherein is heard the melody of joy and health, and of the delightful description of Malachi, the last of the Old Testament prophets, who thus writes, "Then they that feared the Lord, spake often one to another; and the Lord hearkened and heard it; and a book of remembrance was written before him for them that feared the Lord and that thought upon his name: and they shall be mine, saith the Lord of hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels; and I will spare them, as a man spareth his own son that serveth him." (Malachi iii. 16, 17.)

My third argument is, that the examples approved in Scripture, have the force of law. Whatever is sanctioned by the general practice of religious characters, we cannot err in following, nay, we are not safe in neglecting. Consult the records of ancient times, and you will find that the practice of the saints has been uniform in attending to family religion. The account of individual believers is often short, and only a small part of what they did in the service of God is recorded; yet, in regard to many of them, this is particularly specified. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, had

their domestic altar, and called upon the name of the Lord. This is as certain as that they were believers, and heirs of the promise, that in their seed the *families* of the earth should be blessed. A *patriarch* without his family altar would have been a contradiction. The heathen might well have said, "where is *your God?*" Jacob affords a most instructive example at once of family worship, and family reform, and discipline, as recorded in Gen. xxxv. "Put away the strange gods which are among you, and "arise and let us go up to Bethel, and I will make there an altar unto God, who answered me in the day of my distress, and was with me in the way which I went." Next let me bring to your remembrance, the bright example of the noble-minded, patriotic, decided, and single-hearted Joshua, who, on the plain of Shechem, near the close of his bright career—like the planet reflecting a more pure and brilliant radiance, when drawing nearer the sun and fountain of light, as with his departing breath, he declared an adherence to his long-before firmly-founded resolution, "whatever others do, as for me and my house, we will serve the LORD." (Josh. xxiv. 15.) But time would fail to tell of Abel, of Noah, of Job, of David, of Daniel, of Cornelius, a centurion, of the converted jailor at Philippi, who rejoiced, believing in God *with all his house*; and of Aquila, and Nymphas, and Philemon, who had each a church in his house. The Apostle Paul, that bright example of Christianity, can it for a moment be questioned whether he practised family worship, when we find him sending salutations to those Christians I have just mentioned, and to the churches in their houses; when we observe the remarkably devotional strain of his writings; when we find him exhorting to "let the word of Christ dwell in you richly, teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs," &c. (Col. iii. 16;) when we read that *he* and *Silas* prayed and sung praises together in the prison at Philippi; and that before parting with his friends, he kneeled down with them on the sea-shore and prayed: and in the Epistle to the Ephesians, speaks of making mention of them daily in prayer, and of bowing the knee to "the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named?" &c. Eph. iii. 14, 18.

Have we not, moreover, the example of our *Lord and Saviour*, presiding among his disciples as a father in his family, and a master among his domestics, and a teacher among his scholars, in the offices of devotion, as well as in pouring instruction into their ears and hearts, and after the passover and the breaking of bread, singing a hymn before they went out to the Mount of Olives?

When we continue to trace the history of the Church after the canon of revelation is closed, we find the same principles producing similar effects; and religion, wherever it had a being, and in any measure of life and power, occupying first the heart and closet, next the family and household, subordinating the *head* and *members* to the worship and obedience of the living and true God. In every age of the Church, religious parents have been characterized by their care in bringing up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; nor has it ever been with them a matter of doubt, whether they ought to worship God with their families. Some may

have never justified the neglect, or been satisfied in it, but have at length conquered all obstacles, and have sought and obtained grace to be faithful, and having once *tried*, they have never abandoned the practice. And, wherever religion prospers or revives, the prevalence of family worship has been always one of its certain and constant attendants; and on the other hand, where there is little of this godly practice, there is also little fear of God—little religious knowledge—little value for the gospel—little of the life and practice of godliness. In one word, in all ages, personal and family religion have been united, and have declined or flourished together. They who find a place for the Lord in their hearts, will not give sleep to their eyes, nor slumber to their eyelids, till they find a habitation for the mighty God of Jacob in their dwelling. The same person who resolves to “sing of mercy and of judgment,” at the same time resolves, “I will walk within my house with a perfect heart. O when wilt thou come unto me.” (Ps. ci.)

ART. XII.—*Closing Scene of John Calvin, as related by Beza.*

HAVING made his will, Calvin sent to inform the four syndics, and all the senators, that he wished once more before he departed this life, to address them in the senate-room, whither he hoped to be carried the following day. The senators answered, they would rather come to him, and requested him to have a regard to his health. The next day they all repaired from the senate-room to the house of Calvin. After mutual salutations, and an apology on his part, because they had waited on him, when it was his duty to have visited them, he commenced by stating that he had for some time desired this interview, but deferred it until he felt more certainly assured of his dissolution. He then said, “I return you my warmest thanks, honoured lords, for conferring such great honours on me, who have done nothing to merit them, and for manifesting such forbearance towards my numerous infirmities, which I always considered the strongest proof of your uncommon kindness. Though in the discharge of my ministerial duty I have been engaged in various disputes, and have endured numerous insults, a necessary part of the trials even of the best characters, yet I know and acknowledge that none of these have befallen me from any fault of yours. I earnestly entreat you also, if I have not performed my duty in any instance as I ought, to ascribe it rather to want of ability, than to want of will to serve you. For I can testify with sincerity, that I have felt a deep and lively interest in the welfare of your republic; and, if I have not fully discharged all the duties of my station, I have certainly exerted myself to the utmost in promoting the public welfare.

“Were I not to acknowledge that the Lord has sometimes on his part condescended to grant that my services have not been altogether without advantage to you, I should justly deserve to be charged with dissimulation. But I again earnestly entreat your pardon for having performed so little either in my private or public capacity, in comparison with what I ought to have done. I certainly grant

with the greatest readiness, that I am very much indebted to you on account of your patience in enduring that vehemence of mine, which has sometimes been immoderate. I trust God himself has pardoned all these my sins.*

"Touching the doctrine you have heard from me, I testify that I have not taught the word of God intrusted to me in a rash and uncertain manner, but with purity and sincerity. Had I acted otherwise, I should have been as fully assured of God's anger, already impending over my head, as I now feel confident that my labours in teaching have not been displeasing to him. And I testify this before God, and in your presence, so much the more willingly, because I cannot doubt that Satan, after his usual manner, will raise up wicked, vain, light-minded, ambitious men, to corrupt the sound doctrine which you have heard from me as the servant of God."

Then passing to those immense benefits which they had received from the Lord, he said, "I am the person who can best testify from how many and great dangers the hand of the Lord hath delivered you. You see, moreover, in what circumstances you are placed. Whether in prosperity or adversity, keep this truth, I beseech you, constantly before your eyes,—that it is God alone who can give stability to kingdoms and states, and on this account it is his pleasure to be worshipped by mortal men. Remember it was the testimony of the illustrious David, that he fell when he enjoyed profound peace; from which he never would have arisen, had not the Lord, with singular favour, stretched out his own hand to his relief. What then may the lot be of such little weak mortals, when this prince, distinguished for power and fortitude, experienced such a fall! It requires, therefore, great humility of mind, that you may walk with care and great fear of God, relying on his defence alone. You will thus be assured of the continuance of the same protection which you have hitherto so often in reality experienced, and may proceed with stability under his aid, even when your safety and security may, as it were, hang suspended from a slender thread. If your affairs are prosperous, be careful, I request you, not to exalt yourselves, like the profane; but rather, with deep submission of mind, return thanks to God for all your blessings. If your affairs are adverse, and death, therefore, surrounds you on all sides, still trust in him who raises up even the dead. Nay, consider on such an occasion with the greatest earnestness, that God is in this manner awakening you from sloth, that you may learn more fully to look to him alone with entire confidence.

"If you would preserve this republic in security, see to it with unremitting care, that the sacred seat of authority, in which God hath placed you, be not defiled with the pollution of sin; for he is

* Here is the humble and candid confession of a Christian. Calvin was a man of ardent feelings, and they may at times have betrayed him into angry and hasty expressions. And "amidst the incessant and violent attacks which he received, and the uninterrupted warfare which he had to carry on with the advocates of error, he must have been more than mortal, if he had never spoken hastily or harshly. But a few incidental actions, contrary to a man's general conduct, do not constitute character: and after every thing of this kind which can be mustered, it will still be true that, *characteristically*, Calvin was not a traducer or calumniator, but the possessor of a meek spirit, a governed tongue, and a guarded pen. He must, on the whole, be ranked not only among the greatest but the best of men."—*Recs' New Encyclop. Am. Ed.*

the only sovereign God, King of kings, and Lord of lords, who will honour those that honour him; but on the other hand, will cast down, and cover with disgrace, those by whom he is despised. Worship him, therefore, according to his precepts, and let your minds be more and more intensely directed to the obeying of his will, for we are always at a very great distance from the performance of our duty. I know the temper and manner of you all, and am aware of your needing exhortation. There is none, even of those who excel, without many imperfections; and let each in this case examine himself with care, and ask of the Lord the supply of his known deficiencies.

“We see what vices reign in the greatest number of the assemblies convened in the world. Some, cold and indifferent to the public interest, pursue with eagerness their own private emoluments; others, are only intent upon the gratification of their own passions; some make a bad use of the distinguished talents bestowed upon them by God; while others are vain-glorious, and confidently demand that the rest of their fellow-counsellors should sanction their opinions.

“I admonish the aged not to envy such young persons as they find to be endowed by God with particular gifts; and I warn younger persons to conduct themselves with modesty, and to avoid all presumption. Let there be no interruption of one another in the performance of your duties. Shun animosities, and all that acrimony which has diverted so many from a proper line of conduct in the discharge of their office. You will avoid these evils, if each of you confines himself within his proper sphere, and all perform with fidelity the part intrusted to them by the state. In civil trials, I beseech you to avoid all favour, or enmity; use no crooked arts to pervert justice; let none, by any plausible address of his own, prevent the laws from having their due effect; nor depart from equity and goodness. If the evil passions excite temptation in any one, let him resist them with firmness, and look to Him by whom he has been placed on the seat of judgment, and ask the same God for the guidance of his Holy Spirit.

“Finally, I beseech you to pardon all my infirmities, which I acknowledge and confess before God, and his angels, and in your presence also, my honourable lords.”

Having finished his discourse, he offered up a prayer to the Almighty and most merciful God, to shower down upon them, in still greater abundance, his best gifts, and by his Holy Spirit to direct all their consultations to the welfare of the whole republic. He then gave his right hand to each separately, and bade them adieu. All the senators departed in tears, manifesting deep sorrow, as if it was their last interview with a common father.

Calvin addressed all of us ministers under the jurisdiction of Geneva, who were assembled in his chamber, and at his request, on the 28th of April, in the following terms:—“Stand ye fast, my brethren, after my decease, in the work which you have begun, and be not discouraged, for the Lord will preserve this church and republic against the threats of its enemies. Let all divisions be removed far from you, and embrace one another with mutual charity. Consider on all occasions what you owe to the church in which the

Lord hath stationed you, and let nothing draw you from it. It will indeed be easy for such as are wearied of their flocks to find means for escaping from their duty by intrigue, but they will learn by experience that the Lord cannot be deceived.

“On my first arrival in this city, the gospel was indeed preached, but every thing was in the greatest confusion, as if Christianity consisted in nothing else than the overturning of images. Not a few wicked men arose in the church, from whom I suffered many great indignities; but the Lord our God himself so strengthened me, and banished all fear even from my mind, who am by no means distinguished for natural courage (I state the real fact,) that I was enabled to resist all their attempts. I returned hither from Strassburg, in obedience to a call, against my inclination; because I thought it would not be productive of any advantage. I knew not what the Lord had determined, and my situation was full of very many, and very great difficulties. But proceeding in this work, I perceived at length that the Lord had in reality blessed my labours. Do you, therefore, brethren, persist in your vocation; preserve the established order; use at the same time every exertion to retain the people in obedience to the doctrine delivered, for there are yet among you some wicked and stubborn characters. Affairs, as you see, are not now in an unsettled state, on which account you will be more criminal before God, if they are subverted by your inactivity. I declare, my brethren, that I have lived united with you in the strictest bonds of true and sincere affection, and I now take my leave of you with the same feelings. If you have at any time found me too peevish under my disease, I entreat your forgiveness, and I return you my warmest thanks, because during my confinement you have discharged the burden of the duties assigned me.”

After this address he reached out his right hand to each of us, and we then took leave of him with hearts overwhelmed with sorrow and grief, and eyes flowing with tears.

On the 2d of May, having been informed by Farel, in a letter, that he was determined, though now eighty years old, and in a state of health rendered infirm by age, to come and see him from Neufchatel, for Viret's residence was at a yet greater distance, he thus answered him in Latin:—

“Farewell, my best and most faithful brother! and since God is pleased you should survive me in this world, live mindful of our friendship, which has been of service to the church of God, and whose fruits we shall enjoy in heaven. Do not expose yourself to fatigue on my account. I respire with difficulty, and continually expect to draw my last breath. It is sufficient happiness for me that I live and die in Christ, who is gain to his people in life and death. Again farewell, with the brethren.—Geneva, 2d May, 1564.”

The good old man, however, came to Geneva, and after they had enjoyed an interview with each other, he returned the next day to Neufchatel.

Calvin spent the remainder of his days, until death, in almost constant prayer. His voice, indeed, was interrupted by the difficulty of respiration; but his eyes, which retained their brilliancy to the last, uplifted to heaven, and his serene countenance, were certain proofs of the fervour of his devotion, and of his trust and confidence

in God. He often in his prayers repeated the words of David, "Lord, I opened not my mouth, because thou didst it;" and at times those of Hezekiah, "I did mourn like a dove." Once, also, I heard him say, "Thou, Lord, bruise me, but I am abundantly satisfied, since it is thy hand." His doors must have stood open day and night, if all had been admitted, who, from sentiments of duty were desirous to see him; but, as he could not, from difficulty in speaking, direct his discourse to them, he requested they would rather pray for him, than be solicitous about paying their visits. Often, also, though I always found him glad to receive me, he was very scrupulous respecting the least interruptions thus given to the duties of my office, so sparing was he of the time which he knew ought to be spent in the service of the church; and his conscientious feelings, lest he should give the smallest trouble to his friends, exceeded the bounds of moderation. Such was the manner of comforting both himself and friends until the 19th of May, when we ministers were accustomed to meet relative to the censure of morals, and to take a friendly meal together, two days before Whitsuntide, and the celebration of the Lord's supper. He expressed a wish that the common supper, should on this day be prepared at his house, and rallying his little strength that remained, was carried from his bed to the adjoining chamber, when he said, "I come to see you, my brethren, for the last time, never more to sit down with you at table." Such was the commencement of one of the most melancholy repasts we ever took. He then offered up a prayer, took a small portion of food, and discoursed with us at supper, in as cheerful a manner as his weakness permitted. Before supper was fully finished, he ordered himself to be carried back to the adjoining chamber, and addressing the company with a distinctly smiling countenance, said, "This intervening wall will not prevent me from being present with you in spirit, though absent in body." His prediction was fulfilled, for from this day he always lay in a horizontal posture, his small body, except his countenance, which was very little changed, being so much emaciated, that breath only remained. On the 27th of May, the day of his death, he appeared stronger, and spoke with less difficulty; but this was the last effort of nature, for about eight o'clock in the evening, certain symptoms of dissolution suddenly manifested themselves. When one of his domestics brought one of the brethren, and me, who had only just left him, this intelligence, I returned immediately with all speed, and found he had died in so very tranquil a manner, that without his feet and hands being in any respect discomposed, or his breathing increased, his senses, judgment, and in some measure his voice, remaining entire to his very last gasp, he appeared more to resemble one in a state of sleep than death.

Thus this splendid light of the reformation was taken from us with the setting sun. During that night, and the following day, great lamentation prevailed throughout the city, for the republic regretted the want of one of its wisest citizens, the church deplored the death of its faithful pastor, the college sorrowed for such an incomparable professor, and all grieved for the loss of a common parent and comforter bestowed upon them by God himself. Many of the citizens were desirous to see him after he was dead, and could with difficulty be torn from his remains. Some strangers, also, who

had come from a distance with a view to see and hear him, among whom was the very distinguished English ambassador to the French court, were very desirous to see only the body of the deceased. At first, indeed, they were admitted; but afterwards, because the curiosity was excessive, and it was necessary to silence the calumnies of enemies, his friends considered the best plan would be to close the coffin next morning, being the Lord's day; his corpse, as usual, having been wrapped in a linen cloth. At two o'clock in the afternoon on Sunday, his body was carried to the common burying-place called Plein Palais, without extraordinary pomp. His funeral, however, was attended by the members of the senate, the pastors, all the professors of the college, and a great proportion of the citizens. The abundance of tears shed on this occasion afforded the strongest evidence of the sense which they entertained of their loss. According to his own directions, no hillock, no monument was erected to his memory, on which account I wrote the following epitaph:—

Why in this humble and unnoticed tomb
Is Calvin laid—the dread of falling Rome,
Mourn'd by the good, and by the wicked fear'd,
By all who knew his excellence revered;
From whom ev'n virtue's self might virtue learn,
And young and old its value may discern?
'Twas modesty, his constant friend on earth,
That laid this stone, unsculptured with a name;
Oh! happy turf, enrich'd with Calvin's worth,
More lasting far than marble is thy fame!

ART. XIII.—*American Oxfordism.*

[The following is from the *Catholic Herald*, the periodical of the Roman Church, published at Philadelphia:]

So many strange confessions of faith have appeared of late, among some reverend writers in the Anglico-American Church, that we are inclined to think some *new light* has broken in upon their, till now, darkened intellects. We find, generally speaking, that our New York contemporary, the Churchman, inclines strongly to encourage the onward march of looking for the "old paths." We say, generally speaking, for he has not, as yet, given a helping hand to the *bold efforts* of the pastor of St. John's Church, Brooklyn. The Pastoral Letter appeared through his columns, and though, as our readers have seen, it contains doctrines "passing strange," from a Protestant pastor, yet no notice, either laudatory or condemnatory, was taken of it. We are disposed to think, that the doctrines of Rev. Mr. Johnson are not *un-Churchman*, though it may not appear precisely prudent to speak out yet. We must wait till we know what the Ordinary thinks,—one little step or so more, and we will have to defend the author of the "*Pastoral*" ourselves; of others, our contemporary speaks more plainly. In his notice, on the publication of Dr. Onderdonk's sermon, to which we alluded last week, he says:

"But we have another and more particular reason for publishing this discourse at the present time, and that is, because it harmonizes so well with "*The Tracts for the Times*," in its doctrine of the Sacraments. It has been lately remarked by a clergyman of our Church, in a letter which first appeared in the *British Magazine*, and was thence transferred to our columns, that the exhibition of doctrines which were current among us twelve years ago, would now subject a man to be classed with Mr. Newman, Dr. Pusey, and Dr. Hook. Without offering an opinion as to the correctness of this observation, it may be safely said that the present discourse, which was well received ten years ago, contains as much "*Popery*" as any of our Church journalists have yet brought to light in the '*Tracts*.'"

ART. XIV.—*The Diocese of New York.*

MR. EDITOR:—I have had the opportunity of reading the address delivered by Bishop Onderdonk, of the Episcopal Church, at the opening of the Annual Con-

vention of the diocese of the state of New York. This customary document is the annual report of his official acts made by the bishop to each convention. It is rather diffuse, but a few of the facts which are given as proofs of the prosperity of the "church," may be edifying to your readers, and I give them without unnecessary comment.

1. As an evidence of "the progress of true Protestant feeling," we are informed that one or more churches have during the year placed *crosses* on their spires.

2. As proofs of an increasing "reversion to the ancient gospel model," it is stated that in one church the communion table, here called "the altar," "holds its proper distinguished station," by which the people are reminded of "the leading object of their assemblies," to wit, the Lord's supper.

3. As farther evidence of "the progress of correct sentiments," we learn that in another church "the altar, desk, and pulpit, are arranged on *sound Christian principles*." That is—not according to the degenerate method, sometimes practised, of giving the pulpit the chief prominence, but according to "the truly Christian view of the subject" placing "the altar as the most important place in the church, and the desk and pulpit as subsidiaries to it."

4. "But one church has made an attainment in which it seems to stand alone: in the rest there has been "a wide departure from the positive order of the church," which is lamentable. Are your readers impatient to know what this is? Let the bishop end their suspense—"I mean the providing of the chancel with a side table, on which the elements for the eucharist are placed, before their removal, by the priest, to the Lord's table."—*Presbyterian*.

ART. XV.—*Dr. M'Crie's View of Discipline.*

"Evangelical and vital religion cannot flourish generally or permanently in any church, where discipline, in its scriptural purity and primitive vigour, is neglected. Discipline is to the Church of Christ, what a wall is to a city when an enemy has taken the field. It serves the same purpose that a fence does to a garden; if it be broken down, or suffered to fall into disrepair, the boar from the forest, and the wild beast of the field, will enter and devour all that is beautiful or productive within." This is a subject which ought to come home with peculiar force to the consciences and feelings of all Christians dwelling in this favoured land. As marks of the true Church, the reformers on the continent specified the pure preaching of the word and administration of the sacraments; but in addition to these, our reformers of Scotland, in their first Confession of Faith, described "discipline, executed according to the word of God, as a certain and infallible sign of a true Church." The establishment of a scriptural and efficient discipline in the Church of Scotland at the very beginning of the reformation, was her distinguishing glory, on account of which she was lauded and felicitated by foreigners, who desired to possess that blessing, but could not obtain it. As the want of this ordinance of the Church's Head has produced the most mournful consequences abroad, so to the neglect or perversion of it at home may be ascribed, in a high degree, those corruptions as to faith, worship, and morals, which have spread among ourselves, and which, more than once, have threatened to lay waste all our pleasant things. "Purity of doctrine and discipline," says one of our religious patriots, who "stood in the gap" at a critical period of our ecclesiastical history, "are like the twin sisters of Hippocrates, who always sickened and recovered at the same time, and at last dwindled and died together."

ART. XVI.—*Religious Excitement at a Native Festival.*

The Hindoos annually celebrate a festival called the Dhurmarajah Festival, in honour of the goddess Darobathee, who, to prove her innocence of a crime laid to her charge, had to pass through the fire, and came uninjured from it. Several engage themselves to pass through the fire, and this they perform very expeditiously. When the ceremony was last about to take place, a respectable and intelligent native, who had read many of our books, and possesses a considerable knowledge of divine things, took upon himself, in the presence of the assembled multitude, to speak to, and to endeavour, as far as the force of argument would go, to persuade his fellow-countrymen to desist from this cruel ceremony. As soon as his intention was known, those who were personally interested became enraged, and threatened that if he did not go away, they would make him feel the weight of their anger; he did not appear to be intimidated, but dauntlessly told them to bring out the image of the goddess on whose account, and to obtain whose favour and special protection, they were about to pass through the fire, "Which, for my part," said he, "I consider to be not only a very foolish and unnecessary performance, but cruelty

is also combined with it. Let the goddess be put into the fire first; and if she is not burnt, I promise readily to go into the fire with you." Instead of acceding to this fair proposal, they began to cry out, "Punish him, let him be punished for his daring presumption. He has been taught by the Padre and his people to speak against our gods and the worship we pay to them. He is become a Christian." The confusion which took place increased to such a degree, that it was feared some distressing scene would occur; but the man who had occasioned this uproar was obliged to make his escape.

The above-mentioned affair happened on a Sunday. It has produced no small stir among the people, and has excited a good deal of angry feeling in the minds of those who are interested, and who derive a good deal of emolument, honour, and praise from the observance of this cruel ceremony of passing through the fire. Many consultations were held, as to the best method of putting a stop to the progress of the gospel, which, in their estimation, appeared to be an alarming and growing evil, and if not put down soon, that it would spread to such a degree, that nothing would be able to withstand or arrest the influence of Christianity among the people. This, I think, at present, may well be compared to the little cloud which the servant of Elijah saw rising out of the sea, like a man's hand, the forerunner of the desired and expected blessing in that day when the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea.

ART. XVII.—*Voluntary Associations.*

THERE appears to be some difference of opinion among our readers respecting the scriptural warrant for Voluntary Associations, and several intimations have been made to us, that something on the subject, in the pages of the Monitor, would be well received. We have accordingly given the views of *A Western Citizen*, in the present number. He treats the subject dispassionately, and those who entertain different views, can, if they think proper, reply to his arguments.

It is not believed that difference of views on this subject can produce any alienation of fraternal feeling among brethren, as it is a subject not directly embraced in our subordinate standards, and is consequently left open to the discretion and Christian liberty of all our members. If we had any evidence to apprehend that it could by any possibility lead to division, it should not be named by us. Controversies, properly so called, respecting such things as are not terms of communion should be avoided; but a discussion of such questions in a becoming manner is lawful, and may add something to our stock of useful knowledge, and exert a happy influence on our Christian deportment.

With such views, we venture to throw out the following hints, which may be of some assistance, by way of leading us to profitable reflection on the subject.

It is supposed that all associations of men may be divided into three classes:

1. Such as are of divine appointment, with which it is the duty of all men to associate themselves. To this class belong civil government and ecclesiastical associations legally organized under their respective constitutions, and each discharging their appropriate functions.

2. Such as are left to human discretion, with which men may or may not associate themselves, according to circumstances, or con-

victions of duty. Under this class we would rank the association spoken of by a "Western Citizen," and all others, whose design is to raise money for charitable or religious purposes, or for any other laudable object.

3. Such as are *contrary* to the divine law. Of this class the society of freemasons, odd fellows, theatrical associations, jockey clubs, and all associations for the public conveyance of passengers or merchandise on the Sabbath, may be mentioned as specimens.

If this classification be correct, then the only debatable ground remaining, will be in reference to those associations which are formed with the avowed design of correcting some existing abuse in church or state, or both, or of performing some duty which appropriately belongs to those institutions, but which they have neglected. Such associations propose to effect a reformation by the moral influence they appear to think themselves capable of exerting over the public mind. Nor do repeated and signal failures appear to dishearten them in the least. If their principles are sanctioned by divine authority, the question naturally arises, ought not the means they use for the dissemination of those principles to be sanctioned by the same authority?

It is believed to be a sound principle, that in all cases where God has appointed means in his word, either for the temporal or spiritual good of men, that appointment contains in it a prohibition of all other means. This is a principle lying at the foundation of protestantism, and is uniformly urged against the papists. It is the principle on which we condemn all innovations in the worship of God, not prohibited in so many words. Let this principle be applied to the question in hand.

God has appointed civil government, (Rom. xiii. 1—7,) for the regulation of social intercourse, the preservation of natural rights, religious liberty, and the protection of persons and property. He has appointed religious ordinances, for the moral improvement and salvation of men, and ecclesiastical government, for the purity, protection, and preservation of his church. Consequently, if this principle be correct, then it will follow, that he has prohibited the use of all other means, for the attainment of any of those ends for which divine institutions have been ordained. And of course, the principle laid down by a "Western Citizen," "that where an accusation is brought against an individual or society, the burden of proof lies upon the accuser," has no place here. The objection is not in the nature of an accusation. We ask by what authority they exist? Where is their authority for voluntarily associating themselves to do those things which God has commissioned others to perform? The *onus probandi* then rests with them, not with the objector. The President of the United States may convene the le-

gislature on emergency, or issue his proclamation enjoining obedience to the laws, &c., but where is the society that may do this? or, if they should do it, who would regard them? It is not therefore correct, "that whatever is morally right for an individual to do, may be lawfully done by a society." But the converse of the proposition is true.

Nor is the delinquency of constituted authorities a sufficient argument for the formation of voluntary associations for the performance of *their* duties. It may be a sufficient cause for the people to depose them and place more faithful men in their room, especially in a country like ours, where the choice of these public functionaries vests in the people. Owing to this circumstance, the people are more directly involved in our national sins than those of any other country upon earth. Let us then labour to correct the abuses which men have connected with divine institutions, instead of resorting to our own unauthorized inventions.

But we have serious objections to that class of associations to which we refer, to which we have not yet seen a satisfactory answer. Take the anti-slavery society as an example.

1. They have not the power to accomplish the avowed end of their association either in church or state.

2. The formation of associations of this character unnecessarily calls into immediate and active opposition all the conflicting elements. Men will resist their measures who are not opposed to the end of their association, because they disturb other interests.

3. It is inconsistent for men to continue in the communion of any ecclesiastical body, that tolerates in its bosom any of those evils which they propose to remove, by means of voluntary associations. With the exception of the Associate Church, the Reformed Presbyterian, and a few Baptists in Vermont, every ecclesiastical body in the United States, tolerates slavery in its communion; and yet anti-slavery men can give the right hand of fellowship in Christian communion to such as are involved in this sin, then meet in voluntary associations, and give us eloquent speeches to influence public opinion against their own conduct! We have not the least doubt that a majority of the convention which met in Albany in August last belonged to this class of persons; but have not the means of knowing with certainty. Had these men pleaded with their mother for a condemnation of this sin, protested and appealed till they carried the question to the supreme judicatories of their respective churches, and in case of failure seceded, they would have commenced their work where all reformation must begin. The tree of slavery has put forth its roots deep into the bosom of the Christian church, and this is the soil which has given to it a luxuriant growth that overshadows the length and breadth of the land. And till

these roots be lopped off, men may search it in vain, for a single withered branch, or even a "sear and yellow leaf."

Such, then, are our views, briefly and somewhat crudely expressed; if erroneous, we should rejoice to be corrected, and shall therefore conclude by proposing the following query: Have we any warrant from the word of God, to form voluntary associations for the performance of social and moral duties which lie within the appropriate sphere of those civil and ecclesiastical institutions, that are of divine appointment?

ART. XVIII.—*Pious Sayings of Good Men.*

EVIL SPEAKING.—Perhaps no single cause contributes more to banish the Spirit of God from the houses and hearts of men than evil speaking. There are sins of more flagrant enormity, but what sin is more extensively diffused? Evil speaking! Who is without sin in this respect? How common it has become! How much of it there is every day—every where—in the city and in the country—at home and abroad—in every large concourse—and in every little company, and even in the solitude of the closet. Who is not among its actors and its objects? We sacrifice others on this cruel altar, and then we ourselves become its cruel victims. How easily we slide into this sin!

AFFLICTION.—The sweet perfume of many plants remains within them till they are bruised. The alabaster box of precious ointment did not fill the house with its pleasant savour till it was broken. So, it is not prosperity, but adversity, that brings out the loveliness of the Christian character. How much of the Saviour's glory would have been lost to the world, but for his afflictions. How shrunk and diminished would have appeared that prince of Apostles, Paul, had he encountered no peril nor trial in his earthly career! What beauty and glory now gild the martyrs of other days, and of our own! which had been unknown had they not gone through much tribulation. "Prosperity is the blessing of the Old Testament," says Lord Bacon, "adversity is the blessing of the New, which carrieth the greater benediction, and the clearer revelation of God's favour. Yet even in the Old Testament, if you listen to David's harp, you will hear as many hearse-like airs as carols; and the pencil of the Holy Ghost hath laboured more in describing the afflictions of Job than the felicities of Solomon."

He that would govern his actions by the laws of virtue, must regulate his thoughts by those of reason; he must keep guilt from the recesses of his heart, and remember that the pleasures of fancy, and the emotions of desire, are more dangerous as they are more hidden, since they escape the awe of observation, and operate equally in every situation, without the concurrence of external opportunities.—*Johnson.*

We should not be with wicked men as their companions, but physicians.—*Ib.*

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

WE have received a communication from a member of the Anti-Slavery Convention, which met at Albany in August last, who is "persuaded that we entirely misapprehended, and consequently, did injustice to the principles, the moral tone, and the spirit of that body." The only thing which prevents the insertion of this article entire, is want of room. That is, its insertion, together with the requisite reply, would occupy more room than ought to be given to a subject which however important in itself, can only be regarded as *incidental* to the *main* design of the RELIGIOUS MONITOR.

In reference to a statement made by us that out of four hundred delegates, only thirty-eight voted for the withdrawal of political support from pro-slavery men, he says, "the vote here referred to was as follows, *Ayes* 238, *Nays* 10, *declined voting* 8. The remaining delegates had returned home. So the vote was announced at the time it was taken, and as it was published in the *Emancipator*, where also the names of the voters and non-voters were all given." To this we reply, that our statement was taken from the *Emancipator* of August 15, 1839, p. 63, where it will be found recorded in the following words: "The main question being on the adoption of the first resolution, (the one in question) it was carried *Yeas*, 38, *Nays*, 10." It seems the true vote referred to by our correspondent was given in that paper of August 8th, which we never saw till after the receipt of the correction before us. This typographical error of the *Emancipator*, did indeed lead us into a misapprehension of the "moral tone" of the convention, which gave a turn to our remarks not altogether just towards that body, and our correspondent is entitled to thanks for the correction, which it is believed will be deemed satisfactory.

Respecting a communication from the Session of Cæsar's Creek, we respectfully suggest to our brethren of that session, that it would be more orderly to tell their *grievance* to the church than to the world. *Verbum sapienti*. If, however, any member of that session, or any other person in our communion, is desirous of discussing the abstract question of occasional hearing, and will write in the same spirit that characterizes the production of a *Ruling Elder*, on that subject, the Monitor is at his service.

It will be seen that our pages begin to display an unusual quantity of original matter. This is as it should be; and gives us great encouragement. Without underrating other productions, the reader's attention is directed to the article in the number for December entitled, "*Idolatrous Representations*," and in the present number to the articles entitled, "*Schismatics*," and "*How shall they preach, except they be sent?*" These papers are from different sources, on important subjects, and possess intrinsic excellencies, not the least of which is their brevity. May we not hope that a blessing will accompany the circulation of such essays among our people, and that some will good be accomplished?

"Symbolical language of scripture," and the article entitled "Salvation," in the next number.

Erratum—Page 362, 18th line from bottom, for "II." read I.

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,
AND
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

FEBRUARY, 1840.

ART. I.—*The Symbolical Language of Scripture.* No. I.

WHEN earthly or natural objects are employed to represent those that are spiritual, they are called figures; and when the representation is not by any direct resemblance of the one to the other, but in its use or character, it is that kind of figure called a symbol. For example, bread and wine have no direct resemblance to the spiritual and saving efficacy of Christ's finished work, but in their use as a means of life; they are, therefore, properly called symbols. Every reader of scripture has observed that the use of such figures is very frequent, and forms no small difficulty to the understanding of the passages where they occur. If, therefore, we could furnish easy and complete rules for the explanation of them, it would, undoubtedly, be an important acquisition; and though the following remarks do not claim so high a character, it is hoped that they may be, in some measure, useful to that end. The subject is very large, not only by the frequent occurrence of such figures, but also by the variety of sources whence they are borrowed; for sake of arrangement, we may consider them under the following general heads:—

1. Those borrowed from remarkable objects in nature.
2. Those borrowed from the parts of the human body.
3. Those borrowed from animals.
4. Those borrowed from the implements and employments of men.
5. Those borrowed from civil and domestic affairs.
6. Those borrowed from trees and plants.
7. Such as do not strictly come under any of these heads, and may be called miscellaneous.

Before entering on any of the above heads, we must notice some things that are to be kept in view as general rules for the whole.

1st. There is an excellent use in such figures of scripture, more than balancing the difficulty of understanding them. They give a special beauty and interest to the discourse; they are admirably

sued to impress the memory; and, above all, they present high spiritual mysteries in a form within the reach of the meanest capacity.

2d. Every figure of Scripture is more or less explained in some other passage; so that the true key to them is a comparison of all the places in which any one occurs; and this, faithfully attended to, will almost invariably lead the plainest reader to the true meaning. The meaning is often given in the very same sentence: as, (Gen. xlix. 15,) "Issacher bowed his shoulder to bear." Here is a symbolical expression, and the meaning follows: "he became a servant unto tribute." This was characteristic of ancient eastern custom, to introduce any subject by a significant action or representation. The burning bush was such a representation of the subject which, at the same time, was presented to Moses in plain discourse; namely, the sufferings and deliverance of Israel. Our Lord's washing the feet of the disciples in like manner represented that humility and brotherly kindness of which he was immediately about to speak; and many other instances might be adduced. The same practice is observed, though there can be no action, when language is employed in a corresponding manner, first the figures, then the meaning.

3d. Many figures are substantially the same, and, therefore, mutually illustrate each other, and the same figure has the same general meaning throughout scripture; but, as many things from which figures are borrowed have several uses, the connexion must determine which of them is intended in any particular place. For instance, the wind and rain are either beneficial or injurious, according to circumstances, and when employed as scripture symbols, they have a corresponding meaning. (Song iii. 16,) "Awake, O north wind, and come, thou south." The *wind* here plainly signifies something desirable and beneficial; but, in Isaiah xxxii. 2, it as plainly signifies something injurious, "A man shall be a hiding place from the *wind*."

4th. When the several ideas which a figure may present (from the uses of the object from which it is borrowed) are not inconsistent, they are sometimes all intended; as Matt. iii. 11, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost *and with fire*." Fire is here a figure both of the enlightening, warming, and purifying character of the Holy Spirit's work on the soul. But we are not to carry out a figure to the extremity of every thing that may belong to the object from which the figure is borrowed; neither are critical and philosophical niceties at all necessary to the right understanding of them; many ingenious ideas have, in this way, been advanced, and, perhaps, not inconsistent with the analogy of the subject, but not intended by the inspired writer in the place. For example, (Song iii. 16,) "Awake, O north wind, and come, thou south," &c. The wind here plainly means the reviving and refreshing influences of the Holy Spirit; but if we pursue the figure, and take the north wind for his work of conviction, because it is cold and sharp, and the south wind to mean his converting and comforting work, because it is warm, we are undoubtedly beyond the design of the figure. Or if, with some writers, we consider the north wind alone to mean the Holy Spirit's work, because in hot eastern countries it

was most refreshing; and the south wind to mean the temptations of Satan and the workings of corruption, because in those countries the south wind, coming from the desert, was parching and unhealthy; and then, to suit this interpretation, if we should render the expression "come, thou south," return, that is, *go back, thou south*, (as indeed it might be rendered,) however ingenious it might appear, it would be altogether too critical to be the true meaning. We are not to think that the Bible was given only to the learned and philosophical: a correct and profitable understanding of almost every part is within the reach of the humblest reader, with due diligence; and the idea that such persons would most naturally take from the invoking of both the north and south winds, in this passage, is the true one, namely, that a large, a double portion of the Spirit may be given.

5th. We must carefully consider what words belong to the figure, and what not, because it is not unfrequent with the sacred writers to use the same, or similar expressions, both in a figurative and literal sense, in the same passage. "Even upon them shall be no rain." (Zech. xiv. 17, 18.) Rain is here plainly the influences of the Holy Spirit. It follows, "If the family of Egypt go not up, and come not, that have no *rain*." Here it is to be taken in its literal meaning. But another reason for being careful on this point is, that such omission or addition of words as would make no material difference in the literal meaning, would often almost entirely reverse the figurative signification. Thus, to *wink*, and to *wink with the eye*, are literally the same thing, but in symbolical language they are widely different. Acts xvii. 30, "The times of this ignorance, God *winked at*." That is, permitted and overruled for his own holy ends. Again, (Ps. xxxv. 19.) "Neither let them *wink with the eye* that hate me without a cause." That is, let them not get occasion to insult over me.

A like great difference may be observed between the expression "To enlighten," (Heb. vi. 4.) and "to enlighten the eyes," (Ps. xiii. 3.) and many others.

6th. When there is, in the same sentence, a repetition, with such a variation of the terms as would not alter the literal meaning, it is to be considered as one figure, and not two. As, (Ps. xi. 4,) "His eyes behold, his *eyelids* try the children of men." We are not here to consider *eyes* as having a different meaning from *eyelids*, but the same with the explanatory word, they *try* the children of men.

7th. There is what may be called the proportion of figures, in some cases, which it is necessary to consider in explaining them; that is, their correspondence to the style or scale of the whole discourse. For example, the 13th chapter of Ecclesiastes is a figurative description of old age; therefore, the particular symbols of darkening the sun, the moon, and the stars, the clouds, the rain, the doors being shut, looking out at the windows, the almond tree, the silver cord, the golden bowl, the pitcher, the fountain, the wheel, the cistern, &c., are all to be taken in no greater extent of meaning than will suit that purpose, which is much more confined than would belong to them in a subject of a more general description. In the Song of Solomon, also, and especially in the book of Revelation, where the whole discourse is, with care, rendered symbolical, the

figures are often somewhat strained, very different from those in the Psalms, Prophecies, and other parts where they occur incidentally, and are more natural and easy. Many figures in the former books must be considered exceptions to the general rules, and the key to their interpretation must be sought within these books themselves. When any figure in any part of scripture has a meaning altogether peculiar, it is explained more or less fully in the context, as in Psalm lxxiv. 13, "Thou breakest the heads of the dragons in the waters." We might judge from other passages the general meaning of *dragons*, and also of *breaking the head*; but its special application here to the ruin of the Egyptians at the Red Sea would not appear, if it were not intimated by its connexion with the dividing of the sea, and other circumstances mentioned in the immediate context. Again: (Rev. xiii. 1, 2.) "I saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns," &c. This is explained in chapter xvii., verse 9, "The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth." Here is a meaning altogether peculiar. Verse 10, "And there are seven kings," &c.

8th. Symbols are often formed by the combinations of others more simple, and are to be explained according to the meaning of the several parts. (Rev. xiii. 3.) "The beast that I saw was like a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion," &c. The several parts, and also the meaning of this symbol, we have in Daniel vi. 4, 5, 6, 7, &c. Similar combinations illustrate each other as far as they are alike; but we are not to make them agree any farther than the inspired writer has done, by supplying from the one what we might suppose wanting in the other. For instance, Ezekiel's vision of the cherubim, (chap. i.,) is much the same as John's vision, (Rev. chap. vi.,) and there is no doubt both have the same general meaning; but we observe that John's cherubim has six wings, while Ezekiel mentions only four; we are not to presume that they also had six. Again, in the same two chapters the vision of the throne is much the same, and of the same general meaning; but we observe that Ezekiel's throne has wheels, while nothing of that kind is mentioned by John. We must not presume that wheels belonged, also, to that which John saw, though he has omitted them in the description. There are no such omissions in symbolical language, especially in combinations; a wing, a wheel, a horn, a hand, &c., has each its definite meaning, and we may no more add one of them where it is not, or omit it where it is, than we may add or omit a sentiment in plain narrative.

9th. There are many passages which, when taken together, are highly figurative, while the particular words or expressions cannot be said to be strictly symbolical in themselves; as Hab. iii. 10, "The mountains saw thee, and they trembled; the overflowing of the waters passed by; the deep uttered his voice and lifted up his hands on high," &c. This sublime representation gives us a lively idea of God's majesty and greatness, but we cannot affix a definite meaning to each particular expression of it. Again, Job xvi. 12, "He hath also taken me by my neck, and shaken me to pieces, and set me up for his mark. This whole passage together represents, in the strongest language, what Job apprehended to be the great severity of God's judgments bringing the greatest imaginable sufferings upon him, but

we cannot separate the words, or expressions, and give the meaning of each.

These remarks may seem, in many things, indefinite, but exact rules for all cases cannot be given without enlarging beyond due bounds, and, probably, not at all. That which alone can enable one rightly to interpret all symbols, is a sound judgment and a familiarity with the scriptures generally.

OMEGA.

ART. II.—*Occasional Hearing.* No. IV.

BY A RULING ELDER.

IN the last place, I was to answer some objections that are frequently brought against the doctrine that occasional hearing is sinful.

Objection 1. If it is sinful to hear ministers of other denominations preach, how can it be right to read their printed sermons?

Reply. If, when ministers were suspended from the communion of the church, they were, by such act, prohibited from composing sermons, or printing them, the objection would be unanswerable; but this is not the case. And as it has been proved that ministers of other denominations stand in the same relation to us as our own do while under suspension, so, whatever ministers are suspended from, when suspended, in that, and that only, we may not join with other denominations of Christians. And that there is a difference of divine appointment between hearing sermons preached and reading them, is evident from the following consideration:—Any person that pleases, though not a minister, may publish, in any form that suits him best, his views on any portion of scripture that he chooses, and it might possess all the features of a sermon; and people, if they chose, might call it such; and there would be no more sin in reading it than there would be in reading the printed sermons of ministers: but yet it does not follow, that if such an individual should ascend the pulpit and undertake to dispense the ordinances, whether teaching or sealing, we could be partakers with him without sin. But, farther, the pronouncing of the apostolical blessing is appended to the preaching of the gospel. And the apostle, in endeavouring to convince the Hebrews of the superiority of Christ's priesthood over the Aaronic, and having mentioned the circumstance that Melchisedec had blessed Abraham, observes, "Without all contradiction, the less is blessed of the better." The apostle considered that there must invariably be a superiority in the person blessing over the person blessed. But, in what respects are ministers superior to their hearers? It may and may not be in piety, learning, and talent. It can only, then, invariably be in point of authority, as authorized ambassadors of Christ, which is all that gives interest or importance to their blessing. And so of old, King Uzziah could have burned incense as well as any of the priests, but it appertained not to him, and so he was smitten with the leprosy, for intruding into the priestly office. So now, were all men able to write sermons, they might do so, and it would be no sin to read them; but it appertains not to all men to dispense the public ordinances of grace.

Objection 2. Why may we not as well hear ministers of other denominations preach as join with them in family worship?

Reply. Many of the ideas advanced in answer to the first objection might be repeated here, but the reader's own judgment will supply them. Suffice it, then, to say, that if when ministers and others were suspended from the privileges of the church, such suspension implied that they should also refrain from family worship, it would then be sinful to join with Christians of other denominations in such acts of devotion; but this is not the case, and therefore it is not sinful. But farther, it is the privilege of all men, whether professors or not, and even while lying under sins unrepented of, to worship God in their families morning and evening, and to seek repentance and pardon for such sins. But it is not the privilege of persons lying under scandal to administer ordinances, teaching or sealing; and this, by divine appointment, is what makes the difference in hearing ministers of other denominations preach, and joining with them in family worship.

Objection 3. If you consider ministers of other denominations in the same light that you do your own while under suspension, how, consistently, acknowledge the validity of baptism when dispensed by them, which you surely do by receiving without rebaptizing those who leave their communion and join yours?

Reply. There is a vast difference between saying that a thing is not really done, and in saying that there was sin in the act. In order that baptism be rightly administered, two things are necessary. First, that the signs and ceremonies be according to scripture appointment; and second, that they be performed by a minister of the gospel. And wherever these things are observed, the validity of baptism is to be acknowledged. Now, when ministers are suspended, they are not, by such act, divested of their office, though they be deprived of some of its privileges. For, when persons enter the office of the ministry, and take upon themselves ordination vows, they thereby devote their whole future life to that office; and by no sin which they may commit can they release themselves from the obligations under which they have come. And should such totally apostatize from the Christian religion, as ministers they would have to answer at the day of judgment. Nor does the act of suspension absolve them from ordination engagements. For, if this were so, in case of restoration they would have to be reordained, which is not the case. So, then, as they are still ministers, although while under suspension they are enjoined to desist from the exercise of their office, yet if they do, in disobedience, sinfully exercise it, the act is, nevertheless, done, and is to be acknowledged. Therefore, this makes nothing against the doctrine we have been advancing.*

* Our correspondent does not meet the case of *deposed* ministers. Suspension of a minister is, we think, properly regarded as a judicial declaration of the church that he can neither *dispense*, nor church members *receive* ordinances at his hand, without involving themselves in the guilt of disorderly conduct, and rebellion against the King of Zion. Such conduct is encouraging the wicked man in his wickedness; bidding God speed to such as are "despisers of those that are good;" partaking "of other men's sins," and making sad the hearts of the righteous. Aggravating transgressions! Nevertheless, the suspended minister is not divested of

Objection 4. May we not as well hear ministers of other denominations preach, as be present at their meetings of presbyteries and synods, which your members often do, and you do not hold them censurable?

Reply. There is a great difference between being a partaker and a spectator of any transaction. Now, when we go to hear ministers of other denominations preach, should we not join with them either in praise or prayer, or *hearing* the word preached, we would, surely, be only spectators. But this is not supposable; neither would it be justifiable to go to church to worship God as spectators. But if, on the other hand, we join with them in any of their acts of worship, we are partakers with them; which has been proved to be sinful, and, consequently, censurable. But if, when present at their meetings of presbyteries and synods, we do not join with them in any of their ecclesiastical transactions, we are not partakers with them, but merely spectators. Now, if we can find any who may be present as spectators, without being chargeable with sin, so may we. But their own members who may be present, and not members of the court, are only spectators, as their presence or absence affects not the transaction of the business of the court. Yet it never was supposed that this was in them sinful and censurable. So the objection falls.

Objection 5. "There *can* be no sin in hearing a good gospel sermon any where."

his office; his acts are, therefore, not invalid, but sinful. It is a well established principle, that the sin of the agent cannot invalidate those acts, the matter of which is legal; neither can sin destroy existing offices or relations, except in very few cases; and even in those cases, such as adultery in the marriage relation, a judicial declaration of the proper authority appears, in some measure at least, necessary to render it a nullity. But, respecting *deposition*, the mere fact that ordinances are sometimes held valid as dispensed by ministers under a righteous sentence of *deposition from office*, makes nothing against the argument of our correspondent. In order to give weight to this objection against the doctrine of occasional hearing, it is incumbent on the objector to show that ordinances thus dispensed are valid *jure divino*; which has never yet been, and, it is presumed, never can be, shown. The conclusion, then, is irresistible; the doctrine that occasional hearing is sinful is established; and those who are attending on the ministrations of deposed ministers have voluntarily excluded themselves from divine ordinances; have rejected the authority of the King of Zion, and burst his bands asunder, and cast his cords from them. And respecting all such cases, God is saying to the rulers in his house who have been called, in his providence, to the performance of the truly painful duty of inflicting this censure upon the refractory, as he did to the prophet Samuel, "They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them." Lamentable, indeed, is the condition of these despisers of Zion's King! May God, in his rich mercy, speedily deliver all such as, through the wiles of Satan, have been drawn into this snare.

But we cannot consent to dismiss our correspondent without soliciting the reader's attention to his reasoning. His arguments seem to us conclusive on the subject of which he treats; if they should appear to the reader in the same light, it is hoped their force will be felt, and their salutary influence seen in the future deportment of some of our brethren, who appear, as yet, to be unconvinced. Prejudice, can hardly cavil with either the spirit or manner in which a ruling elder has discussed the important, but much abused doctrine of *Occasional Hearing*.—EDIT. MOR.

Reply. This objection, of all others, is the most common and the most foolish. If it had only respect to place, whether there was sin in hearing in one church rather than in another, no person would dispute it. But its meaning is, that there can be no more sin in hearing a good gospel sermon from one minister than another. And it is questionable whether any reflecting person seriously believes it. According to this objection, should an able minister of the gospel fall even into the sin of adultery, and be suspended for it, and yet persist in preaching, and preach *good gospel sermons*, there would be no sin in hearing him. Those who insist on such objections as this are beyond the reach of argument.

Objection 6. The doctrine is too strict, that persons should be censured for occasional hearing. If you act on such rigid principles, many of our members, who will not be bound up by such strict rules, will leave our communion, and others will be deterred from joining us, and so our churches will become desolate. Better leave every one to their own conscience in this matter.

Reply. This objection is diverse from all the preceding. It is set up as a difficulty to the *truth* of the doctrine, while it neither admits or denies it, but is thrown in as an objection to its policy, from its supposed consequences, whether it be true or false. If those who bring this objection consider that occasional hearing is *not* sinful, I would refer them to the preceding pages, where, I humbly trust, the truth of the doctrine has been fully proved. But if, however, they admit this, I would ask them, then, to ponder well the following things:—

If God has any people within the bounds of the congregations in which it is the reader's and the writer's lot to dwell, whether, think ye, that it is more reasonable to suppose that he will gather them into his church, preserve them there, and perfect his work of sanctification in them, where all his known truths, from the least to the greatest, are esteemed precious, and are faithfully witnessed for, and no known sin, in principle or practice, is tolerated in their members; or to suppose that he would pour out more abundantly his spiritual blessings on churches who lightly esteem some of his truths, and allow their members to indulge in known sins? But if, on the other hand, God has no people within the bounds of the congregation where the reader and the writer dwell, what think ye, that you can convert them, notwithstanding, by giving up some truths which are offensive to some, and by allowing them to indulge in some sins to which they are exceedingly prone? By such a course as this we might fill the church with hypocrites, but not with saints. The more truths abandoned, and the more sins allowed indulgence, the more successful, no doubt, would such a plan prove. Then why not, if it be right at all, follow it out to its most promising and prolific extent?

But the objector proposes, as an expedient, to leave every one to his own conscience in this matter. That is, to allow those who cannot be convinced that occasional hearing is sinful, to indulge in the practice. So, because men cannot be convinced of their sins, the church must indulge their members in the practice of it. Were we to apply this mode of reasoning to any other sin, its folly would be most apparent. The greater part of mankind cannot be convinced

that the playing at games of chance, for mere diversion, is sinful. And surely the course of reasoning by which it is proved sinful is far more abstruse, and lies farther beyond the reach of common capacity, than the arguments do by which occasional hearing is proved sinful. Therefore, according to this plan, this sin claims more indulgence than the other. And, perhaps, some are disposed to call both little sins, and not worth disturbing the peace of the church about. What! any thing which God has condescended to make known as a precept of his law, or a matter of faith, too small for the church's observance! Is not this "exalting ourselves above God?" What saith the scriptures? "Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." And, alas! how many professors there are who struggle long and hard to be counted great in the world, but are content to be the very least in the kingdom of heaven! Their hearts are more elated with the applause of a misjudging world, than they would be with that welcome—that highest praise after which the human heart may lawfully aspire: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things—enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." And although those who would now be faithful in all things committed to their charge as overseers in the house of God may not only be the drunkard's song, but may be despised and reproached by loose professors, as bigotedly precise in their adherence to truth and duty; yet "say ye of the righteous, It shall be well with him." And although we may not now be able to see the wisdom and the goodness of God's providence in permitting his own truths and people to be despised and trampled down, while error prevails and the enemy triumphs, yet we may rest satisfied that he does all things well; and that his wisdom and loving-kindness to us in this, as well as in all other adverse dispensations of his providence to us, both as a church and individuals, will be fully disclosed to our satisfaction, when we come to take a retrospective view of the toilsome scenes of time from the peaceful heights of glory.

R.

ART. III.—*How are men sent to preach?*

Ans. In two ways they are sent; either in an extraordinary way immediately by God himself from whom they receive their instructions. In this way Moses was sent, the prophets and the apostles. In their case extraordinary proof of their mission was necessary and was given. Or, in the ordinary way, through the medium of the officers of the church to whom God has given authority for this purpose. In this way, Timothy and Titus, though in some respects extraordinary men, were sent, 1 Tim. iv. 14, and 2 Tim. i. 6. Also, all those preachers mentioned in the New Testament with approbation, and all who are sent according to 2 Tim. ii. 2.

There is, at present, no pressing necessity for discussion on the first of these ways. The imposture of any that pretend in our time to an extraordinary mission is too palpable to deceive. It is the second only, to which my remarks shall be confined.

Observe, 1. That Christ has vested his church with authority to send men to preach the gospel. Unless this can be established there is no such thing as a mission in the ordinary way; and then it would follow that none are sent but they who are sent immediately by Christ himself. But I think it can be satisfactorily proved, that the authority to send men in the ordinary way, is *with* the church, and her only. If it be admitted, as it must, that the apostles did not transcend their authority in any of their transactions recorded in the acts or epistles, they exercised the authority in question. Acts xiv. 23, "And when they had *ordained* elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed." The reader is aware that the term *elder* (in the Greek *Presbyter*) is applied to them whose office it is to "feed the church of God," see ch. xx. 28, and to "Labour in word and doctrine," 1. Tim. v. 17. Here is not a single act, but a practice, wherever they succeeded in planting a church, men being looked out as fit and chosen by the people, *by lifting up the hand* (*χρηστουνοσ αριτες* is the word here used) Paul and Barnabas set them apart to the work of preaching and all other parts of the pastoral office in the name of Christ, "with laying on of hands," see 1 Tim. iv. 15; 2 Tim. i. 6, prayer and fasting. In this way did Timothy himself receive his commission to preach; and he is directed by the same authority how to proceed in the case of others, as in the following passages. "And the things which thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same *commit* thou to faithful men, who shall be able to *teach* others also. *ib.* To this belongs the caution which Paul gives him. 1 Tim. v. 22. "Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of other men's sins."

In like manner Titus with other ministers had this authority. "For this cause," says the apostle, "left I thee at Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and *ordain elders* in every city, as I appointed thee," ch. i. 5. That it was to the work of preaching chiefly they were to be ordained, appears from the following qualification required in them, ver. 9. "Holding fast the faithful word, as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers." In all these instances things were done in the ordinary way, although extraordinary men took part in them; and they are sufficient to show what was the belief and practice of the church, the apostles being in the midst of her, viz. that she had received authority from Christ to send men to preach, and did exercise it.

Obs. 2. Before a man be sent in this way to preach, the church must be satisfied that he is duly qualified; and neither courts or congregations are to be guided in this matter, by human judgment as to what the qualifications must be. The Spirit of Christ has set them down, that all concerned may know them, and that they may be a rule in all ages.

Touching his personal deportment, his ability and his soundness, they are set down at large, 1 Tim. iii. 1—13; Tit. i. 5—9. He must be able and faithful, 2 Tim. ii. 2. "He must not be self-willed, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre; but a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober,

just, holy, temperate, holding fast the faithful word," &c. Tit. i. 8, 9. His faithfulness is to be manifested in "Teaching *all things whatsoever*, (says Christ) I command you," Mat. xxviii. 20. He is to "keep back nothing that is profitable—is not to shun to declare the whole counsel of God," Acts xx. 20, 28. But it is not my design to be minute here. Otherwise the whole of Paul's exhortations to Timothy and Titus, and his own most exemplary conduct, ought to be quoted.

Every qualification is minutely set down, and the church is not allowed to dispense with any one of them, although perfection is not to be expected in any mere man. When, therefore, the courts of Christ give a man authority to preach, it is believed that he has some good measure of the requisite qualifications. But sometimes their examinations may be so very imperfect, or they may be so deceived, that the man whom they judged to be qualified is not so, or the man himself may so change his views or his conduct afterwards as to become unqualified. However it be, whenever it is fairly susceptible of proof that he is *not* qualified, the church has power and it is her duty to deprive him of his authority. Therefore it is that Christ commends the church of Ephesus, Rev. ch. ii. for "trying them who say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars."

Obs. 3. Besides qualifications, there must be express, particular, and solemn engagements required of the candidate to every part of ministerial duty, and especially to defend and maintain the present truth: and they must be as particularly and expressly and as solemnly come under by him as an indispensable condition to his receiving authority. Although the charge, 1 Timothy vi. 13, is not that which was given at his ordination, but afterwards, yet it certainly presupposes that one no less particular and solemn was *then* given and received. And it is not improbable that to it Paul refers in the words immediately before, when he says—"whereunto thou art also called, and hast professed a good profession before many witnesses." Then follows the very solemn charge which was doubtless intended to remind Timothy of his engagements that day: "I give the charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and before Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession, that thou keep this commandment without spot," &c. Again he refers to it, ver. 20, "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust." And again, he calls it up, 2 Tim. iv. 1. The direction which he gives respecting other preachers, 2 Tim. ii. 14: "Charge them before the Lord that they strive not about words to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers," implies that *they* also had come under solemn engagements when put into the ministry. Indeed, the nature of the office implies it always. "A servant, a steward, or an ambassador," is one that has engaged to act in his office according to the express will of another—in this case, it is the will of Christ which has been laid down by the court acting in Christ's name. We shall hardly miss to find it either expressed or referred to wherever there is mention of a mission being given, says the evangelist Matthew, ch. x. 5. These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying, "Go not in the way of the Gentiles," &c. Again, Acts i. 4: "And being assembled toge-

ther with them, commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, &c.—and ye shall be witnesses to me both in Jerusalem and Judea, and in Samaria, and to the uttermost ends of the earth.” To the same purpose is Matt. xxviii. 20—“Teaching them to observe *all things* whatsoever I have commanded you,” &c. It was said to Moses before he set out for Egypt, “Thou shalt speak *all that* I commanded thee,” Exod. vii. 7. And beyond doubt this was the charge given and engaged to by all that came after him, by Joshua, the Judges, Kings, &c. The Lord said to Jeremiah, “For thou shalt go to all that I send, and whatsoever I command thee thou shalt speak,” ch. i. 7. And to Ezekiel, “Thou shalt speak *my words* unto them whether they will hear or whether they will forbear,” ch. ii. 7. If any thing is binding, these engagements are. They are directly made to God, who quickeneth all things, and to Jesus Christ. The three one God, the holy angels, and the church, are the acknowledged witnesses. The day of judgment is the day appealed to for proof of the man’s sincerity. The souls of the hearers are at stake. We might expect that no man in his sober mind who has made them, could suffer himself for a day or an hour to dismiss the solemn thought.

Obs. 4. God lays the greatest stress upon fidelity to these engagements. And this will be readily expected, by all who rightly consider how much the glory of the divine perfections is concerned in the exact performance of them. The honour which God receives from his creatures, lies in their acknowledging his perfections in the utmost sincerity, and with the most entire confidence. This can be done in no way more becoming creatures, than in yielding implicit and exact obedience to his command, irrespective of every thing else. In doing so, we own him to be our rightful absolute sovereign, holy, wise, just, and good. But the moment we take in hand to vary from it in the least, we practically deny that he is God. For if his bare command be not proof sufficient to us always and in every thing of what is wisest and best to be done, it must be only because he is not infinitely perfect. For this reason it seems to be that Christ said, “Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven.” It was by not letting one jot or tittle of the law pass without fulfilling it, that he himself did so highly magnify it, and glorify his Father upon earth. Unless we can acknowledge him to be God in this way by obeying his command and will, our acknowledgments in other ways amount to nothing, and there can be no communion or fellowship between us at all. Therefore it is that he has put forth to his creatures his will in things indifferent in themselves, and comparatively of small importance. For example, the fruit of one certain tree, Adam and Eve must not eat. The second time Moses must not strike, but *speak* to the rock. Naaman must dip in the waters of Jordan, and no other, and he must do it seven times, and not fewer. Lot must not *look* behind him. The prophet that spake against Jeroboam’s altar must not eat bread, nor drink water, nor turn back by the way that he came, &c.

The truth of the remark which I am endeavouring to illustrate appears not more clearly perhaps in any thing than in the severe

corrections with which God has visited the disobedience of his servants in what is called improperly small things. Because Moses, "who was faithful in all his house," with whom the Lord spake face to face, as a man does to his friend, did, in an hour of severe provocation, smite the rock instead of speaking to it. "Therefore ye shall not (says the Lord to him and Aaron) bring this congregation into the land which I have given them," Num. xx. 13. And afterwards, when Moses besought the Lord for leave to go over Jordan, and see the good land, he received for answer, "Let it suffice thee, speak no more to me of this matter," Deut. iii. 27. It was therefore no small matter, for it was to this amount: "Ye *believed me not* to sanctify me in the eyes of the children of Israel," Num. xx. 12. Now if he did lay so much stress on one act of his faithful servant as this, what stress must he lay upon ordination vows? No man in his right mind who sincerely believes that this was written (by God) for his learning, can think it a light matter to go in the face of them under any circumstances.

Obs. 5. The smallest deviation from these engagements, when persisted in wilfully after admonition, is a sufficient ground for deposition or depriving the offender of authority. However small apparently the action be, the offence hath two very great aggravations attending it: first, it is a breach of solemn vows made to God and his people; and whenever these cease to hold the conscience there is no security remaining against the very grossest delinquency. Second, it is to set up the human will against God's. Therefore it need not be any wonder if God has sometimes deposed his servants for seemingly small offences with terrible rebukes. The man of God who came from Judah, to prophesy against Jeroboam, appears to have been honest at heart, and to have withstood all Jeroboam's temptations; but because he went back with the prophet that lied unto him contrary to orders, "His carcass shall not come unto his fathers' sepulchre, and when he was gone a lion met him by the way and slew him," 1 Kings, xiii. We have a very striking instance of deposition in the case of Saul. The Lord sent him "to smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not, and slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass," 1 Sam. xv. 3. Saul thought he had obeyed the commandment sufficiently, "Blessed be thou of the Lord, I have," says he, "performed the commandment of the Lord." When Samuel noticed the bleating of the sheep as a proof that he had not at least killed *them*. *That* he accounted nothing, or if any thing it was rather done out of pious regard for God's altar, and therefore he insists upon it that he *had* fully complied with the word of the Lord, "And had brought Agag king of the Amalekites." This he doubtless thought was nothing but humanity. But says Samuel, "Hath the Lord as great delight in sacrifice *as in obeying* the voice of the Lord?" He would answer no. The Lord sets nothing above his own word. Therefore, although this act was done in pretence of regard for God's ordinance, it was "Rebellion, which is as the sin of witchcraft," or a connivance with the devil against God. It was "stubbornness, which is as iniquity and idolatry"—or setting up an idol in opposition to the Lord. It was a "*rejecting* of the word of the Lord," and the prophet adds, "He also hath re-

jected thee from being king." Now indeed Saul would confess his fault, but it was too late for retaining the kingdom. The prophet repeats the painful sentence with an assurance that "the strength of Israel is not a man, that he should repent."

When the times are characterized by a prevailing disregard to divine commands, and apostasy from the true religion, it makes the least instance of disobedience in God's public servants much more aggravated, and strict discipline and severe censure the more necessary. And the people of God, and the courts of his house, whose lot may be cast in such times, ought duly to consider this, in the administration of censure. Such a time it was in which Moses lived. His people were a stiff-necked and rebellious race; on which account there was the more need for him to be very exact in obeying the word of the Lord before them. They were of the same temper at the time that Saul was sent to destroy the Amalekites, and much more so when the man of God came from Judah to reprove the sin of Jeroboam. But I may have occasion to take up this thought again. ♣

Obs. 6. The Lord Jesus Christ hath given authority to the courts of his house to depose from office any of his public servants whenever it is proper to be done. This may be called an inference from what has been already said; for if he has given them authority to try the qualifications, to exact the promises of fidelity from candidates, as the condition of their receiving authority, and by express terms, in his name to clothe them with that authority, it would seem plainly to comprehend in it this authority to depose. Nay, it would not without it indicate the wisdom of the church's head, because without it their authority to try and ordain men would not serve the end for which it is given, "which is the edification of the church," Eph. iv. 12. If a man once admitted to the exercise of official authority, could continue to hold it, right or wrong, discipline and censure would be of no use in this case. The ordaining of him might be the ordaining of a tyrant, and an oppressor of God's heritage without remedy, instead of a pastor to feed them with knowledge. But it is not so ordered. The rule in Matt. xviii. 18, although not laid down especially for offenders in office, yet is it applicable to them as well as others. If the brother of low degree is to be dealt with as there directed, when he will not be reclaimed, much more are these in office, whose offences, from the eminence of their station is apt to do much more hurt to the church, as they are also much more dishonouring to the church's head. If it be said that the command, "Let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican," is obeyed when a private member is excommunicated with the greater excommunication, it is answered, that when the offender is an officer, it can never be obeyed while he is not put from his office. Without doubt this single text gives the servants of Christ "gathered together in his name," when the case requires it, the authority in question, if there were not another that did speak on the subject. And he also promises that their decision, when given according to the principles of his word, shall "bind in heaven." But several texts speak directly on this subject. The apostle says, "Against an elder receive not an accusation but before two or three witnesses," 1 Tim v. 19. An elder is both "he

that rules and he that labours in word and doctrine," ver. 17. This is indeed a caution against receiving an accusation *hastily* or upon slight grounds against an elder. But, on the other hand, when the charge is weighty and capable of clear proof, his meaning is that it *ought* to be received, and if received, it ought to be prosecuted. Suppose that the proof is clear and decisive, but the delinquent continues after all reasonable and scriptural means to reclaim him, obstinate and impenitent, what is to be done? Is the case to be abandoned and the man allowed to go on in his sin, not only with impunity but triumph? No, verily, but "let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." It was the exercise of this authority to depose that is commended by our Lord in the church of Ephesus, Rev. ii. 2; and the not exercising of it in the churches of Pergamos and Thyatira is reproved. Therefore the church not only can depose, but she is bound to do it. She is faithless, she is perjured, if she do it not, and fearful things are threatened to her by the Lord Christ. Not to mention any more passages, the authority in question may be fairly made out from the apostle's denunciation, Gal. i. 9, 10. For this was a deposing to all intents, by the key of doctrine, and this implies that it would be *lawful* to do it with the key of discipline.

From these observations it may be seen that a most weighty matter is intrusted to church courts, in sending forth men to preach the gospel of salvation. How much depends on their fidelity, vigilance, and wisdom! How deeply concerned in their laying their hands on a man is the salvation of multitudes of men, the edification of the saints, the peace and purity of the visible church, and the glory of Christ! "Lay hands suddenly on no man." Let every doubt and hesitation have time to weigh fully on the conscience. Beware of partiality. Let not the feelings or the prospects of the man decide. Fear nothing so much as dishonouring Christ and wounding his body.

We may also see that ordination vows and ordination days are the most solemn events of a man's life. Never again can any thing so solemn occur, till he stands before Christ to give an account of his ministry. It is one of the dismal signs of our day, that they are treated by many ministers and people as mere ceremonies. We may learn farther, that the decisions of church courts, given in accordance with the word of God and ordination engagements, are not mere nullities, but binding in the view of Jesus Christ, and sooner or later they will take full effect upon those concerned, either to bring to repentance or to harden to a course that will be easily understood by all.

So much for answer to the second question. There are several other things which are connected with the subject that are intended to be brought into the answers that shall be given to the following questions.

I wish earnestly that not only some more able than myself would discuss the subject, but that all the ability in the church were brought to bear upon it. Either I do not understand the *handsome friendly wholesale way* of sending off from communion ministerial and Christian, "them that cause divisions and offences," of which I read from time to time; or, the censures of suspension, deposition and excommunication are about to be laid aside, and a new

way of doing business is about to be introduced. When the number of "men that arise up in the church speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them," becomes very considerable, it would seem, from this new method of dismissal, that they are looked on as a new society or family that has sprung up in the heart of the old, whose *peculiarities render it inconvenient* to dwell with them in the *same house*, but who, if they will go to keeping house by themselves, shall be *decently* sent away and regarded as respectable neighbours. Where in all this course is the odium of sin made to appear? or the daring breach of solemn vows? What reparation does it make for the dishonour done to Christ and the hurt given to his people? What is there in this new way of cutting off "to make others fear?"

Will this new way shield us from the threatening, Rev. ii. 16, and 22, 23, 24, "Repent, or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will fight against thee with the sword of my mouth? Behold, I will cast her into a bed, and them that commit adultery with her into great tribulation, &c. And *all the churches* (among all nations and to the end of the world) shall know that I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts, and I will give unto every one of you according to your works."

The next question is, how may the people know when to countenance men as sent to preach, and when not?

Διακριτικ.

ART. IV.—*Obituary of Robert Martin.*

DIED at Albany, on the 29th of November, 1839, Robert Martin, aged forty, and for many years an elder in the Associate Presbyterian Church in that city.

Mr. Martin was a native of Scotland, we believe Edinburgh, and immigrated to this country in early life; not, however, till he had made a profession of his faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, the only Saviour of sinners. He was a member of the Relief Church. On his arrival in this country, he attended for a time the ministry of a clergyman connected with the General Assembly. Their free communion, lax discipline, and human psalmody, soon became grievous to him, and his dissatisfaction increased in the ratio of his theological knowledge. In 1824, he commenced attendance on the ministry of the Rev. James Martin, and was soon after admitted to full communion in the Associate Church. His sauvity of manners, humble deportment, discriminating mind, and ardent attachment to secession principles, were not long concealed from the congregation. He was unanimously chosen to the office of the eldership, in which he served with diligence and general satisfaction till removed by death. He was a member of the Synod which met at Baltimore in 1834.

A colleague with him in the same session, and in daily habits of social and friendly intercourse for a period of more than ten years,

the memory of his Christian virtues cannot be erased from the writer's mind.

Never too much elated or depressed, his equanimity has seldom been surpassed, though severely tried by a long protracted and distressing disease, which first manifested itself by hemorrhage of the lungs, and which terminated only in death. In his business transactions he was prompt, liberal; and scrupulous respecting the rights of others. But the prosperity of Zion excited in him a more permanent and lively interest. He was much exercised respecting the difficulties which so long afflicted that section of the church. They were a frequent subject of reflection, conversation, and fervent prayer with him. While he deplored the imperfections of Zion's true friends, and was much grieved at the want of love in all, he regarded with horror the treacherous doings of her enemies.

He frequently remarked in substance, that however extensive this defection might be, or however much individual suffering it might produce, he knew it was a purifying process of Zion's King, who sits "as a refiner and purifier of silver," and that it would work together with all other things "for the good of them that love God and are the called according to his purpose."

The writer of this notice enjoyed the heart-felt satisfaction of an interview with the deceased in October last. He was then daily expecting his approaching dissolution. He conversed with freedom and animation on the subject of death, and his own death in particular. He said he felt himself sinking fast, the vital parts of his body were gone, but he had assurance that a better habitation awaited him. His clear views, his vigorous faith, his composure, and even joy in the full prospect of death produced an effect on the few persons present which we shall not attempt to describe. We have been informed by a letter from a friend, that this heavenly state of mind never forsook him, that he breathed out his soul in peace with the declaration, "I behold my Redeemer waiting to receive me." (See Acts vii. 55, 56.)

At a scene like this the infidel in health may sneer, the mere worldling may cry *enthusiasm!* But the Christian will give glory to God, who hath given us the victory over death through our Lord Jesus Christ. Perhaps no man was farther removed from enthusiasm; to mere feeling he never yielded. On this point we appeal without fear of contradiction to all who knew him. He has left a widow and several children, whose earthly loss admits of no compensation. By that faith only which rendered his life peaceful and happy, and his death victorious, can they obtain infinitely more than they have lost in an earthly father and protector.

It is believed the reader will readily excuse the room we have occupied in paying this brief tribute of respect to the memory of one

of God's hidden ones. Obituary notices have been so greatly prostituted to panegyrics on wicked and worthless men, false as they are fulsome, that serious Christians are disposed to look with suspicion upon any thing of the kind. But have we not suffered the enemy to deprive us of the grateful duty and interesting privilege, of *cherishing the memory of the righteous*? God holds them in everlasting remembrance. "The God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob" is his memorial to all ages, and shall we set up no memento to commemorate the faith, the sufferings, the conflicts, the victory of our brethren who have been imitators of those who through faith and patience are now inheriting the promises? Who is he that will condemn us for such a work? Is it not profitable for us to ponder the death of the righteous? Many indeed say, "Let me die the death of the righteous," who give themselves no concern to live the life of the righteous. But over others their example exerts a salutary influence. We see not then why the abuse of obituary notices should be regarded as a valid objection against their legitimate use. The world dares say no more for its device, than *Dum spiro spero*, but the children of God can add, *Dum expiro spero*.*

ART. V.—*A few plain Remarks on the Way of Salvation, addressed chiefly to the Young.* (No. I.)

WHEN our Lord had healed the sick, raised the dead, and by amazing miracles, proved that he was, indeed, the "Mighty God," the Jews, instead of adoring him as the promised Messiah, and blessing him for his mercy, blasphemed, and sought to kill him. To point out their great ingratitude, and humble them under a sense of their heinous guilt, Jesus addressed to them the cutting rebuke—"Many good works have I showed you from my Father; for which of those works do ye stone me?" May not a similar rebuke be justly addressed to the despisers of the Bible? Here is a book which unveils the glories of heaven, and opens to the dying sinner a door of hope. Here is a book, which warns you of the coming wo, and pleads with you, in words the most tender, and the most awful, to turn and live. Here is a book sent to you from heaven; its author, *your Judge*, the God of heaven: a book, which, living and dying, will guide and bless you. The sword of justice is drawn, and descending on the soul; the Bible points you to a strong hold, which that sword cannot enter. Death is drawing near, the grave is ready for you; and when the breathless clay is hidden in its prison, the deathless spirit will be plunged into an eternity of torment. The Bible tells you how death can be disarmed, the grave stripped of its gloom, and an eternity of anguish exchanged for infinite and unending joy. Would you have happiness for your portion on earth? Believe the Bible. Would you have heaven as your home hereafter? Believe the Bible. This is the only book which points out the *way of Salvation*. In sickness and in sorrow, it will sustain

* Leighton on 1 Pet. i. 3.

the broken spirit; and when no earthly friend can comfort, no human power bring relief, this messenger of mercy will pluck from the pierced heart the poisoned arrow, and speak peace to the troubled soul. Yes, here the unhappy wandering soul, like the wearied dove, finds a shelter from the waters of vengeance. And why is this word not welcomed? For which of all these precious offers is it scorned? Could infidels persuade themselves, and persuade others, that there is no heaven, no salvation, no Saviour, would they be more happy? Would the world be less guilty, life less wretched, and death less terrible? Miserable and mistaken men; they would poison our peace upon earth, blast our prospects for eternity, shut against us the gates of salvation, and rob us even of *hope*. They would drag us from our blessed refuge, our happy home; wrest from us our treasure, make us miserable, and then kill the soul. If the stars of heaven should fall, the sun disappear, "all the bright lights of heaven be made dark over us and darkness set upon the land," the judgment would be terrible: but far greater the curse—far more dreadful our doom, if the infidel's wish were granted, and the Bible blotted from existence. A worse than "Egyptian darkness," a darkness that in its dreadful consequences would be felt throughout eternity, would settle on the soul.

Come with me then, my young friends, and see in the precious Bible *the way of salvation* clearly pointed out. Come see your need of a Saviour, and the only way of salvation, through that Saviour's death.

I. This book of God teaches us that we are all sinners, sinners by nature and by practice; and as such, in danger of, and justly deserving eternal death. Humbling as this truth is to the pride, and hateful as it is to the unrenewed heart of every descendant of Adam, it is a truth plainly taught in the word of God,—a truth, the knowledge of which is indispensable to salvation, and which the experience of all ages establishes as incontrovertible. A few texts in proof, may suffice here. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." "The judgment was by one to condemnation."—"For, if by one man's offence death reigned by one," &c. That is, by the one offence, the first sin of the first man, as the representative of all his natural descendants, "death reigned." Yea, "By the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation." See Rom. v. 12—19; 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22. These passages plainly prove, that there was a covenant entered into, with Adam, as the covenant head and representative of all his natural posterity;—that his first sin was imputed to them all, and that in consequence of this sin, we are all by nature in a state of guilt, and exposed to death and wrath, on account of that one offence.

This appointment of Adam as our covenant head, was both just and merciful. Adam was the first parent of all the human race—was formed perfectly holy—was perfectly able to fulfil the condition of the covenant, and keep the whole law of God. He had the strongest inducements, and the most cheering encouragements to resist temptation, and persevere in obedience; while that obedience would soon have secured eternal happiness to himself and to all his posterity.

Besides, God as our creator and judge, who is infinitely wise, and just, and good, in all that he does, was pleased to appoint Adam as our representative, and, at the same time, to give him power and inclination (while left to the freedom of his own will) to procure for himself, and all mankind, a title to eternal life. Genesis ii. 16, 17. But he took of the fruit of the tree, "and did eat," and thus "transgressed the covenant." Hosea vi. 7. And thus "in Adam all die." "The wages of sin is death." Death cannot touch a sinless being. But death, we are told, now reigns as a king, by the offence of one over all, "even over him that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression:"—that is, infants not guilty of actual sin. They die before they are guilty of actual transgression. Having committed no actual sin, and yet suffering its dreadful wages, they must be depraved in nature and guilty of original sin, or they would not be cut off by death. Would a holy and just God thus punish them if they were perfectly innocent, and born sinless?

We are suffering, too, under the curse pronounced on the ground for Adam's sin in paradise, and, of course, were viewed by a just God as deserving to partake in the punishment, because partakers of the sin: not that we actually committed the sin of Adam, in eating the forbidden fruit; but he standing as our federal head, we sinned in him; and the *guilt* of that sin is imputed to all his descendants.

But not only is original sin imputed to us, it is also inherent in us: that is, the guilt of Adam's sin imputed to us, not only exposes us to condemnation and wrath; but original sin inherent, or, the corruption of our whole nature is also derived to us from Adam, as our covenant head. We have lost all original righteousness; we are born utterly depraved. "There is none righteous, no, not one." "Adam begat a son in his own likeness, after his image." "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean, not one?" "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me."

Our whole nature is corrupt. The understanding is darkened, and this darkness can be scattered by no power, but that of God the Spirit. Eph. iv. 18. 2 Cor. iv. 6. The conscience is seared, corrupt, and utterly unfit to direct in duty. The will and affections are earthly, polluted, and full of hatred to holiness and God: yea, the mind of every son and daughter of Adam, by nature, is enmity with God.

By actual sin, too, we have broken the law of our God. That law demands our punishment. When God threatened eternal death against the transgressors, he meant what he said. "The soul that sinneth it shall die." We have sinned, and justice demands our death. How then can we escape? Will the strength of Israel lie? Will the God of truth falsify his word? If the claims of the law could be relaxed, and a single soul escape the sentence denounced, without full satisfaction for sin, then the threatenings of God's word are a mere mockery, and his laws, instead of being fixed, and unalterable, are no laws, but an idle tale of terror, whose sanction and threatened penalty mean nothing at all. And if God does not mean what he says when he threatens, how can we know that he will fulfil what he promises? Can the sinner think that God will disregard his own word, stain his own glory, and break down the

pillars of his throne, rather than execute a deserved penalty upon him?

Let no one object here, that if the law will not be utterly levelled and its requirements entirely withdrawn, still its rigour shall be relaxed, and repentance, without any farther satisfaction, purchase pardon. This is a supposition that has no foundation in the nature of God's law, no warrant in God's word. If penitence could purchase the pardon of sin, if tears of sorrow could wash away the sinner's guilt, then why was the blood of the Saviour shed? Repentance is no satisfaction for sin. It cannot remove guilt from the soul, nor restore glory to God's violated law. To say you are sorry you are in debt, will not pay your debt, nor procure your discharge from the power of the law, and the claims of your creditor. The fear and anguish of the criminal, whose hands are stained with blood, will not, and ought not to repeal his sentence. Even supposing that repentance was payment in part, to God's violated law, (which it is not,) yet that does not come up to its requirements. Perfect obedience is demanded by the law; and it will be satisfied with nothing less. In every action, and throughout every moment of life, it will have perfect holiness: and if we fail in the least, if we violate its smallest command, even in thought, or by a wish, it has no mercy to show us. We must die. It knows nothing about repentance. It presents us all before God as criminals, justly condemned to eternal death. It calls for the tempest of wrath to sweep us away. It summons justice, as the executioner and avenger of its violated purity, to do its office. How vain, then, to hope for salvation, either in whole or in part, through the law. If God could dispense in part with the requirements of his law; if its claims against the sinner could in aught be cancelled, without dishonouring his justice, and staining his sacred truth; then why not another and another, till the whole law was trampled in the dust, its threatenings given to the winds, and sin enthroned in triumph over the dishonoured attributes of a holy God? It can never be.

To say again that you will do better in future, will not pay your past debts,—will not atone for past sins. The law tells you its terms can never be altered. Your determination to reform, it will have nothing to do with. It will have perfect obedience or our life, our soul's life. Repentance too, be it remembered, is God's gift; and how absurd to say, that you will bring his own gift to his throne, and purchase pardon with it?

But not only the nature and sanctions of God's law, the dispensations of his Providence also prove, that the threatening of the law will be inflicted. Go where you will, you find the earth full of suffering, misery, and pain, disease and death assailing, under one form or another, every child of Adam, proclaims that the penalty of the divine law will not be dispensed with. God will be true, and all who contradict him or his word will be found liars. How then shall the criminal escape without perverting justice? The law must be fulfilled in every tittle of its threatenings, though we, and all mankind sink under the judgments it denounces. Mercy cannot reach us till the flood of wrath is driven back, the curse of the law we have broken, borne, and the claims of justice against us answered. If called to answer for ourselves, we will perish eternally.

How then can the soul be delivered from going down to the pit,

and justice not destroyed? In a way which excites the astonishment of angels, and proclaims the wisdom of Almighty God. "I," saith Jehovah, "have found a ransom." Never could it have entered the minds of men or angels, that a plan of mercy by which the sinner could be saved would, at the same time, glorify the truth, the justice, the holiness of God in that salvation. Angels had seen their guilty companions cast down to the darkness of the lowest hell; and they could conceive of no way, in which sinning men could escape a similar doom.

———"Man disobeying,
Die, he or justice must, unless for him
Some other able, and as willing, pay
The rigid satisfaction, death for death."

That satisfaction has been paid by the death of the Son of God. This all-sufficient plan for the salvation of the helpless sinner, infinite wisdom only could devise; infinite love only could execute. If in any other way sin could have been forgiven, Christ crucified would never have hung on the hill of Calvary; the king of heaven would never have suffered on the cross; the precious blood of Christ would have been spared. The substitution then of the Son of God explains the mystery of the sinner's safety. The guilty are indeed delivered from the sword of justice, but not till that sword has drunk full satisfaction in the blood of an infinite victim for their sins. The redeemed are before the throne, because He who reigns on that throne, "loved them, and washed them from their sins, in his own blood." In contemplating then the necessity of this sacrifice, and the way of salvation through the atonement of Christ, we must remember, that this atonement does not consist merely in the death of the cross. Every circumstance connected with the sacrifice of Jesus, from his birth to his resurrection, enters into the nature of the atonement, and is necessary to be understood by all who would obtain salvation.

ART. VI.—*Essay on Family Worship.*

By the Rev. W. H. Burns, of Kilsyth.

PART II. ADVANTAGES OF FAMILY WORSHIP.

HAVING set forth the obligations of family worship in three views, as founded in the domestic relationship, as implied in many scriptural injunctions, and as taught by approved examples, I would now proceed to recommend family worship from some additional considerations.

I. How becoming and pleasant is it for a family to join in devotional duties! Can any sight be more venerable and lovely, than a religious parent surrounded by his family, pouring out the warmest desires of his heart in *their* behalf, as well as in *his own*—that they may be blessed of the God of heaven—that they may be made wise, and holy, and happy; endowed with heavenly wisdom, sanctified by grace, preserved from evil, supported under trials, prospered in their lawful callings, pardoned and accepted in the Beloved, and led forward daily in the path to heaven? Can any thing be more plainly reasonable and becoming, than for a family to give thanks together to the Author of those blessings

they have jointly received; to implore grace to perform the duties they owe to their common parent, and to one another; and to commend themselves to the care of the Shepherd of Israel, and to seek that blessing of the Lord which is in the habitation of the righteous? How pleasing the melody of joy and of health in the dwellings of the righteous, and to hear the supplications, which though, it may be, simple and unlettered, are serious and devout! It is the heart, brethren, and the utterance of the heart, which constitutes prayer—which is its life and its charm; and where would the heart have freer scope, where should the soul have a fuller flow, than at the domestic altar, where the strongest feelings of nature, and the purest desires of the new man, conspire together and rise to heaven!

II. The sacrifices thus daily offered, return in blessings like the refreshing rain and dews of heaven. The blessing of the Lord is in the habitation of the righteous. The Lord hears and answers the prayers of his people from the dwellings of Jacob, as well as within the gates of Zion; from the family group of worshippers, as well as from the great congregation. True, indeed, affliction often enters the dwellings where prayer is wont to be made; yet a sovereign remedy is furnished from the promises of God, from the well-grounded persuasion of an interest in his covenant, from the supports and aids of his grace, and the animating hopes of glory. To the people of God affliction is not the rod of indignation, but the chastisement of a father. Great is the advantage which in this view results from the worship of God in the family. What comfort can those have in such cases, whose families are strangers to prayer? They may have all the assistance which medical skill can supply, and the presence and attention of earthly friends; but, alas! these are poor and miserable comforters, when there is no acquaintance with God as a refuge and a sanctuary—no interest at a throne of grace—no extracting of comfort from the precious promises—no searching of Scripture, that through patience and the comfort flowing from the promises they may have hope. In time of health and prosperity, the family that is without religious worship may amuse themselves with the timbrel and harp, with the tale, and the song, and the glass; but for these things there can be no relish when days of darkness, and nights of pain, and the evening of death arrive. For these they make no provision; and though they may be forced to have recourse to religion in such a season, and call for prayer as a kind of last resource, they can have no delight in it; and what they then swallow reluctantly as a nauseous draught, can administer no real relief or comfort; whereas the devout worshipping family have daily in their hands the great charter of salvation. They are daily in the habit of applying the gospel remedy, and supplicating grace to help in time of need, which a faithful God and Father never fails to grant. They have been learning songs for the night, and have them ready when the darkness comes on. It is not merely when sickness is in the house, that the members are called to prayer, or merely on Sabbath days; so that in the minds of the members of praying families religion is not associated with melancholy, nor its exercises regarded as a kind of funeral knell and farewell to life. It is the glory of their

day of prosperity, as well as their solace in the night of adversity. It is like the song of the lark, as well as of the nightengale. And a blessing is entailed upon the posterity of such worshipping Abrahams, far higher in value, and far more productive of comfort, than the richest heritage in houses or lands. This leads to observe,

III. That the practice of family worship is calculated to have the best effects on the members of the family. For example, can there be a more likely or powerful means of promoting *harmony* in a family than this, that they are accustomed daily to meet together at the throne of grace, to pray with and for each other to the God of love? Can any thing tend more effectually to enforce regularity of deportment, and fidelity in all the transactions of life, than the consideration of their daily solemn professions of religion? What *awe* must this practice impress upon the several members of the family? and what powerful motives have such to good conduct, above those families which are seldom engaged together in religious duties, and who, excepting in church, are never called to pray, or brought together into the immediate presence of God, or under the solemn impression of things invisible and eternal? Families who have no family worship, seem to want a proper bond of union; the members are all scattered and divided, each allowed in a manner to do what is right in his own eyes. At any rate, they certainly want one of the most powerful and salutary means of enforcing regularity, and of preserving order and discipline. Every time a family is called together to pray and to read the Scriptures, the bond of union is produced; the authority of the King of heaven is recognised, and a new engagement entered into to be His servants and children. And let it here be particularly noticed, that with family *worship*, family discipline, that is, both religious instruction and good order as to hours, and company, and moral conduct, must be conjoined. It is a good, though quaint saying, that *prayer* must make us give up sinning, or sinning will make us give up praying. To attempt to keep both is impossible. It is granted that this monstrous inconsistency has been too often exhibited, as in the Pharisees who devoured widows' houses, and for a pretence made long prayers. There have been in every age hypocrites as well as unbelievers. But assuredly, the glaring inconsistency which strikes every one, and which has made the character of the *knave* who pretends to keep up the form of religion so universally odious, is a proof that so strict a profession as the practice of family worship implies, is viewed as an engagement and guarantee for correct and strict conduct in all respects, and in every relation of life; and that every one who professes to live in a godly manner, is thereby solemnly engaged, on every principle of duty and of consistency, to live also soberly and righteously. We have a good example in the case of Jacob, of the conjoining of family reformation and discipline, with the erection of the family altar, in Gen. xxx. as before referred to.* Instruction and rules of order, which every family making any claim

*Some excellent remarks on the superior influence of religious instruction, when accompanied with family worship, are to be found in Dwight on Family Worship.

to respectability and morality more or less observe, will most unquestionably have tenfold more influence, and obtain more of the divine countenance and blessing, when these instructions and rules are solemnized, consecrated, watered, defended, and supported by united fervent prayer, coming up in memorial before God.

In conclusion, let those who have not yet worshipped God with their families, consider these things seriously, and follow out their convictions; and, in the strength of promised grace, earnestly asked on the bended knee in secret, begin the godly and goodly practice of family worship; otherwise think how you can answer to your own conscience, to your family, to God the great judge, if you still refuse to pray to Him in your dwelling; if you continue to live like heathen and unbelievers, while you call yourselves Christians. Remember the heathen will rise up against you in judgment, if you have no altar for God, while they have their gods of the house and of the hearth in the very midst of their dwellings, as the most sacred place.

Let those who do perform the duty persevere in it; be very serious and in earnest, guard against formality, and be holy in all manner of conversation. You have set up a standard; be not false to your colours. Dishonour not your Master, nor bring reproach on a good cause. Be consistent, and, like the good Centurion, (Acts x. 2,) let your prayers and alms, your devotion, and your good works, come up together before God.

Let all of us consider that when the Lord numbers his people, we must belong to one class or another; either of those who fear the Lord and worship him, or of those who fear Him not; either Bethaven (house of vanity) or Bethel must be inscribed on our houses. Shall it be written on them, *No worship of God here!* "There is heard here the sound of revelry and mirth, but never the voice of prayer and of praise." Can you not bear to think that this should be written as the character of your house? then adopt the other alternative. Let God have your heart and your house as an *altar*, and a *throne*, and a temple. Worship the Lord your God, and him only do you serve. (Ps. l. last verse,) "Whoso offereth praise glorifieth God: and to him that ordereth his conversation aright, he will show *his salvation*."

[From the Edinburgh Instructor.]

ART. VII.—*Essay on Christian Watchfulness.* (PART I.)

NEXT to faith and repentance, *watchfulness*,—with its inseparable concomitants, sobriety and prayer,—is most frequently enforced by our Lord, and by his apostles.

Watchfulness may be truly said to come *in, second* to every other duty, as its guardian and preservative. Even in paradise it was needful; for while the great law was love, and the first duty to worship the blessed Jehovah, the very next was, to *beware* of yielding to the tempter. Through defect of watchfulness, sin entered, and the glory departed.

In our fallen state, the first call is to return to the Lord our God, because we have fallen by our iniquity; and the very next is to

“watch and pray, that we enter not into temptation.” The call indeed is *positive*, to love the Lord our God with all our heart; and the life of a Christian is not a system of mere restraints and prohibitions. Yet, surrounded as we are with snares, and prone as we are to return to folly, it is the exercise, and the duty of every day, and in all circumstances, to “take heed to ourselves, that we may love the Lord our God;” in other words, that we be watchful.

I propose, therefore, in this essay, to attempt an illustration, first, of the nature, and next, of the importance of watchfulness.

I. The nature of watchfulness.

Here I would set out by observing that some of the duties of Christianity belong to the foundation; others to the superstructure; and others to the means, and guards. Faith lies at the root; holiness in all its branches is the production; and watchfulness and its concomitants preserve and keep the defences.

It is plain, therefore, that in order to watch, there is something requisite as a preliminary: and that is, that we be really and truly converted. It is Christian, *religious* watchfulness we are treating of, and not mere natural—far less worldly activity and vigilance—which a man may possess while spiritually dead. It is *with* Jesus Christ we are to watch—in his service, as it is by his strength, and to his glory. He addresses his disciples as servants and soldiers, when he charges us to watch. The mind and the heart must be in a sound state of spiritual life; furnished with right principles, and having the spiritual senses exercised aright, in their apprehensions and feelings. A man asleep cannot watch;—a man who is not on duty at all, but wandering at large, or in the service of the enemy, cannot watch. You would not say to any one, or every one you met, “you must be on the watch;” but to the man who is engaged as the servant, the soldier, or the ally. Doubtless it is the duty of each of us to be in a condition to watch; but there is the previous duty to repent, and be converted; to “put on Christ;” not providing for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof.

The 1st and most obvious description or mark of watchfulness is the being *awake*. The sleeper and dreamer cannot possibly watch. The sentinel found asleep on guard incurs capital punishment.

The Christian soldier must not sleep as do others. He sees things in their true light and due proportion, and according to their real value. The eyes of his understanding have been enlightened, to discern the real and important difference between the temporal and the eternal—between the essential and the less important—between pilgrimage and home—between what is a loan, and what is secured—what is for a moment, and what is for ever. Yet even the truly awakened and living Christians are too apt, by degrees, to begin to slumber and sleep. To watchfulness, therefore, as opposed to slumber, we must often be summoned. Yawning is infectious—sleep creeps on insensibly—the regions of downy ease, and of visionary and imaginary joys, are very seductive, and dangerous.

Beware of yielding to a little sleep, or even to a little slumber, or even to a little more folding of the hands to sleep, lest spiritual poverty come upon you. Beware of forgetting yourselves as men, as Christians, as pilgrims, as soldiers, as dying, and as immortal.

2nd. You must not only be awake, but *observant*; not only walk-

ing your rounds, but walking circumspectly, accurately, as wise, and not as fools.

Be on the look-out, and make every requisite remark and observation. "Watchman, what of the night?" The pilot and the captain of the vessel must make frequent observation of the coast; of the winds and tide; and frequent use of the compass, and chart, and of the sounding line. The sentinel in the camp or fortification must observe narrowly, and with unelosing eye and unmoved attention, every movement of the enemy. So must we, as Christian voyagers and soldiers, always be at our post of observation, with clear and steady eye, and ear quick in warning of the approach of danger; with all the spiritual senses exercised to discern good and evil, and take warning, and either approach or flee, lest we be ensnared, or sustain loss or injury. We must observe and guard against *right* and *left hand* errors; lest friends engross us,—landing us in idolatry; or enemies insnare us,—subverting our faith,—“the evil heart of unbelief, departing from the living God.”

3d. Watchfulness implies *caution*, as opposed to presumption.

Much of the exercise of the Christian, both in private and in public, in the church and in the world, and in the intercourse with society, is of this kind—the guarding against dangers and snares, by which we are daily surrounded. You may not always be engaged in actual conflict with the enemy, but you are always in danger from the inroads of the tempter. Do not for a moment flatter yourself that you are quite free of all danger, and may relax your vigilance; for even in paradise there was a forbidden tree and a tempter. Even in the church and among friends, the enemy is busy. Even in the garden you must “watch and pray that ye enter not into temptation.” Even in the sweet well watered vale which Lot chose, there were pits and snares far worse than the slime pits which the eye might, with care, observe and avoid. And when you go forth to actual conflict with the enemy, let it be with caution, as well as bravery; by keeping out of the scene of danger, rather than by presumptuously, like Simon Peter, going into dangerous or doubtful ground. You must make use of your shield as well as of your sword; have the breastplate as well as the helmet; the defensive pieces of armour, as often in use as the offensive; and, keep them all bright and at hand, by watchfulness and prayer. Beware of the rock of presumption; and be not high-minded, but *fear*.

4th. We are to watch not only *against* the intrusion of evil, but also *for* opportunities of active usefulness, and growth in *grace*.

The Christian is called to exercise himself to godliness, which bears the idea of making this, as it were his trade and constant occupation.* Immediately and closely connected with this view of the Christian's life, is watchfulness. We must be up and doing; not lying down, nor loving to slumber. It is an active frame and posture of mind, and not merely a being so far awake, as to guard against inroads and attacks. Indeed the two things are closely connected, namely, the vigilance of resistance, and that of conquest and activity in well doing. You are to be watchful, not only not to lose, but to gain; not only to have your talent kept, but increased.

* There are two excellent sermons of Boston's on this text, the first to ministers, the second to Christians.

The command is, "Go and *work* in my vineyard." Our blessed Lord set us an example, "Wist ye not, that I must be about my Father's business?" Jesus of Nazareth *went about* doing good. Every day, every season, in every company, in all situations, we are to seek out and to improve opportunities of usefulness: to seek to obtain good, and to diffuse good. Now, such is our natural sloth, and so many the temptations around us, that unless we be very fully awake and watchful, and make it our real business, and even as our meat and drink to do the will of God, we shall most certainly decline, instead of going on and growing. The soul will not be kept in proper tone without watchfulness; the spirit will flag; the spiritual eye will become dim in its perceptions; the opportunities of good will slip away, unnoticed and unimproved. The merchant, the husbandman, the children of this world, wise in their generation, all read a lesson of rebuke, and of emulation to Christian men and women; a lesson of vigilant activity, as well as of well proved sagacity in prosecuting their objects. The skilful and active mariner, too, studies the winds, and tides, and currents, not merely to keep out of danger, but also to facilitate and accelerate his voyage: and the skilful general not only watches against a surprise, but to achieve a signal victory; not only against the shame and ruin of defeat, but also that he may push on in advance, and extend the line not only of defence, but of conquest. And the faithful gospel minister watches for souls, not only against the entry of wolves, who would devour the flock, but also to lead them to the best spiritual pasture, healthful and nutritive. And every Christian is called to watch for his own soul, and for the souls of others, by cultivating the mind and the heart; by collecting, and also by distributing, stores of knowledge and of grace; and in ways and at seasons, and by means which Christian wisdom and zeal, vigilantly exercised, only can discover and improve; but which, without watching, never would be thought of, or applied to any useful end.

We add, that sobriety and prayer are always, in scripture, connected with watchfulness; and they are its essential concomitants,—the former, that we may have our mind entire, our senses unimpaired, our passions under rule;—the latter, that we may call in supplies of wisdom and of grace from above. Without sobriety, both of mind and of body, watching is impossible; and without prayer, it will be ineffectual. Sobriety is needful as a removal of disqualification for watching; and prayer is essential to watching with success. Sobriety, prayer, and watchfulness, form a three-fold cord; they are distinct, but not separable; at least, if any one of them be found in a state of separation from the others, it will be destitute of any real virtue, and form no part of the furniture of the man of God. To be sober without prayer or Christian watchfulness, is to be of a selfish and stoical character; to be attempting prayer, without being habitually sober, would be to provoke the holy One of Israel, and to offer strange fire; and to attempt to watch without being sober, is to gather the stormy winds, or to quench the raging fire by a look or a wish. Prayer without watching is *presumption*; and watching without prayer is *atheism*. We are exhorted to be sober, and to watch unto prayer. In the army of Christ Jesus, there cannot be a *prayerless watch*. Did any one of you ever meet with an *honest thief*? Then you may meet also with a prayerless Christian, but not till then.

ART. VIII.—*On Religious Melancholy.*

A VOLUME might be written on this topic, and such a volume is much needed; but it would be difficult to find a person qualified for the undertaking. We have some books written by pious casuists; and the subject is handled in medical treatises on insanity; but to do it justice, physiological knowledge must be combined with an accurate acquaintance with the experience of the Christians. Burton's "Anatomy of Melancholy," is one of the strangest books I ever read. For curious learning, and classical quotations, it cannot be surpassed. And there is much originality of remark, and frequent strokes of wit, in the work, but very little valuable information on the subject of which it treats. The author seems to have been himself troubled with fits of melancholy, and enjoying much learned leisure, amused his melancholy hours by searching after, and heaping up much learning, out of the common track. The spiritual physician, who has the cure of diseased souls, takes much less pains to inquire minutely and exactly into the maladies of his patients, than is observable in physicians of the body. I have often admired the alacrity and perseverance with which medical students attend upon anatomical and physiological lectures; although often, the exhibitions are extremely repulsive to our natural feelings. The patience and ingenuity with which the men of this profession make experiments is highly worthy of imitation. Many of our young preachers when they go forth on their important errand, are poorly qualified to direct the doubting conscience, or to administer safe consolation to those troubled in spirit. And in modern preaching, there is little account made of the various distressing cases of deep affliction under which many serious persons are suffering. If we want counsel on subjects of this kind, we must go back to the old writers; but as there is now small demand for such works, they are sinking fast into oblivion; and their place is not likely to be supplied by any works which the prolific press now pours forth. It is, however, a pleasing circumstance, that the writings of so many of our old English divines have recently been reprinted in London. But still many valuable treatises are destined to oblivion. The only object which I have in view in introducing this subject is, to inquire, what connexion there is between real experimental religion, and melancholy. And I must in the first place endeavour to remove a prevalent prejudice, that in all religious persons there is a strong tendency to melancholy. Indeed there are not a few who confound these two things so completely, that they have no other idea of becoming religious, than sinking into a state of perpetual gloom. Such persons as these, are so far removed from all just views of the nature of religion, that I shall not attempt at present to correct their errors.

There are others, who entertain the opinion, that deep religious impressions tend to produce that state of mind called melancholy; and not only so, but they suppose that in many cases, insanity is the consequence of highly raised religious affections. And the fact cannot be denied, that religion is often the subject which dwells on the minds of both the melancholy and the insane. But I am of opinion, that we are here in danger of reversing the order of nature,

and putting the effect in the place of the cause. Religion does not produce melancholy, but melancholy turns the thoughts to religion. Persons of a melancholy temperament seize on such ideas as are most awful, and which furnish the greatest opportunity of indulging in despondency and despair. Sometimes, however, it is not religion which occupies the minds and the thoughts of the melancholy, but their own health, which they imagine without reason to be declining; or their estates, which they apprehend to be wasting away; and abject poverty and beggary stare them in the face. And not unfrequently this disease alienates the mind entirely from religion, and the unhappy victim of it refuses to attend upon any religious duties, or to be present where they are performed. Frequently it assumes the form of *monomania*, or a fixed misapprehension in regard to some one thing. The celebrated, and excellent William Cowper, laboured for years under one of the most absurd hallucinations, respecting a single point; and in that point his belief—though invincible—was repugnant to the whole of his religious creed. He imagined, that he had received from the Almighty a command at a certain time, when in a fit of insanity, to kill himself; and as a punishment for disobedience, he had forfeited a seat in paradise. And so deep was this impression that he would attend on no religious worship, public or private; and yet at this very time took a lively interest in the advancement of Christ's kingdom; and his judgment was so sound on other matters, that such men as John Newton and Thomas Scott, were in the habit of consulting with him on all difficult points. The case of this man of piety and genius, was used by the enemies of religion, and particularly by the enemies of Calvinism, as an argument against the creed which he had embraced; whereas his disease was at the worst, before he had experienced any thing of religion, or had embraced the tenets of Calvin. And let it be remembered, that it was by turning his attention to the consolation of religion that his excellent physician was successful in restoring his mind to tranquillity and comfort. And the world will one day learn, that of all the remedies for this malady, the pure doctrines of grace are the most effectual to resuscitate the melancholy mind. This is in fact a bodily disease, by which the mind is influenced and darkened. Thus it was received by the ancient Greeks; for the term is compounded of two Greek words which signify *black bile*. How near they were to the truth in, assigning the physical cause which produces the disease, I leave to others to determine. Casuists have often erred egregiously, from referring all such cases to mental or moral causes. It is probable that even when the disease is brought on by strong impressions on the mind, that by these physical derangement occurs. To reason with a man against the views which arise from melancholy, is commonly as inefficacious, as reasoning against pain. I have long made this a criterion, to ascertain whether the dejection experienced was owing to a physical cause; for in that case, argument, though demonstrative, had no effect. Still such persons should be affectionately conversed with; and their peculiar opinions and views should rarely be contradicted. Cases often occur, in which there is a mixture of moral and physical causes; and these should be treated in reference to both sources of their affliction. Melancholy is sometimes hereditary, and often constitutional.

When such persons are relieved for awhile, they are apt to relapse into the same state, as did William Cowper. The late excellent and venerable James Hall, D. D. of N. C., was of a melancholy temperament; and after finishing his education at Princeton, he fell into a gloomy dejection, which interrupted his studies and labours for more than a year. After his restoration he laboured successfully and comfortably in the ministry for many years, even to old age; but at last was overtaken again, and entirely overwhelmed by this terrible malady. Of all men that I ever saw, he had the tenderest sympathy with persons labouring under religious despondency. When on a journey, I have known him to travel miles out of his way to converse with a sufferer of this kind; and his manner was most tender and affectionate in speaking to such.

I have remarked, that persons who gave no symptoms of this disease until the decline of life, have then fallen under its power; owing to some change in the constitution at that period, or some change in their active pursuits. I recollect two cases of overwhelming melancholy in persons, who appeared, in their former life, as remote from it, as any that I ever knew. The first was a man of extraordinary talents, and eloquence; bold and decisive in his temper, and fond of company and good cheer. When about fifty-five or six years of age, without any external cause to produce the effect, his spirits began to sink, and feelings of melancholy to seize upon him. He avoided company, but I had frequent occasion to see him, and sometimes he would be engaged in conversation, when he would speak as judiciously as before; but he soon reverted to his dark melancholy mood. On one occasion he mentioned his case to me, and observed with emphasis, that he had no power whatever to resist the disease, and said he, with despair in his countenance, "I shall soon be utterly overwhelmed." And so it turned out, for the disease advanced until it ended in the worst form of *mania*, and soon terminated his life. The other was the case of a gentleman who had held office in the American army, in the revolutionary war. About the same age, or a little later, he lost his cheerfulness, which had never been interrupted before, and by degrees sunk into a most deplorable state of melancholy, which, as in the former case, soon ended in death. In this case, the first thing which I noticed, was, a morbid sense, which filled him with remorse, for acts, which had little or no moral turpitude attached to them.

I would state then, as the result of all my observation, that religion in its regular and rational exercise, has no tendency to melancholy, or insanity, but the contrary; and, that religion is the most effectual remedy for this disease, whatever be its cause. But melancholy persons are very apt to seize on the dark side of religion, as affording food for the morbid state of their minds. True Christians, as being subject to like diseases with others, may become melancholy; but not in consequence of their piety: but in this melancholy condition, they are in a more comfortable, as well as in a safer state, than others; they may relinquish all their hopes; but they cannot divest themselves of their pious feelings.

I have said nothing respecting the supposed tendency of strong religious feeling to produce insanity, for what has been said respecting melancholy is equally applicable to this subject. Indeed, I am of

opinion, that melancholy is a species of insanity; and in its worst form the most appalling species; for, in most cases, insane persons seem to have many enjoyments, arising out of their strange misconceptions, but the victim of melancholy is miserable; he is often suffering under the most horrible of all calamities, black despair. When a child, I used to tremble when I read Bunyan's account, in his Pilgrim, of the man shut up in the iron cage. And in the year 1791, when I first visited the Pennsylvania Hospital, I saw a man there, who had arrived a few days before, said to be in a religious melancholy, and to be in despair. He had made frequent attempts on his own life, and all instruments, by which he might accomplish that direful purpose, were carefully removed. Having never been accustomed to see insane persons, the spectacle of so many, deprived of reason, made an awful impression on my mind; but although some were raving and blaspheming, in their cells, and others confined in straight-jackets; the sight of no one so affected me, as that of this man in despair. Although nearly half a century has elapsed since I beheld his sorrowful countenance, there is still a vivid picture of it in my imagination. We spoke to him, but he returned no answer; except that he once raised his despairing eyes; but immediately cast them down again. Whether this man had been the subject of any religious impressions, I did not learn. But this one thing I must testify, that I never knew the most pungent convictions of sin to terminate in insanity; and as to the affections of love to God and the lively hope of everlasting life producing insanity, it is too absurd for any one to believe it. I do not dispute, however, that enthusiasm may have a tendency to insanity; and some people are so ignorant of the nature of true religion as to confound it with enthusiasm. I will go farther and declare, that after much thought on the subject of enthusiasm, I am unable to account for the effects produced by it, in any other way, than by supposing that it is a case of real insanity. And diseases of this class are the more dangerous, because they are manifestly contagious. The very looks and tones of an enthusiast are felt to be powerful by every one; and when the nervous system of any one is in a state easily susceptible of emotions from such a cause, the dominion of reason is overthrown, and wild imagination and irregular emotion govern the infatuated person, who readily embraces all the extravagant opinions, and receives all the disturbing impressions which belong to the party infected. Without a supposition such as the foregoing, how can you account for the fact, that an educated man and popular preacher, and a wife, intelligent and judicious above most, having a family of beloved children, should separate from each other; relinquish all the comforts of domestic life, and a pleasant and promising congregation, to connect themselves with a people who are at the extreme of all enthusiasts—the Shakers? But such facts have been witnessed in our own times, and in no small numbers. In a town in New Hampshire, the writer, when in the neighbourhood, was told, of the case of a young preacher, who visited the Shaker settlement, out of curiosity, to see them dance, in which exercise their principal worship consists; but while he stood and looked on, he was seized with the same spirit, and began to shake and dance too; and never returned, but remained in the society. But there being no demand for his learning or preaching talents, whatever they may be—and he being an able-bodied man, they em-

ployed him in building stone fences. This species of infatuation, which is called enthusiasm, is apt to degenerate into bitterness and malignity of spirit towards all who do not embrace it, and then it is termed fanaticism. This species of insanity, as I must be permitted to call it, differs from other kinds in that it is social, or affects large numbers in the same way and binds them together by the link of close fraternity. It agrees with other kinds of monomania in that the aberration of mind relates to one subject, while the judgment may be sound in other matters. No people know how to manage their agricultural, horticultural, and mechanical business more skillfully, and successfully, than the Shakers. And the newer sect of Mormonites would soon settle down to peaceable industry, if the people would let them alone. This country promises to be the theatre of all conceivable forms of enthusiasm and fanaticism; and as long as these misguided people pursue their own course, without disturbing other people, they should be left to their own delusions, as it relates to the civil power; but if any of them should be impelled by their fanatical spirit, to disturb the peace, they should be treated like other maniacs.

The causes of melancholy and insanity, whether physical or moral, cannot easily be explored. The physician will speak confidently about a lesion of the brain, but when insane persons have been subjected to a post-mortem examination, the brain very seldom exhibits any appearance of derangement. The casuist, on the other hand, thinks only of moral causes, and attributes the disease to such of this class as are known to have existed, or flees to hypothesis, which will account for every thing. There is a remarkable coincidence, however, which has fallen under my observation, between those who assign a physical cause for melancholy and madness, in regard to one point. Some forty or fifty years ago, the writer, about the same time, read Shepard's "Sincere Convert," and Robe on "Religious Melancholy," and he noticed, that they both ascribe the deep and fixed depression of spirits frequently met with, to a secret, criminal indulgence. Well, in the statistics of several insane asylums and penitentiaries which have been published recently, the most of the cases of insanity are confidently ascribable to the same thing, as its physical cause. This increasing evil is of such a nature that we cannot be more explicit. Those who ought to know the facts, will understand the reference. It must, after all, be admitted, that the claims of intemperance in the use of intoxicating drinks, to a deleterious influence on the reason, stand in the foremost rank; but the madness produced by this cause is commonly of short duration. I do not speak of that loss of reason which is the immediate effect of alcohol on the brain; but of that most tremendous form of madness, called *delirium tremens*. I have said that it was short, because it is commonly the last struggle of the human constitution, under the influence of a dreadful poison, which has now consummated its work—and death soon steps in, and puts an end to the conflict.

After spending so much time in speaking of melancholy as a disease, I anticipate the thoughts of some good people, who will be ready to say, What, is there no such thing as spiritual desertion—times of darkness and temptation, which are independent of the bodily temperament? To which I answer, that I fully believe there are many such cases; but they deserve a separate consideration, and do not fall within the compass of my present design. The causes,

symptoms, and cure of such spiritual maladies are faithfully delineated by many practical writers. And although these cases are entirely distinct from melancholy, they assume, in many respects, similar symptoms, and by the unskilful casuist, are confounded with it. And, as I have before intimated, these two causes may often operate together, and produce a mixed and very perplexed case, both for the bodily and spiritual physician.

After all that has been said, the fact with which we commenced, that religious exercises are very much modified by the temperament; and in some cases, by the idiosyncrasy of the individual. The liquor put into an old cask, commonly receives a strong tincture from the vessel. Old habits, although a new governing principle is introduced into the system, do not yield at once; and propensities, apparently extinguished, are apt to revive, and give unexpected trouble. It is a comfortable thought, that these bodies cannot go with the saints to heaven, until they are completely purified. What proportion of our present feelings will be dropped with the body, we cannot tell. How a disembodied spirit will perceive, feel, and act, we shall soon know by consciousness; but if ever so many of the departed should return and attempt to communicate to us their present mode of existence, it would be all in vain; the things which relate to such a state are inconceivable, and unspeakable. What Paul saw in the third heaven he dare not, or he could not communicate; but he did not know whether he saw these wonderful things in the body or out of the body. This was a thing known, as he intimates, only to God.—*Dr. Alexander.*

ART. IX.—*The Churches of Holland and Scotland compared.*

THE Reformed Church of Holland is, in its form of government, Presbyterian. The population of the country, in 1838, was 2,552,339; of whom 1,518,700 belonged to the Reformed Church; the rest being dissenters of various sects, Roman Catholics and Jews.* The number of communicants in the Reformed Church was, at the same time, 505,217. The number of Classes, or Presbyteries, is 43; the clergy, exclusive of those who may be superannuated, amount to 1450; and the number of places of worship is 1240. It is a noble regulation in this church, and one which we regret exceedingly had not been attended to in Scotland, that the ministers are increased according to the demands of the population. A village or district whose inhabitants, belonging to the Reformed Church, do not exceed 200 souls, is, when a vacancy occurs, united to an adjoining parish. Unless where weighty reasons can be adduced, a community under 1600 is entitled to one pastor only. The legal allotment of clergymen for the supply of the Reformed Church is as follows:

Population.	Ministers.
1600 to 3000.....	2
3000 to 5000.....	3
5000 to 7000.....	4
7000 to 10,000.....	5
10,000 to 13,000.....	6
13,000 to 16,000.....	7
16,000 to 20,000.....	8

* The number of Jews in Amsterdam, and the other large towns of Holland, is said to amount to 40,000!

For every additional five thousand souls in a town or district, another minister is allowed by government.

We shall draw a comparison between the churches of Holland and Scotland, in a few prominent particulars, and the comparison may prove useful. The two *ought* to be "sister churches." Once they were so; and after a long period of cold reserve and mutual distance-keeping, the General Assembly of our church has renewed a correspondence which, if kept up in the spirit of brotherly love and mutual faithfulness, may issue in great good to both.

1. *Plan of Church Government.*—In Holland, as in Scotland, the church courts are four in number. The consistory, or kirk session, consists of the minister or ministers, the elders and the deacons of each congregation. Elders and deacons are elected by the kirk session; but this election must be notified *three* successive sabbaths to the congregation, that objections may be laid against the nominee. They continue in office for *two* years only, not as with us, for life; but they are very often re-elected after a short interval. In towns, there is commonly one session, consisting of all the ministers, together with the office-bearers. In no case can there be fewer than *two* elders and *two* deacons; in congregations served by one minister, there cannot be more than *four* of each; should there be two ministers, the number of elders and deacons shall not exceed *five* of each. In congregations served by more than two ministers, the number of elders and deacons must not be more than double that of the ministers. The *classis*, or presbytery, consists of a select number of the ministers, and one elder. Each classis is subdivided into two, three, or four bodies, called *rings*, composed, however, of the ministers alone, who meet at one another's houses for mutual improvement, and to supply vacancies, &c. Their transactions are recorded and held as legal, and as such reported to the supreme court. We can see great liability to abuse in these sort of demi-official courts, from which the laity are excluded. To the *classis*, or presbytery, belongs the superintendence of all matters of religion within their bounds, and by them a system of regular visitation of all the churches is kept up. The regulations for these visitations are comprehensive and searching, while there is nothing like austerity or an unchristian spirit manifested, either in the regulations themselves, or in the dignified manner in which the answers to the prescribed queries are elicited. A system of this kind seems to be essential to the full development of the advantages of the presbyterial system, and Scotland may, in this respect, profitably copy the Dutch Church. The provincial *synod* consists of a minister from each classis in rotation; and *one elder* at a time, sent by each classis in rotation; and the *general synod* (*allgemeine synode*,) is composed of a deputy from each of the provincial courts, and from the Walloon, or French-Belgian congregations; of a clergyman from the home commission of the Colonial Churches; of a theological professor from each of the universities of Leyden, Groningen, and Utrecht; of one elder sent by the provincial courts, and by the Walloon churches in rotation; a clerk and a treasurer: in all, eighteen members; but three of these, the theological professors have, for what reason we know not, *no vote*. *The king names the president and vice-president*; and the minister of state charged with the ge-

neral direction of the affairs of the Reformed Church is present with his secretary, and advises at the various sittings of the synod, and is ready to give his opinion, and to direct in difficult cases. All extraordinary resolutions must have his *vision*, as also every ecclesiastical deed of national importance. The general synod discusses every thing regarding the state of the church as a whole; makes and alters, *with royal authority*, general rules, and decides on all appeals from the inferior courts. In this, and in all the other courts, business is conducted invariably *with closed doors*.

Looking at this outline of the Dutch ecclesiastical system, we would be inclined to say of it that it is *Presbyterianism caricatured*. It has the *name*, and something like the organization of the courts of *our* Presbyterian Church; but it has nothing more. Even the consistory, in which the resemblance is nearest, labours under a great defect, in the limited number of its elders and deacons, and their frequent change. The classis, with its solitary elder, and clogged by the demi-official nondescripts called *rings*, is a poor imitation of our efficient and well balanced presbytery; while the synod, with *one elder* only, and a single deputy from each Classis, and intrusted with no business peculiarly its own, or in any way distinct from the Classis, cannot once be compared with our provincial assemblies composed of a minister and elder from *every parish* within the bounds. As to the *general synod*, it seems to be a neat little pocket concern of the king and his minister of state. In the presence of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, it would resemble the mouse, which once on a time happened to find itself in the presence of Jupiter. In all the courts, the admixture of lay members is by far too small; in both synods, the number of members altogether is too scanty. There is, moreover *no freedom of election*, and from all of them the influence of public opinion is withdrawn, as they all proceed with "shut doors!"

II. *Education of the Clergy*.—We tremble for our Church at the very threshold. Certainly *our* clerical education is good, and surely no man can question that—we are a *learned clergy!* And yet, after all, we incline to think that the Church of Holland has the advantage of us here. "The Dutch clergy are an uncommonly well educated body of men."* Every student for the Church, *must* take two degrees at the universities, known by the names of "candidate in literature, and candidate in theology." Before obtaining the former of these ranks, he must be examined in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and Oriental Antiquities; and give proof of his having benefited by attendance on the classes of logic, general history, and the language and literature of *his own country*. Before being advanced to the rank of candidate in divinity, he is examined on Moral and Natural Philosophy, Natural Theology, Oriental literature, and the Hebrew language, Church history, and the general doctrines of Christianity. He must attend the divinity lectures for *three* sessions, and *our* anomalous plan of "irregular attendance," which may be no attendance at all, is unknown. He enjoys much intercourse with his teachers; delivers written discourses before them, on which also he

* Stevens' Account of the Dutch Church, p. 20. We owe many thanks to Mr. S. for this valuable tract.

may be examined; and *not unfrequently* takes the degree of *Doctor in Divinity* before leaving college. After three years' regular attendance at the hall, he is allowed to preach before a congregation as a *probationer*; but he can only be called to a charge after he has become a *proponent*, or been licensed by the competent ecclesiastical court. Students are not licensed till they have completed their 22nd year. Being then regarded as "ecclesiastical persons," a watchful eye is constantly kept by all the Church courts on their conduct. Care is taken to make the people acquainted with their pulpit gifts, and that their talents are otherwise rendered available to society. An official roll of their names, places of abode, and actual engagements, is not only forwarded once a-year to the general synod, but is published likewise by authority, every six months, in a widely circulated periodical. In the biennial almanacs also, their names are printed immediately after the stated clergymen in each province whose court granted them license. Each probationer is obliged to send his address to the Classical ecclesiastical court within whose bounds he resides. The Dutch clergy manifest a kindly feeling towards candidates for the ministry, and like the community, have a tolerably accurate knowledge of the peculiar gifts and graces of almost every licentiate of the Church. In all this we ought to imitate their example.

III. *Ordination, status, and duties of the clergy.*—Ordination is conferred by the provincial ecclesiastical courts, answering to our Presbyteries, by whom also all candidates for ordination are examined. The applicant, two months before the time of examination, must deliver, to the clerk or court, a certificate of his having attained the degree of candidate in literature, and also that of candidate in theology—certificates of his having attended the whole of the prescribed course of lectures in philosophy and theology—of his having been at least two years in full communion with the Church—of his having preached at least twice before one of the theological professors—and of the purity of his moral character. No one who has obtained ordination in any reformed Church abroad, unless he has also occupied a pastoral charge, is allowed to officiate as a minister in the Reformed Church in the Netherlands, till he has been examined by one of the provincial ecclesiastical courts; and before examination, he must produce certificates of character, and of literary and theological study. The examinations for ordination are substantially like those in the church of Scotland, and they embrace the following branches: biblical exegesis, comprising a Latin translation of two chapters of the historical books of the Old and New Testaments, and a chapter of one of the epistles, with an explanation of the sense and meaning of the same; answering to our "exercise with additions."—Ecclesiastical history—dogmatic theology and history of controversies—Christian ethics—the art of preaching—and the duties of the pastoral office, with written and verbal specimens. The candidate having given satisfaction, takes an oath against simony, and comes under a solemn vow to adhere to the standards of the Church, to uphold its interests, and to submit to its discipline.

A minister who has served 40 years in office, may retire with full salary; and at any time, if disabled by bodily or mental infirmity, he may become *emeritus*, and retire on a regulated portion of the

salary. This is an excellent regulation; and thus parishes are not left, as with us, for a succession of years destitute of an efficient ministry. The private duties of visiting and catechising are held to be essential to the due discharge of duty. Candidates for membership receive, for a series of years, a regular course of religious instruction, according to the Confession of Faith and the Heidelberg catechism, and they are also carefully taught Bible history, and the *origin and progress of the Reformation from Popery*. The sacrament of the supper is administered *once a quarter*. On Saturday previous, there is an evening service, after which the new members are admitted publicly, with suitable exercises. The rolls of communicants are scrutinized previously to every communion. Members of other Protestant Reformed Churches are admissible on producing proper certificates. No tokens are used, as with us; and herein we think they are wrong; as are our brethren in Ireland, and wherever this most wholesome practice is discontinued. Nor can we approve of the Dutch plan of men and women communicating *separately*.—At *baptism*, as well as in dispensing the supper, printed formularies and prayers are used. Baptism is always done publicly, and never on a week day.—The use of organs is retained, and the observance of Easter, and other festivals.

In Holland, the affectionate respect of the people to their ministers is very strongly marked; and I believe that *there*, as in Scotland, there is given every reasonable encouragement to the faithful and conscientious discharge of all the duties of the pastoral office.

IV. *Church patronage*.—Voetius, the celebrated Dutch divine, who flourished in the early part of the seventeenth century, has recorded in his writings a very decided testimony in favour of the "divine right" of the election of ministers as vested "in the Church," as contradistinguished from "the clergy alone," and from "all magistrates, patrons, bishops, ediles, or any other, whose patronage," says he, "without doubt, arose from human deeds, usurpations, and ordinances." Luther, Calvin, and Zuinglius, speak in the same style; and the standards of the Belgic, the Helvetic, the French, the Saxon, and the Scottish Churches, all maintain the same doctrine as scriptural, and as essential to the right constitution of a Protestant Church. The public confession, and other authorized documents of the Church of Holland are decidedly opposed to the system of lay patronage. That system was introduced into some of the villages and country districts, but the synods remonstrated against it. According to the present practice, a *veto* on every nomination is possessed by the king, while the election is made by the consistory of elders and deacons; and very seldom is the veto exercised.* As in Holland there

* The magistracy held a veto over the elections, even in the *Scots Churches* in Holland; and Mr. Stephen, in his "History of the Scotch Church at Rotterdam," mentions a curious case of its *repeated* exercise on occasion of one vacancy. Not one of the ministers chosen *could* have been known personally in Holland; but the Rev. Henry Lindsay of Bothkennar, on whom the people of the congregation were particularly set, was a marked man in the days of Presbyterian-prelatic-moderate ascendancy. He was an ardent anti-patronage man; and supposed to have *leanings* towards the seceders, on the question of popular calls. Letters were therefore written from certain quarters in Scotland, to *warn* the council of Rotterdam against such a man; and he was *retained* accordingly. One wonders at the want of *policy* in this, for surely the "transportation" of one or two "wild men," to foreign parts, and particularly to a *cold* and *cool* region, would be a "neat transaction" at any time! See Mr. Steven's History, pp. 161—165, where this curious piece of history is given at length; and testimonies in favour of Mr. Lindsay inserted.

is nothing that corresponds exactly to parishes, the minister is called *in each congregation* by the Church council of elders and deacons. In the larger towns, the surviving ministers make a nomination by themselves, which is afterwards compared with that of the elders and deacons; and when an election takes place by a decision of all parties, the call is despatched to the government, in order to receive the royal assent, which in ordinary cases is never refused. In some country places, a private patron retains the right of nomination; but this extends no farther than *an approval or rejection* of the call produced by the kirk session. Generally speaking, the clergy elected in this way, are acceptable to the people; and there have been fewer secessions from the national Church of Holland, than any other on the continent.*

It may be questioned whether this system of patronage *practically* works better than our own. There have been, indeed, fewer instances of cases of "forced settlements," and of secession movements in consequence, than in Scotland; and the system, as a whole, is unquestionably far better than that of exclusive and absolutely irresponsible patronage. But the evil in the Dutch plan is, that the office-bearers of the congregations are *too few* in number; and when the right of election is committed to a small junta, without any check on the part of the people, the results will very much resemble those of individual patronage. Still, even the very moderate portion of popular influence which has been infused into the system, combined with the checks that have been interposed against abuse, have had the good effect of generally securing acceptable settlements. That it has not succeeded in preserving orthodox sentiment in the Churches of Holland is easily accounted for. The theology of Germany has been poured into the land from the seminaries of learning, and French infidelity has aggravated the evil. Need we wonder that such causes should have succeeded in estranging the people in too many instances from the very *knowledge* of sound doctrine, and diminished greatly in them the power of spiritual discernment? More especially when we remember that ever since the synod of Dort, in 1618, the Dutch have been placed in circumstances not at all favourable to the prevalence of spiritual, experimental, and practical views of divine truth. *Barren orthodoxy* is at present a prevalent character of the Church; and *this*, a system of pastoral election, even far more scriptural, and far more popular than what obtains in Holland, could not be expected by its single influence to subdue.

V. *Connexion with the state.*—In former days, there were *national* synods held; but now, and for two centuries, the term *general* synod has been preferred; and this change is symptomatic of a gradual loosening of the ties which connected the Church of Holland with the state. Since 1795, there has been no exclusive connexion of the Church with the state. The Church property has been made over to, or assumed by, the state; and the clergy are pensioned out of the public treasury. Besides a veto on all nominations to charges, the king, or sovereign power, (call it what you please,) has the no-

* See the valuable evidence of Dr. Welsh in the Patronage Report of the House of Commons, p. 225.

mination in some cases to offices purely clerical; such as Presbytery and Ring clerks, Presidents and Vice-Presidents of synods, &c. And a public state-officer, with assessors, attends for advice and assistance in the higher Church courts. The constitution of the Dutch Church is thus a very anomalous one. It possesses the essential character of an established Church, while it possesses not those checks which in *our* case are found so beneficial. The plan of paying all the clergy out of the public chest, is not a good one, as it substantially reduces the clergy to the rank of pensioners on the state. The *teind* system of Scotland, administered as it is by a court altogether independent of the crown, or of the reigning ministry, is a far superior one; and *our* ministers can go to that court, not in the character of humble petitioners, but in the more imposing attitude of claimants, with a "summons," and other "forms of process," in their hands. The interference of the king, also, in so many cases of ecclesiastical procedure, is strikingly contrasted with the independence of the Church of Scotland—an independence which no "king's commissioner," sitting in all the pomp of imitation-royalty, can infringe. The Dutch Church appears to us to be a *state* Church, rather than a *national* one. We dislike the term—*state* Church. It always conveys to us the impression of *gross Erastianism*, and tame subserviency to state purposes. The Church of England is a *state* Church; the Church of Scotland is *not*. The one was reformed partially by the *ipse dixit* of her king and parliament; the other was reformed thoroughly by the order and the will of her people. In the one we decry "the Church of the *Constitution*," sitting enthroned in proud magnificence, amid the sternness of her canons and the rigidity of her forms; in the other, we behold "*the Voluntary Church*" of an enlightened, a free, and a willing people.

Is the Church of Holland *now* what she was *once*? Alas! no. Her glory has passed away. Not that she does not contain within her bounds many able, learned, and pious ministers. Not that her clergy would shrink from a comparison with those of any Church in moral rectitude of deportment and activity in pastoral duty. Not that she has been overrun with the corruptions of heterodox impiety to the same extent as the once flourishing Churches of France and Switzerland. We believe that there is a good measure of orthodoxy within her pale; but we also believe that that orthodoxy, generally speaking, is cold and barren in its character. Many of her clergy have learning without piety, and decency of manners without spiritual life. Not a few are Neologian in sentiment; and a spiritual deadness has more or less affected all. Five or six pious young ministers lately raised within her pale the standard of a more evangelical, and more ardent piety; and had they been guided by prudence, and had they not made a precipitate secession from her ranks, the great Head of the Church might have owned their efforts for extensive good. As it is, they have shrunk into a motley seat; they have split among themselves; and the benefits of their promising zeal have been lost to the community, and to the Church.

Were the question put to me, Whither may the Church of Holland turn her eyes for assistance in the way of reformation? I would answer at once, to the Church of Scotland! *She* has not only a scriptural standard, but, in addition, a numerous clergy to bear it

before her people. She has an admirably adjusted constitution, and her discipline is moderate, but firm. She enjoys all the real benefits of a civil establishment, while she cherishes, as far more dear, her spiritual independence, and *holds directly* of her glorious Head in heaven. *There is spiritual life in her*; and amidst shaking establishments and tottering thrones, there is in *her* the principle of perpetuity. Let her look with kindly affection on the Church of the Belgic confession; and when a deputation from her members shall go forth to seek the "lost sheep of the house of Israel," let them be charged with a commission to *that Church* in the bonds of "a common faith," that they may "strengthen the things which remain."

ART. X.—*Union of Seceders with the Synod of Ulster, Ireland.*

AGREEABLY to the direction of the two Synods, at their last meetings, the Committees appointed to confer upon the subject of Union, met in the Presbyterian church, Fisherwick-Place, on the 28th of August. On the motion of the two Moderators, the United Committees agreed to elect as Chairman the senior minister present, when the Rev. Thomas Miller, of Cookstown, was chosen, and the meeting was opened with prayer. The Rev. George Bellis was requested to act as Secretary. A general conversation ensued on the best method of conducting the deliberations of the meeting, when the following resolutions were agreed to:

1. "That union among Christian churches for mutual edification and for the extension of the gospel, is agreeable to the Scriptures, and at all times highly desirable.

2. "That the leadings of Divine Providence seem to favour a union between those Presbyterian churches in Ireland, that maintain the doctrinal standards of the Church of Scotland, in the profession of which they were originally planted.

3. "That whereas the general Synod of Ulster did appoint a Committee to consider of this matter, and the Presbyterian Synod of Ireland, distinguished by the name of Seceders, did appoint another Committee for the same purpose—these Committees, now in joint meeting assembled, do proceed to consider the details of a union upon the principle that each Synod receives the Westminster Confession of Faith as founded on, and agreeable to the Holy Scriptures, in the same manner, as it was received by the Church of Scotland, in the year 1647."

These resolutions having been unanimously adopted, a Sub-Committee, consisting of an equal number from each Committee, was appointed to prepare a course of proceeding, and submit, in a digested form, the various subjects that should be considered and discussed by the Joint-Committee. After deliberation, the Sub-Committee submitted their report, when it was resolved by the Joint-Committees,

1. "That the Synods respectively acknowledge each other as equal and co-ordinate church courts.

2. "The Committee of the Synod of Ulster, for the information

and satisfaction of their brethren of the Secession, state that the Synod of Ulster require from all candidates for license, or ordination, subscription to the Westminster Confession of Faith, in the following words, namely: "I believe the Westminster Confession of Faith to be founded on, and agreeable to the word of God, and, as such, subscribe it as the Confession of my Faith,"—that the practice of their Presbyteries is uniform in this matter, and a report of their faithfulness annually made to the Synod; that the Synod of Ulster maintains the rights of the people in the election of ministers and other office-bearers, without any interference or control whatsoever, of private patrons, or of the State; and that as a court of Christ, the Synod is perfectly free in all matters of doctrine, order, and discipline, from the interference or control of any other church.

3. "The Committee of the Secession Synod, for the information and satisfaction of their brethren of the Synod of Ulster, state, that the Secession Synod require from all candidates for license or ordination, subscription and acknowledgment of the Confession of Faith, in answer to the following question:

"Do you sincerely own and believe the whole doctrines contained in the Confession of Faith, Larger and Shorter Catechisms, compiled by the Assembly of Divines that met at Westminster, with Commissioners from the church of Scotland, as the said Confession and Catechisms were received and approved by the Acts of the General Assembly, 1647, and 1648, to be founded on the Word of God, and do you acknowledge the said Confession and Catechisms, as the confession of your faith?" That the practice of their several Presbyteries is uniform in this matter, and a report of their faithfulness annually made to the Synod. They farther desire to state, that, as individuals and as a Church Court, they continue to approve, profess, and maintain the original principles of the Fathers of the Secession in their faithful witness-bearing and labours, for soundness of doctrine, strictness of discipline, and the assertion and maintenance of the rights of church members; and that, as a church court, they are perfectly free, in all matters of doctrine, order, and discipline, from the interference or control of any other church.

4. "The Joint-Committees mutually acknowledging, that the modes of receiving candidates for license or ordination, as practised in their respective Synods, are equally satisfactory, do yet resolve to recommend the adoption of one common formula and practice as a part of the basis of union.

5. "The Joint-Committees agree to recommend, that it be recognised as a principle of the contemplated union of the Synods, that all ruling elders, before being considered qualified to sit in church courts, or otherwise exercise the office of elders, shall produce documentary evidence of their free election, public ordination and subscription to the Westminster Confession of Faith.

6. "The Joint-Committees agree to recommend, that it be acknowledged as a principle of the contemplated union, that any member or elder known to maintain or teach doctrines contrary to the Westminster Confession shall be amenable to the discipline of the United Church.

7. "The Joint-Committees resolve to recommend the recognition and adoption of public baptism, as agreeable to Scripture, to the na-

ture and ends of the ordinance, and the original practice of the Presbyterian churches in these kingdoms.

8. "The Joint-Committees resolve to recommend, that every election of office-bearers shall be, at least by a majority of communicants; and that the amount of stipend paid by electors shall not be calculated in the decision.

9. "That the contemplated union be formed with an earnest desire, prayer and resolution, to seek, obtain, and enforce increased strictness of discipline in the admission, oversight, or, when need demands, the exclusion of members.

10. "In the event of union, the designation of the united bodies shall be "The Presbyterian Church in Ireland," and that of its supreme court, "The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland."

11. "It is recommended, that the moderators be directed to call meetings of their respective Synods at Belfast, on Wednesday, the 8th of April next, to receive and deliberate on the reports of the Committees.

12. "The Joint-Committees do now adjourn till Tuesday, the 7th of April next, at 5, P. M., in Fisherwick-Place."

These resolutions are now published for the information of the ministers and congregations of both Synods.

The Joint-Committees are happy to state, that the spirit in which the entire business was conducted was most pleasing. There was a delightful manifestation of the unity of brethren. No unpleasant difference of opinion arose, while every topic was canvassed with the utmost freedom. The Committees now recommend this subject to the prayerful consideration of the members of their respective Churches, in the humble hope that He who is head over all things to his body, the Church, and who has prayed that His disciples may all be one, will order these proceedings to the advancement of His kingdom and glory.

(Signed by order.)

GEORGE BELLIS, *Secretary.*

Belfast, 29th August, 1839.

ART. XI.—*Doctrine and Practice.*

AN intimate and inseparable connexion exists between the theory and experiment of religion. Yet it is a vulgar prejudice, and quite a popular sentiment that Pope, in his poetic essay on man, has thus expressed:—

"For modes of faith, let graceless zealots fight—
His can't be wrong, whose life is in the right;
In faith and hope the world will disagree,
But all mankind's concern is charity;
All must be false that thwarts this one great end,
And all of God that bless mankind or mend."

If, by these lines, the bard would insinuate it is of no consequence what principles we maintain—whether Infidel or Christian, Romish or Protestant Catholic—we protest against his ground, as it is in it-

self contradictory and impossible. How can his "life be in the right," whose creed is in the wrong? How can he who believes not in the Son of God, but tramples him beneath his feet, be in the right either towards God or man? How can his kindest sympathies and his most benevolent deeds be praiseworthy, when they proceed from every other principle except love to God and man? If important that the fundamental doctrine alluded to should not be disregarded, but contended for as for life, all truth is to be estimated in the same proportion. It is, therefore, far from being of triyial moment what we believe, as to salvation by the grace of God. How could our character be evangelical or acceptable to God, unless we know enough not to depend on an arm of flesh—not to boast, as Pharisees, of our good deeds—not to compliment ourselves as profitable servants?

Much learning is not the requisite for which we would make interest. If well directed, it cannot be too comprehensive—nor can it be too limited if misapplied. All that is needed to answer the object now advocated, is, simply, acquaintance with the truth. It is often to be found to an extent almost incredible with many, whose education goes not far beyond their Bible and catechism. The discriminating clearness of their vision, the reasonableness of their humble arguments, the natural force of their conclusions—to which may be annexed—their long, thorough and tried experience, are almost marvellous, and demonstrate them prepared to give a reason of the hope they express before the most sophisticating doctors; and, if necessary, to seal their faith by their blood. They have been taught, as man cannot teach them—by the word and Spirit of God. And they appear in the Church with enlightened understandings, glowing hearts, and consecrated lives. When the most learned Grotius was about to die, he observed that he would cheerfully part with all his literary acquisitions, performances and fame, if he might possess the pious information and experience of a poor and ignorant neighbour. Ignorant! not of his Bible, not of grace, but of the wretched and foolish philosophy to which Grotius had been devoted. O, we might rather be the most ignorant Christians imaginable; yet enjoying correct views of the Scriptures, than the most seraphic and celestial professors of divinity that live—who nevertheless know not, nor understand, nor receive the plain, simple, reasonable, matter of fact doctrine, that the salvation of a fallen, perishing sinner, is by grace, from the beginning to the end—by grace.

Another consideration should guard us against the prejudice apt to prevail in favour of the worst kind of all ignorance—that which is evangelical or religious. It is the following: that there is no doctrine of Scripture not decidedly practical in its design, tendency and result.—Select what mystery we may of faith, we cannot justly denounce it as speculative and inefficient and superfluous. Surely, the doctrine of the Trinity may not be adduced. Is not this practical? Is it not so much so, that a knowledge of it is essential to our salvation? How, if unacquainted with it, could we be apprized of the redeeming love of God? How could we cry *Abba, Father?* How could we plead the intervention of Christ, or in his name ask for the influences of the Spirit? How could we forgive those who trespass against us, if we had not been led to taste of the forgiving

love of the Father, at the cost of the atoning blood of his Son? Nor may we stigmatize the doctrine of election as speculative, and rather operating against practical and active godliness. Is not this the identical truth that shows us to be greatly polluted, helpless, and undone sinners? Is it not this that constrains us, in self-despair, to cry out to God for assistance, and that generously impels us to ascribe to him all the glory of the unmerited and blessed deliverance he has been pleased to vouchsafe? So with every other doctrine. Indifference, therefore, or opposition to the pure principles of revelation, is indicative of no little moral obliquity, if we might not also question the mental rectitude of him who indulges in it, and flatters himself that he is acting the only part that is independent and magnanimous.

Yet, with all the manifest evils accruing from the common prejudice we would gladly remove, there is too great laxity about doctrine, under a pretext of the enlarged views and feelings that charity would dictate. We should not, most assuredly, condemn all who differ from us—nor is such censorious severity at all necessary. We may hope all things in relation to Arminius—that his heart was more logical and evangelical than his head. There are many Christians among his followers. But must we therefore connive at their leading defects, the partial, distorted and inconsistent, and unscriptural views on points of immense, if not of essential moment—points that influence the fountain of action, and that savour, as we think, of a spirit of proud independence—that is, to say the least, exceedingly unlovely in the follower of the meek and lowly Saviour, whose crowning grace should be humility? This were not charity, but latitudinarianism—an error dangerous in the extreme; since under its daring and unsettling influence we would at length, by gradual transitions, be led to fancy and conclude that any system of divinity may be regarded with favour—that the Trinitarian may give the hand of fellowship to the Unitarian. Dr. Livingston taught his students “charity is no fool.” This, among many of his valuable sayings, is worthy of remembering—especially at the present day, a day of departures, of loose views and feelings—of loose policy, discipline, and order. Never, perhaps, in this free country, has there been a louder summons upon our ministers and members to be tenacious of the good old doctrines in which they have been instructed, and which have been committed to their guardian care. The righteousness of our adorable Saviour, imputed to us by faith, cost him too much, and is intrinsically too valuable to be exchanged for some new theological and absurd dogma. So with all truth. We are to hold fast the form of sound words. We are to maintain sound doctrine. Here is no bigotry. Here is sacred principle—a compromise of which cannot otherwise than expose us to the delusions of the perfectionists, now rearing their heads where we might have predicted they would appear—if not to the aberrations and proficiencies of atheism.—*Christian Intelligencer.*

ART. XII.—*Love of Home.*

I HAVE at times tried to imagine the feelings of a man who is about to emigrate, fully convinced that he never again will look

upon his native land. To my mind it brings thoughts allied to death. I could fancy that it was going away to die—going to live somewhere until death came—in some huge prison with a jail like sky above it, and an area that might stretch hundreds of miles, with a wide sea around it, on the margin of which I should wander alone, sighing away my soul to regain my native land. Every thing would be strange to me; the landscape would call up no recollections; I should not have even a tree to call my friend, nor a flower which I could call my own. Ah! after all it is something to look upon the churchyard where those we loved are at rest, to gaze upon their graves, and think over what we have gone through with them, and what we would now undergo to recall them from the dead. There seems something holy about the past; it is freed from all selfishness; we love it for its own sake; we sigh for it, because it can never again be recalled, even as a fond mother broods over the memory of some darling that is dead, as if she had but then discovered how much her heart loved it.—*Miller's Rural Sketches.*

ART. XIII.—*Power of Superstition in a Child in India.*

“WE had an affecting instance a short time since of the deep hold upon the mind of idolatrous prejudices, even at an early age. A poor girl, about ten or eleven years old, was brought to us; she appeared an amiable child, very obedient and tractable. She was not in good health when she came, and shortly after she grew worse, when she was told she must pray to Jesus, she turned her head away, and said, “No, no; Umoor, Umoor.”* This poor child was constantly calling for a goat to go to Umoor; it was truly distressing to see how much fear amounting to terror, prevailed in her mind; she was constantly calling to some of the older girls not to leave her, but to send a goat to Umoor. Poor thing! it was in vain we told her that “the blood of goats would not take away sin;” her case greatly distressed us. The scholars met for prayer: the children were much affected, and so were we, to see the tears rolling down their little black faces, weeping over an idolatrous sister. I asked them, “Can Umoor do her any good?” “No, no, ma’am, she must go to Jesus.” One little girl said to her, “If you die, where will you go? Umoor cannot love you.” Another said, “We must pray for her.” Another said, “We must tell her of gentle Jesus.”

“They all knelt down, and prayed for her; much fervent prayer was offered for her, and we have reason to believe, that before she died the feeble eye of faith was directed to the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. She had not been in the school long enough to obtain much knowledge, and died six weeks after she came. A little girl who died of cholera some months before, manifested a striking contrast. She died with the greatest composure, saying, “I see bright light; it is Jesus; I am going to him.””

Missionary Magazine.

* A goddess, worshipped by the lower castes, whom they suppose sends sickness of various kinds, such as small-pox, cholera, &c., and whose anger they hope to appease by sacrificing goats, fowls, rice, plantain, &c.

ART. XIV.—*Taxæ Cancellariæ.*

THROUGH the politeness of a friend, we have been favoured with a sight of this famous work, which so clearly reveals the corruptions of the Church of Rome, that it has become a matter of prime moment to the adherents of that church to deny its authority, and to represent it as interpolated by Protestants for base purposes. If the Church of Rome now repudiates it, that is one thing, and may be regarded as an improvement on the customs of their fathers, but to attempt to deny the authentication by the Roman Chancery of a tariff of Indulgences, in which each sin had its price affixed, is to fly in the face of the most veritable history.

This very point is now in progress of discussion between Mr. Fuller and Bishop England of South Carolina, a small part of which alone we have seen. As the *Taxæ Cancellariæ* is a scarce book, we will give some notice of the copy before us. It was published at Sylva-Ducis, (Bois-le-Duc,) by Stephen Dumont in 1706. The preface states that it is reprinted from a copy printed at Rome in the year 1514, by Marcellus Silber, and compared with an edition printed at Paris in the year 1520, by Tossanus Denis. At the request of the publisher, Dumont, the Senate of Bois-le-Duc appointed two of their members to compare the work with the originals. Their "authentication," signed by the Secretary of State, J. V. Muelen, is prefixed. They state that it agrees *de verbo ad verbum* with the originals. To convince the most incredulous, the editions of Rome and Paris, from which it was copied, were deposited in the house of the publisher, open to the public inspection, which was invited. It appears that even at that time, copies of the popish editions were becoming very rare. The work was early placed on the catalogue of prohibited books, as having been corrupted by the heretics,—a very convenient pretext for suppressing a work, the influence of which, against the church, they began to dread. He also gives a certified copy of the Indulgence, the shameless sale of which aroused the zeal of the great reformer. We think it would puzzle even the ingenuity of Bishop England to reconcile his statement, that the Indulgence "is not a remission of sin—nor the remission of the eternal punishment due to sin," with the following language of the Indulgence:

"Te absolvo, primo ab omnibus censuris ecclesiasticis per te quomodolibet incursis, deinde ab omnibus peccatis, delictis, et excessibus tuis hactenus per te commissis, quantumcunque enormibus, etiam sedi Apostolicæ reservatis."

We now subjoin a specimen of the ecclesiastical tariff, without disturbing the original Latin, only noting by way of explanation, that the letter *g* prefixed to the Roman numerals and designating the prices of absolution, is a contraction for *grossus*, a coin, the value of one-tenth of a ducat.

"Absolutio pro illo, qui litteras testimoniales falsas scripsit," *g. vii.*

"Absolutio pro eo, qui in Ecclesia cognovit mulierem et alia mala commisit," *g. vi.*

"Absolutio pro eo, qui matrem, sororem, aut aliam consanguineam vel affinem suam, aut commatrem carnaliter cognovit," *g. v.*

"Absolutio pro eo, qui virginem defloravit," *g. vi.*

"Absolutio pro perjuro," *g. vi.*

"Absolutio pro illo, qui in causa criminali falsè depositit," *g. vii.*

"Absolutio pro illo, qui revelavit confessionem alterius," *g. vii.*

"Absolutio pro eo, qui interfecit patrem, matrem, fratrem, sororem, exorem, aut alium consanguineum, si laicum, quia si esset, aliquis eorum Clericus, teneretur interfector visitare Sedem Apostolicam," *g. v. vel vii.*

"Absolutio pro muliere, quæ bibit aliquem potum, vel alium actum fecit, per quem destruxit fætum in utero vivificatum," *g. v.*

ART. XV.—*Wicked Attempt to Destroy the Mission.*

A FEW weeks after the above affair took place,* a most wicked plot was laid by some of the enemies of the mission, which, if it had proved successful, would have produced serious and fatal consequences, not only to myself, but to my people. The design was to excite the inhabitants to rise up in a mass against us. Some wicked men came one night and removed the god Veniagen from its pedestal in the temple; brought and placed it in front of our Mission Tamul School in Sheva Petta; took off the idol's hand, threw it aside, covered it with filth, and went away. Early the next morning, when those who had to pass that way saw the horrible condition in which their god was placed, they went and informed the rest. In a very short time, almost the whole of the people residing in Sheva Petta were assembled on the spot, filled with indignation and rage against the perpetrators of this most atrocious and wicked act. Many cried out that "No one else but the Padre and his people could have dared to commit such a wicked deed." Others said, "What is the use of our

* Excitement at a native festival, published in the last number.

living any longer in the world, if Christians are permitted to ill-treat our gods in this most shameful manner?"

When the minds of the people were in an inflamed state, the Lord graciously, and in a very remarkable manner, rescued us from the imminent danger to which we were exposed. He raised up a few of the most respectable and influential men among them to speak in our behalf, and to prove to the people that what was brought against us was a false accusation; that what a set of wicked men said, with an intent to do mischief, should not be relied upon, and that it would be well for them to consider before they rushed heedlessly on to destruction. With these words, in imitation of the prudent town clerk of Ephesus, they succeeded in dispersing the confused and irritated assembly. "Many are the afflictions of the righteous, but the Lord delivereth him out of them all."—*London Missionary Herald*.

ART. XVI.—*The Christian's Paradox.*

THE Christian's life a riddle seems,
Strange, paradoxical;
When born he's dead, when dead he's born,
And dying lives withal.
His life is war, his life is peace;
No suicide is he,
Yet kills, yea crucifies himself,
Is bound, and yet is free.
In smiles he's sad, he mourning joys,
Happy in misery;
Despised slave, and honoured king,
Rich, though in poverty.
Earth's happiness he values much,
Yet it contemns also;
He pleasure draws from the same source
Whence others taste but wo.
Thrones, kingdoms proffered unto him,
He tramples in the dust;
Yet to a kingdom and a crown
He is an heir with Christ.
While others love to take their walks
Through smiling, flow'ry meads,
Through fiery flames, like *three* of old,
Are his choice promenades.
In sorrow's overflowing floods
He deeply dives, that he
May precious pearls and richest gems
Add to his treasury.

When sore disease and death him rack,
All weeping round him stand,
Then joyous smiles rest on his cheek,
He welcomes death a friend.
Though clad in rags, yet he is decked
With robes which him adorn;
Though clouds and darkness overwhelm,
His midnight is his morn.
When sets his sun, his sun appears
In divine glory bright;
When all seems dark and gloomy, then
Beam rays of heavenly light.
He mortal dies, yet dying lives
Immortal, ever blessed;
His death is life, his loss his gain,
For pains eternal rest.
Sepulchral bones now youthful bloom,
A worm, a being fair;
Human divine, flesh spiritual,
He, Christ, and God, *one* are.
In temple of God's glory stands
This monument of grace,
Heav'n's ornamental fairest flower,
Blooming in Paradise.
May you, kind friend, and I, well know
This mystery of grace,
And meet again above, with Christ,
"And see him face to face."

DEAR SIR:—Accept this as a memento of a dying friend, who, in memory of your generous friendship, and with sentiments of the highest esteem, ever remains,

In the bonds of Christ's love,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN M. SCROGGS.

March 25th, 1839.

Prayer.—Prayer is the ornament of the priesthood, the most essential duty of a minister, the soul of his functions. Without prayer, he is no longer of any use in the ministry—of any service to Christians. He plants, but God does not give the increase; he preaches, but his words are as sounding brass; he recites the praises of the Lord, but his heart does not join in them, and he honours God but with his lips. In one word, without prayer, a minister is without soul, and without life—all whose labours in the vineyard of the Lord are but like the mechanical movements of an inanimate machine. It is, then, prayer alone which constitutes the strength and success of his different services; and he ceases to be acceptable to God or useful to man, as soon as he ceases to pray. In prayer consists all his consolation; and his functions become to him like the yoke of a hireling—like hard, burdensome, and painful tasks, if prayer neither alleviates their burden, solaces their pains, nor consoles him for the little success attending them.—*Massillon*.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—"Anti-Slavery," and Extracts from the "Address of Rev. James Patterson," in the next number.

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,
AND
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

MARCH, 1840.

ART. I.—*On the supposed Quotations of the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament occurring in the New.*

THE Septuagint translation of the Old Testament was made about 285 years before the birth of Jesus Christ. It is thought by eminent critics to have been made from Hebrew manuscripts, which were very corrupt, by persons also who were not skilful in Hebrew; and to have been itself greatly corrupted by frequent transcription, previously to the time of Origen, who laboured to restore its text. This version being in Greek, and much used in the time of Christ and his apostles, it has been generally supposed that their quotations from the Old Testament were made from it. It is evident that several quotations in the New Testament vary from the text of the Old, as we have it in the Hebrew, and in our common versions. Some of these variations in the English version have arisen from the scrupulous fidelity and exactness of our translators, who have carefully avoided every thing like an attempt to force a harmony between the texts and the citations, where there was the least appearance of discrepancy. Yet it is obvious that in some instances, the variation is considerable, and use has been made of it by infidels against the correctness, and so against the inspiration of the Bible. This objection has not been removed, but rather strengthened by the common theory, that the apostles and evangelists quoted from the Septuagint, even where that version differed from the Hebrew and was inaccurate, provided only that its mistakes were not such as militated against their design in the use of the texts cited. (See Horne's Introduction, vol. i. chap. iv. sect. 1, edition of 1836.) According to this view, the penmen of the New Testament cannot easily be vindicated from the charge of having lent their sanction to a translation which is frequently inaccurate, and sometimes altogether erroneous. From an inspection of the quotations in the New Testament, it is evident that, in many instances, the writers have quoted from the Hebrew, where it varies from the Septuagint. In a very few instances they seem to have quoted from the Septuagint where it differs from the Hebrew. Mr. Horne mentions only six texts of this kind, though he notices many

more where he supposes the Septuagint to have been followed as a sufficiently accurate translation. Doubts have sometimes been started respecting these alleged quotations from the Septuagint, though perhaps nothing like a general examination of the subject, in order to disprove their theory has been attempted. It would seem as probable, and more creditable to the sacred text, to suppose that the Septuagint had borrowed the readings of texts quoted, or supposed to be quoted in the New Testament, as that the writers of the New Testament had taken their quotations from the Septuagint. It is true the Septuagint has the advantage of greater antiquity, but it would not be difficult for transcribers after the times of the apostles to alter its text, in order to promote a greater harmony between it and the New Testament. Many have supposed that attempts have been made to bring the New Testament into conformity with that version; but it seems much more reasonable to suppose that these attempts would be made upon a version, than upon the originals of the scripture. The correction of a version is what the most religious may allow without any scruple, but the alteration of the originals of the Holy Scriptures is what even corrupt men could not attempt without daring presumption.

It is at once admitted that there is a remarkable agreement between the Greek of the Old Testament and the citations of the New. A great similarity might be found in translations of the same original by different persons; but in this case the similarity is, in several cases, beyond what is accidental. Either the penmen of the New Testament quoted from the Septuagint, or the New Testament has been altered to agree with that version, or that version has been altered to agree with the New Testament, or something of all these things has happened. It may be fully admitted, that where a text was accurately translated, and known to the people in a translation with which they were familiar, the evangelists and apostles might make use of it, not needlessly changing words for others which would only express the same thing. But the main question is, where there is a difference between the quotations of the New Testament and the Hebrew, and an agreement with the Septuagint, whence has the difference on the one hand, and the agreement on the other originated? Had the evangelists and apostles been ignorant of Hebrew, or had they made no use of it in their quotations, it would seem very reasonable to say that they had quoted from a version, though this would not have been very creditable to them as mere authors, and much less as men moved, in what they wrote, by the Holy Spirit. But when they did make use of the Hebrew, and were inspired men, there seems no just reason to conclude that they cited passages from a version when it translated the original badly, and much less that they cited from that version as Scripture, what is now where to be found in the Scripture.

To arrive at the truth on this question, it is to be observed, that differences from any writing are both more natural, and more allowable in citations, than in a translation. When persons cite a passage from an author, they only cite so much as answers their particular design, and may, accordingly, omit some things, and introduce others from the context; they may make changes of numbers and persons, they may use the noun for the pronoun, and in other ways accommodate the passage to their design, and the strain of their own dis-

course. The modern way of making quotations confines us to the very words of the author; but before the introduction of the marks of quotation, writers were not so confined; they appear to have regarded it as enough to give the sense of the author with fidelity. A passage taken out of its connexion, and introduced into the discourse of another writer, will often appear very awkwardly, and sometimes be unintelligible, without alterations. The penmen of the New Testament appear to have made such alterations freely, for the purpose of framing what they cite into their own discourse, and exhibiting the sense of the passage in such a way as to answer their particular design. Thus, Gen. xv. 6, we have these words, "He believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness." The connexion clearly shows that Abraham is the person intended, and when Paul cites these words, Rom. iv. 3, he very properly introduces the noun instead of the pronoun, "Abraham," says he, "believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness." The Septuagint, without any necessity, or authority from the Hebrew, reads the passage in the same way with the apostle. There is no reason to suspect that the passage in the epistle to the Romans has been altered, for the apostle must have originally used the name of Abraham to make himself intelligible, but the close and unnecessary agreement of the Septuagint, in this and other passages of more importance, may excite a reasonable suspicion that it has been amended to agree with the evangelists and apostles.

The writers of the New Testament frequently combine the different texts which they quote, they enlarge them by introducing something from the context, they abridge them by omitting what has no bearing upon their design, they explain by changing that which is figurative or difficult into words better understood, they give an inference from a text as what the text teaches, they give us the sense of the original instead of scrupulously confining themselves to the words. These liberties were very proper in them; but if we find what professes to be a translation adopting the same changes without any authority from the original, it seems fair to conclude that these changes were transferred from the New Testament into that version. That this is precisely the case with the Septuagint, we think may be proved by numerous examples. The following are given as specimens in the order in which they occur.

Matt. xv. 9, "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." These words our Saviour cites from Isaiah xxix. 13: "Their fear toward me is taught by the precepts of men." The words "in vain" do not occur in the prophet, but appear to express the sense of the context. Because the people were guilty of the offences charged, it is threatened in the next verse that "the wisdom of their wise men should perish, and the understanding of their prudent men should be hid." They drew near to God with corrupt hearts and in corrupt ordinances, and therefore their instructors should lack wisdom, and the worshippers would receive no profit. Our Saviour appears to have incorporated these threatenings in his citation under the abridged form of declaring the worship *in vain*. The Septuagint, however, though a professed translation, uses the very same words with our Saviour, while there is nothing in the Hebrew text, or any various reading of it, corresponding to this translation. Grotius will have it that the present

Hebrew text is corrupted, and he proposes a reading agreeing with our Saviour's citation; others will have it that the Greek text of the New Testament has been corrupted and made to agree with the Septuagint. It seems as if these critics were ready to suppose any thing rather than that which is the most probable of all, that the Septuagint has been altered so as to agree with the words of our Saviour.

Luke iv. 18, 19, we have a passage from Isa. lx. 1. The last words of the verse in the prophet are as follow: "the opening of the prison to them that are bound." The whole passage is a figurative description of our Lord's works. He did not go about literally opening prisons and liberating captives, but he delivered those who were under spiritual bondage. "The opening of the prison to them that are bound" represents to us the deliverance of those who were under the bonds of sin and Satan. In the evangelist this single figure of the prophet is rendered or explained by two, representing the bonds of ignorance and affliction, "the recovering of sight to the blind, and setting at liberty them that are bruised." Of these two figures, illustrating the one used by the prophet, the Septuagint retains the former, and, that nothing cited in the New Testament might not be found in that version, some transcriber has introduced the latter figure, "setting at liberty them that are bruised," into the description of the acceptable fast, Isa. lviii. 6. In the former case the Hebrew is badly rendered by confining the bondage mentioned in the text to blindness; in the latter case, there is no rendering of the text at all, for the words are manifestly interpolated for the purpose of agreement with the New Testament.

Acts ii. 25—28, Peter, in his discourse, cites some verses of the sixteenth Psalm, and interprets the word glory, which otherwise might not have been well understood. "Therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue (Hebrew, glory) was glad." The Septuagint has adopted this interpretation.

Acts vii. 14, Stephen says, "Then sent Joseph, and called his father Jacob to him, and all his kindred, threescore and fifteen souls." This computation has a reference to those who went down to Egypt. In Gen. xlv. 26, 27, we are told that "all the souls which came with Jacob into Egypt, which came out of his loins, besides Jacob's sons' wives, all the souls were threescore and six, and the sons of Joseph, which were born him in Egypt were two souls, all the souls of the house of Jacob which came into Egypt were threescore and ten." Moses reckons the proper children of Jacob exclusive of their wives as 66; including Jacob himself, Joseph and his two sons 70. Stephen reckons all the kindred of Jacob, and so includes the wives. The two sons of Pharez mentioned in the list of names were born in Egypt, but are reckoned as having gone down in the loins of their father. Take these from the 66, we have 64, and add to these 64 the 11 wives of Jacob's sons, we have the 75, or all the kindred mentioned by Stephen as having gone down to Egypt. But some one having observed Stephen's enumeration and supposing a discrepancy between him and Moses, has attempted to make the Septuagint agree with Stephen, and by so doing has brought out a contradiction of the Hebrew, of Stephen, and of the Septuagint itself. In this place the Septuagint is made to read thus: "All the souls which went with Jacob into Egypt, that came forth from his loins, without

the wives of the sons of Jacob, all the souls were sixty-six. But the sons of Joseph, who were born to him in the land of Egypt, were nine souls; all the souls of the house of Jacob which went with Jacob into Egypt were seventy and five souls." Gen. xli. 26, 27, *Juxta LXX*. To make out the nine of Joseph's family, five sons born to Manasseh and Ephraim are introduced into the twentieth verse without any warrant from the Hebrew. Now, as the Septuagint expects the wives, agreeably to the Hebrew, and Stephen expressly takes in all the kindred, this attempt at agreement brings about a flat contradiction. Moreover, as often happens in the case of frauds, something is left which betrays the imposition. In Deut. x. 22, the account of the number going down to Egypt is incidentally mentioned, and here the Septuagint reads the same as the Hebrew: "Thy fathers went down into Egypt with seventy souls." It may be safely left to every unbiassed person to judge whether, in this case, Stephen drew his account from the Septuagint, or some transcriber of the New Testament altered its text, that it might harmonize with that version; or whether some transcribers of the Septuagint altered this version, and that not with much skill, that it might agree with Stephen.

Rom. iii. 13—17, we have some quotations from the Psalms and Isaiah intermingled. A part of these verses is interpolated in the printed editions of the Septuagint, between the third and fourth verses of the thirteenth Psalm, where there is nothing in the text to warrant their insertion. This interpolation is said to be found in the margin of the Vatican Manuscript, but is not in the Alexandrine Codex. It is found in the Latin Vulgate, and is thought to have been translated into that version from some copy of the Septuagint containing the interpolation. Here then we have evidence virtually admitted that attempts have been made to alter the text of the Septuagint by the text of the New Testament.

Rom. xi. 26, we have an inference, explanation, or perhaps more properly a citation, so made as to embrace the argument founded upon it, instead of a literal translation. The passage to which the apostle refers is Isa. lix. 20, "The Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the Lord." The object of the apostle in referring to these words is to prove that Israel shall be again brought into the church. He finds in these words a promise that God would come to such as turned from ungodliness in Jacob; he infers that there would be such in Jacob to whom the promise would be made good, and that the Lord would fit them for the promised communion by turning them from their sins: and in the abrupt and comprehensive manner for which his style is so remarkable he throws into one his authority and his argument, citing the words thus: "There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob." The Septuagint has received the passage word for word into its text. Some have observed that it is difficult to see how the seventy read the Hebrew. It is very probable that the Hebrew was not read at all for the introduction of words into a version to which its text might lead a commentator, but not a translator.

Rom. xii. 20, in a quotation from the Proverbs, the apostle accommodates the language to the argumentative strain of his discourse, introducing the text with *therefore*, and inserting in it, for *in so*

doing." *Therefore if thine enemy hunger feed him, if he thirst give him drink, for in so doing, &c., there is nothing in the Hebrew agreeing to the words, in so doing.* It is easy to see why the apostle has introduced them, but why should the identical words have been employed by the Septuagint, or how came they into it, except from the text of the New Testament?

Gal. iii. 13, "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." The original text, xxi. 23, says nothing of a *tree*. This circumstance is borrowed from the preceding verse. "If a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be put to death, and thou hang him on a *tree*." The words cited by the apostle follow in the next verse, "He that is hanged is accursed of God." The Septuagint penmen, without any occasion for the repetition of the word *tree*, introduces it after the manner of the apostle, and so has the suspension on a tree three times repeated in the two verses.

Heb. i. 6, "And let all the angels of God worship him." This is an expression of the sense, not the exact words of Ps. xvii. 7: "Worship him, all ye gods." The Septuagint has the exact words of the apostle, Deut. xxxii. 43: "Rejoice, O heavens, with him, and let all the angels of God worship him." Is it not very probable, if not certain, that some transcriber of the Septuagint, observing the quotation of the apostle in the epistle to the Hebrews, and not remembering any passage of the Old Testament exactly agreeing to it, considered this a suitable place to introduce it, so as to force a harmony without any warrant from the Hebrew text.

Heb. ii. 13, two passages are cited, one from Ps. xviii. 1, "I will put my trust in him." The other is from Isa. viii. 18: "Behold I, and the children which God hath given me." These are distinguished as separate quotations, by the introduction of the words, "and again," between them. The Septuagint, however, contrary to this distinction, introduces them both into Isa. viii. 17, 18, by changing "I will look for him," into, "I will put my trust in him."

Heb. x. 5—7, we have a remarkable instance of conformity in the Septuagint, where no proper citation was intended. In Ps. xl. 6, Christ is introduced as saying, "mine ears hast thou opened." The apostle, apparently as if citing, but in reality deriving an inference from these words, says, "a body hast thou prepared me." Dr. Owen, in his exposition of this epistle, shows that these words of the apostle, to which there is nothing which corresponds in the Hebrew, have been mistaken by some transcriber of the Septuagint for a translation, and transferred to its text. This instance alone is sufficient to show that there has been an attempt to harmonize this version with the New Testament by alterations of the version.

Heb. x. 37, the apostle accommodates the words of Habakkuk, ii. 3, 4, respecting the coming of the vision, and its not tarrying to the coming of Christ, substituting *he*, that is, Christ for *it*, that is, the vision. He speaks with allusion to the words, but does not formally cite them: yet this mere accommodation of the words of the prophet is introduced into the Septuagint without any material alteration; and by this means nearly half of the verse is left untranslated, and the remainder is quite perverted.

Heb. xiii. 15, the apostle gives an exhortation with allusion to the sacrifices offered under the law: "By him, therefore, let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is the fruit of our

lips." He professes not to cite any place, but uses and explains ceremonial language. Some one, however, probably supposing that he was citing the words of Hosea, xiv. 2: "So shall we render the calves of our lips," has harmonized the Septuagint with the apostle in this place also, making it read, "And we will render to thee the fruit of our lips."

In 1 Pet. i. 24, 25—Rev. ii. 17, and other places, which we omit to notice, alterations of a similar character appear to have been made, in order that the citations might agree with the places cited.

If, on the one hand, the present Hebrew text be accurate, and the apostles followed the incorrect translations and interpolations of the Septuagint, how can they be vindicated from the charge of ignorance or unfaithfulness? If, on the other hand, the Septuagint be correct in the places cited, and the Hebrew corrupt, so that, as some contend, it should be amended by the Septuagint, then we are driven into a woful uncertainty respecting the text of the Bible. If, in a few quotations from the Old Testament, it be found that such a large proportion of the texts cited are corrupted, we may infer that these are but a sample of the corruption which pervade other parts, not cited; so that between the loose translations of the Septuagint and these manifold corruptions of the Hebrew, we would have very little ground for confidence that we had in our hands the very word of God. In either case, the conclusion from the common theory about these quotations from the Septuagint is inimical to a settled faith in the Scriptures. These conclusions, however, may be avoided in a way which seems to me rational and probable. The penmen of the New Testament used great liberty in omitting, adding, abridging, explaining, and otherwise altering the passages which they quoted. In this liberty they may be defended, as they gave the sense faithfully, and were not writing as translators, but as inspired commentators on the word of God. These changes, however, have been introduced into the Septuagint in a way which could never be accounted for or defended in the original translators. They were, in all probability, introduced by transcribers in the early ages of Christianity, when hardly any, if indeed any except Origen and Jerome, were acquainted with the Hebrew. These transcribers might even honestly suppose that the Hebrew, of which they were ignorant, must agree with what they regarded as quotations from it, by the evangelists and apostles, and so they might look upon their altering the text of the Septuagint by these quotations as rendering it a better translation of the original. The same ignorance of the Hebrew, which might so readily give rise to these supposed emendations of the text, might also shelter this work from detection until it was too late to be remedied.

PHILOLOGUS.

ART. II.—*Farther Remarks on the Treatment of our Coloured Population.*

MR. EDITOR,—In the remarks which I have heretofore made, I think the following propositions have been irrefragably established:

1st. That the system of slavery, as practised in our country, is calculated to keep the people of colour in a state of hopeless degradation.

2d. That this system has been built up and sustained by the action of the whole community. And,

3d. That all expectation of separating the blacks from the whites is visionary and chimerical.

May we not, then, safely defy the ingenuity of man to point out any but three courses, one of which, events must necessarily take in reference to this momentous subject. The Africans must be granted that freedom which will elevate them to substantial citizenship, with all its attendant blessings, or they must remain as they are, the curse of our country's fame and the bane of its prosperity, physically, intellectually, and morally, or their blood must sink into the earth, crying for vengeance on those who *have been their keepers*, and their bones whiten those fields on which they have toiled, and suffered, and bled. Is the God of heaven, then, not saying to us, this day, "How long halt ye between two opinions? if the Lord be God, follow him: but if Baal, then follow him."

The inquiry presses itself irresistibly upon us, What shall be done? It is vain to try to blink the question. As sure as the wheels of Providence roll on the events of futurity, so sure will we have to grapple with this monster, in all its deformity. It bespeaks neither wisdom nor courage to retreat from an enemy, while an unalterable destiny has decreed we shall meet. If those be censurable who are urging us on to the conflict, with that intemperate zeal which is not according to knowledge, and which characterizes the fanatic rather than the Christian, neither can we acquit others of blame, who fold up their hands, and cry, peace, peace, while a voice is heard from above, saying, "*There is no peace.*" It is matter of astonishment how professing Christians can rest satisfied under existing circumstances. There are few, if any, denominations amongst us who do not acknowledge some of these prostrated beings as our brethren, in the strictest sense of the word. Let such prayerfully ponder the injunctions of divine truth. One citation may suffice, out of the innumerable array which might be advanced. "But whoso hath this world's good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him? My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue, but in deed and in truth." Who possesses more of this world's good than the free people of this country? Our lines have indeed fallen in pleasant places, and the Lord has bestowed upon us a large and a fruitful heritage. We not only possess the glory of all lands, but in civil, political, and religious freedom we are blest far beyond other nations. The God of providence may justly challenge us, and say, "What could I have done for you more than I have done?" On the other hand, look at our brethren of colour, and point to those who are more needy than they. Can the Christian reconcile it to his conscience to take sweet counsel, to go up to God's house, to partake of feasts of love with those who are liable, at any moment, to be sold to the heathen, to be maltreated in their persons, to be tarnished in their reputation without redress, and still shut up his bowels of compassion from them?

But what ought to be done? The solution of this question is easy, and the answer short. Unfetter the bondman, and restore him to freedom.

Is the task an arduous one? It may be so; but consider the righ-

teousness of the cause, and the glory that must crown a successful effort. What a triumph would it be to our common Christianity? It may be asserted that, since the day that the powers of darkness were overwhelmed by the heralds of the cross, sustained by visible tokens of divine power, such a victory has hardly been obtained. What would be its political bearings? It would more than double the productive energies of three millions of our people. In the same ratio it would increase the consumption of this same class. Instead of having enemies in our midst, whom we dread, we would have a phalanx of devoted freemen on our southern border that would bid defiance to every invading foe. Agriculture, commerce, manufactures, literature, arts, science, in a word, every pursuit, useful or ornamental, would feel its vivifying influence, and our country would receive an impulse such as it has never felt, which would urge her onward with an accelerated force and majesty that would leave the nations of the world far behind. It is not my purpose, however, to present views of political economy, and more on that head need not be added here.

As a triumph of the pure principles of Christianity, who would dare to cast the vast amount? Many are sanguine that the day is not distant when the Sun of Righteousness will arise, with healing in his wings, enlightening with his rays the dark places of the earth, and bring in the fulness of the gentile nations. Efforts are making for scattering the seed of the gospel truth far and wide, that the places of horrid cruelty may be converted into abodes of peace and love. It would be unkind, perhaps unjust, to censure such efforts, but so far as our countrymen are engaged in them, it might be well to ponder whether these efforts are directed in the best possible manner. As they stand connected with the subject on hand, I would beg leave to suggest a few ideas for consideration, not, certainly, with the intention of discouraging missionary enterprise among the heathen, but to enforce the necessity of purifying our own Zion.

When we bear the gospel message to heathen lands, what is the language we hold to those who are sitting in darkness? We tell them we present to them, from the King of kings, the great charter of their religious, civil and political rights. We give an assurance, so far as language can do it, that we furnish them with a code of laws, precepts, and directions, which, if they will accept and obey, will banish tyranny, injustice, and oppression of every name. Not only will it do this, but we tell them it will purify, elevate, and fraternize the whole community, so that, as brethren, they will dwell together in amity and in concord. Blind as the blindest of mankind are, they are not destitute of natural reason, and "by their fruits shall ye know them" is perfectly on a level with their comprehension. What will naturally be their conclusions when they learn from the mouth of this messenger from the purest and most Christian nation on earth, that the principles which he holds forth, though they have been professed from the infancy of our existence as a people, so far from purifying and fraternizing us, have left mingled with us a host of human beings which must appear to these worshippers of stocks and stones as sunk far beneath themselves in the scale of existence? If we tell the tyrants of other lands that, through the sacred influence of our holy religion, justice and judgment are the pillars on which our institutions rest, and that to the

lowest and meanest amongst us justice holds her scales with as steady a hand as for the highest and most honourable, can they but sneer when they learn that one-fifth of our nation are scarcely known as human beings at all, but are, in all respects, regarded as little better than irrational animals?

Look, then, at the glory of the conquest. It would not be a triumph like that won by a foreign kingdom, where the many compelled the few to accept the terms that were offered, without consulting their will, and where political and national aggrandizement might have had much influence with the controlling power, and where such action could not affect either national institutions or established customs. Neither would it be a case in any respect like that which has occurred in several of our sister commonwealths at home. In them it was, perhaps, for the most part, an unwilling sacrifice by the master; and, at all events, the number of those who were restored to freedom could scarcely be felt either in the body politic or the body social. Widely different, indeed, would be the merits of our southern friends, should they manifest the magnanimity, the true Christian heroism, of granting liberty to their slaves. It would stand out, in bold relief, as an act of moral sublimity unequalled in grandeur, challenging the admiration of an astonished world. Should the whole United States unite in disenthraling the coloured people, and placing them on the footing of freemen in *deed* and in *truth*, it would be presenting the church in our country as a city set on a hill, the hallowed influences and sacred light of which would be seen and felt in the remotest corners of our globe. On the contrary, while they remain amongst us an outcast race, it will be vain to expect a blessing from on high. It will prove a wedge of gold, a Babylonish garment in the camp of our Israel, which will, it is much to be feared, discomfit our best appointed attacks upon the kingdom of darkness in foreign and heathen countries.

What is the primary obstacle which lies in the way of freeing the people of colour, and from which all others emanate? It is neither more nor less than the absence of a proper Christian spirit. Were men generally disposed to come fully up to the requirements of the divine law, without stipulated or mental reservations, every difficulty would in a moment vanish. Viewing the subject of slavery in our country through the medium of the perfect law of God, we are constrained to come to the conclusion that the master does himself more injury than he does the slave. It is an obvious principle, as I have, perhaps, more than once stated, which pervades the sacred volume, that it is better to suffer wrong than to do wrong. Much, then, as the whites wrong the blacks, it would seem that they wrong themselves still more. It is only by viewing things through a *distorted* medium that we come to the conclusion that our enjoyments can be enhanced, or our true interests promoted, by infringing upon the rights or marring the enjoyments of others. Is any one so skeptical as not to believe that if every son and daughter of Adam were put in possession of all the happiness of which they are susceptible, that his own true pleasures would be greatly increased? Unless this Christian feeling can be much improved and extended, it is folly to hope that the benefits of freedom can be conferred on the oppressed. Indeed, if any one possessed a despotic power which would enable him to break the fetters which bind

them, and yet could make no impression on the hearts of their oppressors, the exertion of such power would be, at best, an act of doubtful propriety, as it could not fail to lead to scenes of horrid anarchy and bloodshed. Efforts, then, must be made to cultivate and diffuse this Christian spirit, or it is obvious that nothing beneficial can be effected. I shall, therefore, briefly notice some of the obstacles over which people usually stumble, and conclude by assaying to point out some of the positive duties which we owe those whom we have so grievously wronged.

It is urged upon us, that if we free the slaves, and suffer them to remain in our country, they will prove little better than lawless banditti, preying upon our property, thirsting to avenge themselves for injuries which they have received at our hands, filling the land with crime, and endangering the stability of our social and political institutions. We are referred to the statistics of our jails and penitentiaries as proof positive that they will prove a curse to the country. That these fears are unfounded in some respects is, doubtless, true; nor is it less true that in others they would, in all probability, be, to a certain extent, realized. What has been our conduct toward them but a long continued course of injustice and cruelty? and can we expect to escape, entirely, the scourge of Heaven? National sins can meet no retribution, as such, beyond the grave; and just as sure as we have, as a people, wronged the African race, just as certainly must we bear the national punishment, or God is no longer King of nations, nor are justice and judgment the pillars of his throne. A sacrifice must be made, or we insult the majesty of Heaven if we look for a blessing upon our country, even in efforts to reinstate the bondman in the enjoyment of freedom. For centuries we have been treating them as beasts of burden, denying them that culture which strengthens and enlarges the understanding, and purifies the faculties of the soul. In this wretched condition, can we expect them to entertain a scrupulous regard for truth, for justice, for integrity, or whatever else enters into the composition of the character that is suited to discharge the duties which the laws of the country require. If this be the case with respect to the severer virtues, what can we look for in reference to taste and sentiment? Whose fault is it that they are thus debased, and to a great extent unfitted to discharge relative and social duties with that delicacy and refinement which we expect from good citizens? It is ours, and not theirs; and the forfeit we must pay, either willingly or unwillingly. We must either prepare to offer the sacrifice, that Heaven may be appeased, or we may prepare for that awful reckoning which, perhaps at no distant day, we will be called upon to make, when repentance will prove unavailing.

Repentance is sometimes said to be an up-hill business. It is so, however, only in consequence of the unsanctified nature of our souls. Why is it that we shrink at the idea of cutting off right hands, and casting from us right eyes? It is simply because of the imperfect work of grace in our hearts. If we entertain toward a portion of our brethren antipathies and prejudices, which operate as a barrier to Christian fellowship and sympathy, we may rest assured, that if there be grace in our hearts, it is imperfect as to degree, and weak in its operation. It is mournful to witness so many evidences existing, even among those from whom we might expect better things,

that they not only do not mourn over the prevalence of such unhal-
lowed prepossessions, but that they would consider themselves as
grossly insulted, if any one were even to suppose that the case was
otherwise with them. On what other principle can we account for
that predominant delusion which so extensively prevails, that the de-
scendants of Japhet and the children of Ham can never become ho-
mogeneous, can never live amicably together, can never reciprocate
the sympathies of the soul, or commune with each other in fellow-
ship with their risen Lord and Saviour? That there is something of
this in most of our hearts, few will deny; but it ought to be matter
of mourning and sorrow; and it is a fearful omen that we love to
have it so, when we would subject others to the infliction of wrong,
that we may escape the humbling process of having our corruptions
mortified. Whatever we do, let us not fly in the face of the Al-
mighty for his providential dealings with us. Whatever we do, let
us not Cain-like fly from the presence of our Maker, because our bro-
ther is more righteous than we. Let us rather feel the rod, and him
who hath appointed it, and receive with becoming submission and
humility the chastisements which our Heavenly Father may be
pleased to measure out to us.

But, say some, the people of colour must not be set free in our
midst, or all the horrors of amalgamation will be entailed upon us;
and what is not a little strange, many who earnestly insist that
slavery is in its very nature immoral, join with them in their denun-
ciations. I feel assured I shall stand acquitted before my readers of
wantonly charging others with entertaining contradictory or incon-
sistent sentiments; but really it appears difficult, if not impossible, (if
slavery be in its very constitution sinful,) to reconcile the idea of re-
taining the blacks in bondage, through a long series of years, with
the rectitude of the moral law. Is it possible that the dispensations
of Providence have been such towards us as to involve the *necessity*
of transgressing the laws of the Divine Being? AMALGAMATION ap-
pears to have become a perfect shibboleth for the rallying of parties,
without reference to common sense or revealed truth, and while my
pen unconsciously traces these lines, I feel it chilled with a presentiment
that the hearts, if not the eyes, of those for whom they are in-
tended will be closed against them. But since I have undertaken
to vindicate the rights of outraged humanity, wo is me if I halt be-
tween two opinions—since I have undertaken to plead in behalf of
my oppressed, my bleeding countrymen, parched by my tongue, and
palsied by my hand, if I handle the word of God deceitfully, or pan-
der to corrupt ambitious lusts, which war against the Spirit. Let
it be borne in mind, however, that I have heretofore, and do still
disavow all thoughts of advocating the union of whites and blacks
in the bonds of matrimony; but I assume not this position because
I regard such union contrary to the laws of nature or revelation.
Nature and revelation coincide in representing the whole human
race as one great family, united by common ties, and as having a
common destiny. If this be the case, why, it may be asked, do we
hesitate about approving marriages entered into by parties the most
remote and dissimilar? Now, to be candid, no better reason can be
given than that we are *weak*. It was certainly lawful for the apos-
tle Paul to eat meat, yet he solemnly declares he would eat no
meat while the world stood, if it would offend a weak brother. If
Christians had the strength which would enable them to say with

truth, in reference to their affections, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, barbarian or Scythian," we should hear nothing of the horrors of amalgamation from their lips.

There is no truth more reasonable or more susceptible of proof, than that error in principle leads to error in practice. So it is here. It will not be in the power of man to prevent finally the amalgamation of all the different tribes of the human family, both in our own and in foreign lands; but without controversy, nothing will more certainly put a stop to that shameful amalgamation which is now in process, than the elevation of our coloured people. It is true indeed, that if they were thus elevated, intermarriages would be more frequent than they now are; but who would not prefer such commerce carried on according to the directions of that law which is holy, just, and good, to the carrying it on in a way to prostrate every virtuous sentiment and feeling of the human heart? And here it may not be amiss to notice how prone public sentiment, even in the religious part of the community, is to run into error on such subjects. If a man in the purity of his soul loves and weds what doubtless appears to him a most interesting lady of colour, and by her raises a family, bestowing upon them all the care of a pious parent, he is railed at, and treated with all the scorn and contempt which usually fall to the lot of the most abandoned; and this too by persons who assume to themselves credit for superior attainments and sanctity. On the other hand, if a gentleman covers his plantations with his illegitimate offspring, dooming them to ignorance, toil, and all the horrors of a wretched bondage, he may still be regarded as a patron saint, at least in politics and polite society!

Man was created a commercial being. The various climes, the various productions of our globe, the facilities which nature has furnished for making exchanges, and man's numerous wants, all unite in declaring that a free commercial intercourse in the exchange of the productions of our world was intended by our Creator. That he is intended for a commercial being, in reference to the productions of the understanding, is equally clear. As an individual, isolated being, he is perhaps the most helpless of any of God's creatures; but by mutual aid and assistance, he becomes lord of the world below. Is he not destined, is it not the intention of his Maker that he should be commercial in his affections also? In fact, how can he carry on, to the utmost advantage, an exchange of the productions of nature, or the advances of mind, how can he render that mutual aid and assistance, which his helpless dependent situation emphatically requires, unless he be united in the bonds of affection?

The family of mankind is characterized by an endless variety of distinctive marks, both in its mental and physical structure. To pronounce this a defect in its constitution, would be to arraign the wisdom and providence of God; and to fail to appreciate the beauty of such variety, and profit by the advantages held forth, argues neither the acuteness of the commercial man, nor the piety of the Christian. Is there any greater crime, or even impropriety in uniting the black colour with the white, than the Grecian head with the Calmuck? Is all the beauty and energy of the human constitution, both mental and physical, necessarily developed by any particular structure of the body or colour of the skin with which we are acquainted? If it be desirable for the promotion of symmetry and

vigour of body, for the promotion of mental energy, for the promotion of extended fraternal feeling to prohibit the union of persons within certain degrees of consanguinity, is it not absurd to say there is any thing wrong in itself, in uniting the most distant and dissimilar branches of the descendants of one common ancestor?

What a pity it is that Christians do not more fully realize their destiny! Is it one family, one tribe, one nation, which absorbs all the sympathies of their souls? Will even one world fill the anxious cravings of the understanding, or satisfy the outgoings of the heart? A full fruition of the things that may be known and enjoyed, in the present life, and connected with our world, is indeed much; but we do ourselves great injustice, if we circumscribe the efforts of the understanding, or the range of the affections within limits so straitened and obscure. Why not, by way of foretaste, make ourselves familiar with every mode of existence, with every grade of intelligence which doubtless diversify and render glorious that frame of extended nature, whose outskirts we are here permitted to survey? Is it possible that there is one being so lost, so dead to the overflowings of a benevolent soul, that he will withhold the hand or the heart from those whom he regards as destined to hold communion with him in rapturous enjoyments, to be realized far beyond yon distant orb, whose dim and straggling rays but feebly tell us that it has a being? Let us not deceive ourselves. Nothing is more certain, than that our future condition will be exactly suited to the inclinations and desires, to the frames of our hearts while here on earth. How dangerous then to indulge in a rancorous frame of spirit! If we cannot take delight and complacency in God's children here, whether white or black, what can, what must we expect, but to be excluded from their society in the realms of bliss?

I am aware that physiological objections will be urged in opposition to the suggestions here set forth; but the man of piety and the enlightened philanthropist will be slow to believe that the facts, on which such objections are supposed to be founded, are the result of sober inquiry and impartial observation. But admit the fact, that in some cases the descending race follow in the course of the inferior parent, without receiving any advantage from the more elevated one, it can only be regarded as an exception to the general rule, and militates not against the views here maintained. But I must bring this somewhat lengthy communication to a close; for although it might not be altogether irrelevant to pursue this inquiry farther, yet it would lead me beyond the limits which I have prescribed to myself. Be the facts what they may, it will at once strike the reader that it is a point which can, with no propriety, be made a subject of church regulation or civil enactment, but ought to be left to that prudence and discretion, which individuals will ever exercise better than public authorities can possibly administer.

A. R.

ART. III.—*Symbolical Language of Scripture.* No. II.

IT was proposed first to consider those symbols that are borrowed from remarkable objects in nature. *Heaven*, or the *heavens*, is very often used in a figurative sense, sometimes alone, and sometimes with *the earth* joined to it, and in either case, it is of very extensive meaning.

1. The first idea naturally suggested by *heaven* is, that it is *high* above the reach of changes and evils in this world, that it is therefore *permanent*, the place of *peace and happiness*. Accordingly, this is often its symbolical meaning, as, Deut. xi. 21: "That your days may be—as *the days of heaven* upon earth." That is, that ye may enjoy *long life and happiness* in the secure possession of the land. Ps. xi. 4: "The Lord's throne is in *heaven*." His power and government are *unchangeably* righteous. Ps. ciii. 19, is nearly in the same words, and of the same meaning. Ps. xxxvi. 5: "Thy mercy, O Lord, is in the *heavens*." Very great and *unchangeably sure*. Ps. lxxxix. 29:—his throne as *the days of heaven*; verse 2: "Thy faithfulness shalt thou establish in the *very heavens*." These expressions will be easily understood by the preceding examples; but the last mentioned may also be taken as strictly literal. The faithfulness of God will be perfectly and eternally established, or manifested by his bringing every true believer, in due time, to heavenly blessedness.

2. Heaven is used to signify, *high*, in respect to honour and power; because properly, all honour and power come from the God of heaven as their fountain. Accordingly, the term is often used to denote the high stations among men. Isa. xiv. 12: "How art thou fallen *from heaven*, O Lucifer." That is, the king and kingdom of Babylon, which had held such *eminent dignity* among the nations, as might be compared to the morning star among the rest of the stars, was stripped of their glory and entirely reduced. Eph. ii. 6: "And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together *in heavenly places*, in Christ Jesus." That is, he hath exalted us from the lowest grade of misery, to a rank of *spiritual honour and enjoyment* among his children. I am aware that various views are given of the expression here; but believe this, and the rule above given, the only key that will fit it, in all places where it occurs. Rev. xii. 7: "There was war *in heaven*." A great conflict between the religion of Jesus and heathen idolatry, even among *the great and powerful of the world*." Verse 8: "And the dragon fought, and his angels, and prevailed not, neither was their place found any more *in heaven*." That is, Christianity, as to its outward form and profession, triumphed over all opposition, and idolatry fell into disrepute, and was professedly renounced *by those in power*. Verse 5: "Her child was caught up *to God and to his throne*." This expression has much the same meaning as *heaven*, namely: he was set *in safety and honour*. Ch. xi. 12: "God's two witnesses ascended *up to heaven* in a cloud," &c., is the very same.

When *the earth* is joined with *heaven*, by way of opposition, it has, of course, an opposite signification. Lam. ii. 1: "The Lord hath cast down, *from heaven* unto *the earth*, the beauty of Israel." That is, the *dignity, power, and prosperity* of Israel was, by the Chaldean ravages, converted into a scene of *desolation and misery*. Rev. xii. 9: "And the great dragon was cast out—he was cast out *into the earth*," &c. That is, the practice of idolatry, being now disgraceful or unfashionable, was left to the *lowest grades of society*, and the *obscure parts of the world*.

3. Heaven signifies that which is holy and spiritual, and is, therefore, used as a symbol of *the church*, because such is properly her character, a *holy, spiritual kingdom*, which is concerned about heavenly

things. Rev. xiv. 6: "And I saw another angel fly in *the midst of heaven*, having the everlasting gospel to preach," &c. This denotes a great increase of preachers and of zeal in the preaching of the gospel, with a corresponding power in the *church* and the world. Ch. viii. 1:—"There was silence in *heaven* about the space of half an hour." That is, the *church* had a short period of quiet.

When *the earth* is joined to *heaven*, in this sense of it, by way of distinction, and not of opposition, it signifies the civil state, because to it belong earthly things, as heavenly things belong to the church. Isa. li. 16:—"That I may plant *the heavens*, and lay the foundation of *the earth*, and say unto Zion, Thou art my people." This is an allusion to God's organizing Israel into a *church*, and giving them a civil constitution as a *nation*, on their coming out of Egypt. Isa. lxxv. 17, also Rev. xxi. 1:—A *new heaven* and a *new earth*, signifies such a renovation of the *church*, and also of *civil governments*, both being carried to such admirable perfection as might be thought an entire new creation.

From these notices of the simple figure, its combinations, which are only additions of certain circumstances, may be readily explained.

1. The *host of heaven*—Literally means the heavenly bodies, which very fitly represent ordinances, and the various ranks of rulers. Accordingly, this is the symbolical meaning.

When the subject in hand is the church, then, of course, *the host of heaven* signifies ecclesiastical rules and ordinances; and when the subject is any nation as such, the host must mean ordinances and officers of a civil kind. Dan. viii. 10: "And it waxed great, even to the *host of heaven*, and it cast down some of the *host*, and of the *stars* to the ground, and stamped upon them." That is, the power there spoken of would increase, and arrogate authority over all *ordinances and rulers in church and state*. Rev. xix. 14: "And the armies, (or *hosts*,) which were in *heaven*, followed him upon white horses." That is, *the ministers of Christ*, having his gracious presence with them, go forth to preach the gospel in its purity, with great zeal and success. Isa. xxxiv. 4: "All the *host of heaven* shall be dissolved," &c. This is part of the judgment threatened on Idu-mea, of course the host of heaven signifies all *their rulers and civil institutions*, which should be utterly destroyed and brought to nothing.

2. The *kingdom of heaven*, or *the kingdom of God*.—This is a symbol of very frequent occurrence in the New Testament, and with a considerable variety of meaning. It seems to be derived from the expression of Daniel ii. 44: "In the days of these kings shall the *God of heaven set up a kingdom*," &c.; therefore when respect is had to the time of accomplishing that prophecy, *the kingdom of heaven* signifies the period of the gospel dispensation, as in Mat. iii. 2: "Repent ye, for *the kingdom of heaven* is at hand." The time is come for the erection of the new dispensation.

When respect is had to its outward form, it signifies *the visible church*, as Mat. v. 19: "Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in *the kingdom of heaven*." Again, "*The kingdom of heaven* is like unto a net cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind." And many other places, where it has the same meaning.

When respect is had to its spiritual character, it signifies *the true church*, including all real believers, as Mat. viii. 11:—"Many shall

come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in *the kingdom of heaven*." That is, many of all nations shall be brought, by the gospel, into fellowship with Christ, and the communion of the saints. John iii. 3:—"Except a man be born again, he cannot see *the kingdom of God*." That is, he cannot understand nor partake of the spiritual privileges of believers.

3. We read of *rending the heavens*, and *bowing the heavens*. The visible heavens are often spoken of as the veil or curtain of God's glorious habitation, which hides him from our view; therefore to rend the heavens, is to remove whatever hinders his people from beholding him spiritually. Isa. lxiv. 1: "O that thou wouldst *rend the heavens*," &c. That is, that thou wouldst, in a special manner, *manifest thyself* to us. To bow the heavens is much of the same meaning with the idea of condescension in God's manifestation of himself, and interposition for his people. Ps. xviii. 9: "He *bowed down the heavens* also, and came down." That is, with *wonderful condescension* he appeared and interposed in my behalf. The same symbol with the same meaning occurs, Ps. cxliv. 5.

4. *Opening of heaven* signifies the discovery of heavenly mysteries. Ezek. i. 1: *The heavens were opened*. No doubt such an appearance was literally presented to the prophet's vision, but the meaning was as we have given it; accordingly it follows, *I saw visions of God*. John i. 51: "Hereafter ye shall see *heaven open*, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man." That is, ye shall have *heavenly mysteries opened to you*, and shall see in Christ, the meaning and fulfilment of the vision which Jacob had at Bethel, Gen. xxviii. 12. Again, Rev. iv. 1: "After this I looked, and behold a *door was opened in heaven*." The meaning is the same, accordingly it follows,—*I will show thee things which must be hereafter*.

5. *Riding on the heavens, on the clouds, &c.*, signifies *glorious majesty and power*. Deut. xxxiii. 26:—"Who *rideth upon the heaven* in thy help, and in his excellency *upon the sky*." That is, he proceeds with *great majesty and power* for the help of his people. Ps. lxxviii. 4: *He rides upon the heavens* by his name JAH, is the same meaning. *Riding on the clouds, on a cherub, &c.*, has also the idea of *great swiftness*, in proceeding to execute his purpose. Ps. xviii. 10: "He *rode upon a cherub*, and did fly." That is, he came *speedily*, and with *great majesty and power*, to my help. Ps. civ. 3: "He maketh the *clouds his chariots*, who walketh upon the wings of the wind." Isa. xix. 1: "Behold the *Lord rideth upon a swift cloud*," &c. Rev. xiv. 14: "And I looked, and behold a white cloud, and upon the cloud, *one sat like unto the Son of man*:" all are of the same meaning.

6. *Shaking the heavens and the earth*.—We have the undoubted signification of this symbol, Heb. xii. 27. It signifies *the removal of those things that are shaken*. We must remember, however, that it is to be applied in a suitableness to the subject in hand, whether that be the church or the nations of the world. Isa. ii. 19: "When he ariseth to *shake terribly the earth*." That is, when he proceeds to execute his terrible judgments in *the overthrow of the ungodly nations*, ch. xiii. 13: "Therefore *I will shake the heavens, and the earth shall remove out of her place*." This chapter is a denunciation of judgment against Babylon, and this figure signifies *the terrible convulsions and utter overthrow of that kingdom*. Joel

iii. 16: "The Lord shall roar out of Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem, *and the heavens and the earth shall shake.*" Hag. ii. 6: "Yet once, it is a little while, and *I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land.*" The meaning of both places, is in the following words: "And *I will overthrow the throne of kingdoms, and I will destroy the strength of the kingdoms of the heathen.* And the apostle farther teaches us in Heb. xii. 26, 27, that it signified a complete revolution in the church also, by the removal of the Old Testament worship and ceremonies, and substituting the new in their place.

7. *The earthquake* has very much the same meaning as the preceding figure. When the shaking of the earth is mentioned, simply as an effect, and not a positive work of God, it signifies the solemn fear and dread that is due to his Holy Majesty, or is merely a token of his presence. Ps. lxxviii. 8: "The earth *shook*, the heavens also dropped at the presence of God." Acts iv. 31: "And when they had prayed, the *place was shaken* where they were assembled together," &c. In both these cases, the shaking of the earth was, no doubt, a literal fact; but its symbolical meaning was, nevertheless, as above. When the shaking is represented as of a convulsive kind, or accompanied with other terrific emblems, it signifies great changes and revolutions in civil affairs. Ps. lxxv. 3: "The earth, and all the inhabitants thereof, are dissolved." That is, all the institutions for maintaining order and justice in society, are so corrupted that *they are in a manner ceased.* Rev. viii. 5: "And there were voices, and thunderings, and lightnings, *and an earthquake.*" Also ch. xi. 19, and xvi. 18, we have the same figure, signifying the *convulsion and overthrow of kingdoms*, by the judgments of God, war, &c.

8. *The entire removal of the heavens and the earth*, has the same general meaning, but in a higher degree. Isa. xxxiv. 4: "And all the host of heaven shall be dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll; and all their host shall fall down, as the leaf falleth from the vine, and as a falling fig from the fig tree." This is the judgment denounced on Idumea, and signifies the complete destruction of that nation: their rulers, their nobles, and armies should be brought to nothing, and the very frame and being of their government should be dissolved and cease. Rev. vi. 12—14:—"And lo, there was a great earthquake, and the sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the moon became as blood; and the stars of heaven fell unto the earth, even as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind, and *the heaven departed us a scroll when it is rolled together, and every mountain and island were moved out of their places.*" That is, a revolution took place, great and wonderful, sudden and complete; heathen idolatry was defeated and overthrown, and cast down at once, never to regain the same power and respect, and all its supporters sunk into disgrace, as it is explained in the following verses of the same chapter: "And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every freeman, hid themselves in the dens, and in the rocks of the mountains," &c.

The next remarkable objects in nature, from which symbols are borrowed, are *the sun, moon, and stars.* They are very frequent-

ly employed, though not altogether. The natural use of these bodies is, first, to *rule* over the day and over the night, then to give *light* upon the earth. Hence, also, they are the *most manifest and public* objects. The sun is, moreover, the source of *comfort and growth to the earth*. These ideas will, therefore, serve to explain all the symbols in which they are found.

1. Considered as to their situation being plainly visible to all, *the sun* signifies that which is most public and plain. Rev. xix. 17: "And I saw an angel *standing in the sun*, and he cried with a loud voice," &c. That is he proclaimed *in the most public manner, and in the clearest light*, the speedy and utter destruction of the combined enemies of Christ and his church.

2. Considered as *ruling*, they signify the various orders of *rulers* in the church or in civil society, as the subject may be, as, Rev. vi. 12, 13:—"The sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the moon became as blood, and the stars of heaven fell," &c. Also, Dan. viii. 10; both before noticed.

3. Considered as to their light and glory, they signify the *means and ordinances for diffusing and preserving true knowledge*. Rev. xii. 1: "A woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars." That is, the church in the enjoyment of the *clear and spiritual ordinances* of the gospel dispensation, comparable to the sun, much above what had been under *the Old Testament*; which was only as the light of the moon. She is, also, now adorned by the ministry of those *eminent teachers*, the twelve apostles.

4. Considered as to their influence on the earth, they signify *comfort and prosperity*. Ps. lxxxiv. 11: "For the Lord God is a sun and shield." From the application of the figure here, its meaning is more large and full. He is the source of all light, life, comfort, and growth to his people. Mal. iv. 2: "To you that fear my name shall *the Sun of righteousness* arise," &c. That is, Christ who is the source of spiritual light, comfort, and righteousness to believers.

When they are distinguished, in this respect, from God and Christ, they signify spiritual ordinances as the means of comfort. Isa. lx. 19: "The sun shall be no more thy light by day, neither for brightness shall the moon give light; but the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light." And the same occurs, Rev. xxi. 23. That is, the church shall then enjoy a degree of *knowledge, comfort, and communion with God*, as far superior to any thing previous, as if all her *ordinances* were superseded by the immediate and glorious presence of God and the Lamb.

5. A star, when in connexion with the sun and moon, signifies only an inferior ruler, but taken singly, *an illustrious prince*. Num. xxiv. 17: "There shall come a star out of Jacob." That is, a mighty and victorious king. The *day star* is but once mentioned. 2 Pet. i. 19:—"Until the day dawn, and the *day star* arise in your hearts." It is here considered, as to its light, as compared with the darkness of night, and signifies, till the *day of glory* dawn on the soul, when spiritual things will be clearly seen, and compared with which, the greatest light enjoyed here is but darkness.—*The bright and morning star* is mentioned but once, Rev. xxii. 16. And it is expressly claimed by Christ as one of his titles, "I am the bright and morning star," &c.

The combinations of this symbol are neither very many, nor very complicated. They are such as,

1. Being deprived of the sun's light, to signify a falling into adversity. Job xxx. 28: "I went mourning *without the sun.*" That is, I was deprived of comfort, and brought into great affliction. Jer. xv. 9: "Her *sun is gone down* while it is yet day." Amos viii. 9: "I will cause *the sun to go down at noon*, and I will darken the earth in the clear day." Both of these passages are of the same signification, namely: their prosperity should suddenly come to an end, and great adversity come upon them. Mic. iii. 6: "The *sun shall go down* over the prophets, and the day shall be dark over them." That is, their popularity shall quickly vanish, when the calamities predicted by the true prophets shall come to pass, and these thereby proved to be liars.

2. *The increase and continuance of sunshine*, signifies *remarkable prosperity*. Isa. xxx. 26: "Moreover the light of the moon, shall be as the light of the sun, and the *light of the sun shall be seven-fold*, as the light of seven days." That is, it shall be a time of unparalleled knowledge and *spiritual prosperity*. Ch. lx. 20: "*Thy sun shall no more go down*, neither shall thy moon withdraw itself." It shall be a time of wonderful freedom from all kinds of afflictions, and of the enjoyment of every blessing, as the whole chapter particularly explains.

Isa. xxiv. 23: "Then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of hosts shall reign in mount Zion," &c. This symbol, though apparently opposite in the terms of it is, nevertheless, to the same amount, namely: the light of the sun and moon shall be so far surpassed that they shall be ashamed. That is, the glory and happiness of that period of Christ's kingdom shall utterly eclipse all that has preceded it.

3. The excessive and hurtful heat of the sun, signifies oppression and persecution. Mat. iv. 6, comp. 17. Song i. 6: "Look not upon me because I am black, because *the sun hath looked upon me.*" That is, I have been exposed to *persecution* from the world. Isa. xlix. 10: "They shall not hunger nor thirst, neither shall the heat nor *sun smite them.*" That is, they shall be no more *afflicted and persecuted*. Rev. vii. 16, is quoted from this, and, of course, has the same meaning. Rev. xvi. 1: "And the fourth angel poured out his vial upon the sun, and power was given him to *scorch men with fire.*" That is, as a judgment of God, a dreadful spirit of tyranny possessed those in power, so that they oppressed and persecuted those under them intolerably.

4. *The diminishing or destruction of the sun, moon, and stars*, signifies the reduction or overturning of nations or great changes in the church: it generally accompanies the shaking of the heavens and the earth, and has already been noticed under that particular. Two remarkable passages, in which it occurs, may be examined, Joel ii. 31, and Mat. xxiv. 29.

5. The falling of one star, signifies, not simply the fall of an individual ruler, but of an entire order of rulers. Rev. viii. 10:—"And there fell *a great star from heaven*, burning as it had been a lamp." That is, that particular *order of civil rulers or form of government* was subverted. Ch. ix. 1: "And I saw *a star fall from heaven to the earth.*" That is, the whole order of the Christian ministry, *corrupted, debased*, and become earthly, &c.

ART. IV.—How may the people know when to countenance men as sent?

Ans. It will not be necessary, at this time, to say any thing respecting the mission of the first reformers, as whatever was done in a confused and broken time of the church, such as that in which they lived, cannot be drawn into precedent at this time. If they observed, as closely as circumstances would admit, the appointed way of entering the ministry, and if they publicly manifested, to the satisfaction of the godly and discerning, their ability and their faithfulness, their mission is not to be called in question. And, that they did so, is freely acknowledged by all, except Roman Catholics and their friends.

The preacher that has not a mission from any church, while he has it in his power to make application for it, is not to be countenanced as one sent. This will be conceded by all. If he be so uninformed as not to know that a mission from some church is necessary, he is not qualified, and so not sent. If he knows, but will not, in this very thing he shows that he is not sent; because he acts in disobedience to the authority of Christ, or in direct opposition to it. Of late years, there have been several instances of female preachers, and some indications of a disposition to favour them; but this we deem unworthy of a serious refutation.

Those who preach under a license are not to be considered as yet sent. They are only allowed to exercise their talents before the church, to give the people opportunity to judge of their qualifications; and their preaching may be considered as a continuation of their trials. And it is a highly necessary and scriptural precaution: "Lay hands suddenly on no man," 1 Tim. v. 22.

If a man has been tried as to his qualifications, has been approved and ordained in the regular way, we say that, in ordinary cases, he is to be considered as sent. But here we must explain. While every true church has authority to send men to preach the *gospel as revealed in the word*, and to teach *all things whatsoever Christ has commanded*, no church has authority to send them to teach *one single error*, or to make, or maintain, one single deviation in doctrine, worship, or order, from that which Christ has commanded. For, says the apostle, "We can do nothing *against* the truth, but *for* the truth," 2 Cor. xiii. 8. The church has no authority in or over this matter, but what she has received from Christ; and it cannot be believed, without blasphemy, that he would give it to teach or maintain such a thing. In proof of this, were it needful, we might refer to all the strict and solemn charges given from the time that Moses was sent, down to the sending of the apostles; and we should find them all to be according to the tenor of Deut. iv. 2, "Ye shall not add to the word that I command you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God," &c. Many true churches allow errors and innovations to be taught in them, which we may charitably suppose to be done through ignorance, made strong by prejudice. And it is abstractly true, that the authority which they have from Christ is so far perverted; and that, so far as their ministers teach these errors or innovations, their authority is null and void. But, until they discover this to be the case, it is not to be expected that either they

or the people will admit it to be so, or act according to it. Their courts will continue to send men to teach their errors, under the impression that they are truths, and their people will acknowledge them to be sent.

But I will now suppose that the people of one or more true churches do clearly see these errors and innovations of their neighbouring societies, and openly profess their convictions before the world respecting them, in what light are *they* to view the ministers that maintain them, sent or not sent?

Ans. They are not to deny that they have authority to teach *truth*—or, the *all things whatsoever Christ* has commanded; but they ought to deny that they have any to teach *error*, or to hold back any of these “all things.” And since they are the ministers of their whole system or creed, and especially of its peculiarities, it is fair to infer that their whole ministry, as separate and distinguished from the ministry of others, goes to propagate and maintain what errors or innovations may be in it, and that they are *always*, either by express purpose, or necessary consequence, doing this. Therefore, the people, as named in the supposition, ought to deny that they are sent to preach *as they do it*. This is the position which all the people of the Associate Church, if they mean to be consistent, are bound to take, in regard to the ministers of other churches. They are not sent to preach *as they do it*. This is not to deny that they preach truth, and it may be the leading truths of the gospel; but it is to affirm that they *always combine* error with it, either in express terms or by necessary consequence, which Christ never authorized. Let the reader suppose, if he is one that thinks this “a *hard saying*,” that some individual, among the many members of other churches, makes application, to some session under the Associate Synod, to be received as a member of their congregation, but *on condition* that they will allow him to hold his peculiar views; I will suppose, for the sake of argument, that he is a friend to the congregational plan of church government; ought that session to admit him? You will certainly say, if they mean to be honest to their profession, or faithful to their ordination, *they will not*. If you are attached to that cause, or a friend to the applicant, you will say they *ought not*. Were he admitted, by his appearance in the congregation, he would say, “*The Presbyterian form of church government* is the only one appointed by Christ,” while in his heart he would be an Independent.

Suppose again, he applies to Presbytery to be received as a student, or as a minister, but *on the same condition*, it is plain, from the reason already mentioned, they could not receive him. If he was not fit to be admitted to the communion table, much less is he to be admitted to the pulpit. To this every honest, intelligent Seceder will say, Amen. But what is this less than to say to him, you are not sent to preach *as you do it*. But I suspect, that not a few who would stanchly refuse this man admission into *their* pulpit, think no great harm to hear him sometimes in his *own*!

Again; if any minister *in* the Associate Synod should change from the sentiments upon which he was ordained and sent, and profess to be in favour of some new tenet, for example, *free communion*, or Watts' Psalms, *he must* be suspended, and dealt with, and if he continue in his new sentiments, he must be deposed and cast out of

communion, for reasons in part the same, for which the other was refused admission into it.

It is true, indeed, that Seceders are reproached, generally, for their exercise of discipline to this effect, and yet it is equally certain, that all regular and consistent bodies act upon the same general principle. If they did not, they could not long maintain, in any degree, the ends of their association, or continue a distinct body. And some of them are, at this moment, paying dearly for their disregard of it.

I now proceed to offer a few remarks on the effect which the sentences of the church have.

And, *first*, I say, that when a minister is tried, convicted, and deposed, by the court of any true church, generally he is rightly deprived of his authority, and ought not to be reckoned a minister, or one sent. The Holy Spirit of Christ is pleased so to guide his servants in judgment, that this is generally the truth in the case. I fully admit, that all churches, and church-courts, *are fallible*; and that innumerable failings attach to their proceedings. But it must be carefully observed, that it is not *every thing* of this nature that affects the *validity* of their judgment. If the thing laid to the man's charge is really censurable; if he is charged with preaching error; if he is a liar, a slanderer, or a drunkard; or is obstinate, and will not be reprov'd and brought to repentance; if he takes unlawful means to destroy the court that tries him; and the thing is certain, and clearly made out against him, by testimony or other evidence; then, whatever failing there may be on the part of the members of the court, though they may display an undue warmth, or in some things be irregular, their judgment must stand. What they have "bound on earth is bound in heaven." Their sentence has really and truly taken the man's authority to preach away; because, however they may have erred, in coming to this sentence, it is righteous in itself, and the thing that ought to be done. The church of Ephesus, Rev. ii. 4, is reprov'd for having "left her first love;" and this was such a failing, as would affect more or less all that she did, and, consequently, would have its influence on the members of her court, when they sat in judgment. Yet she is commended by the Lord for the sentence which she passed on some ministers—"And how thou canst not bear them which are evil; and hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars."

It is neither to be denied nor concealed that ecclesiastical courts have sometimes, either through ignorance, prejudice, or corruption, or all of these together, condemned the innocent, and acquitted the guilty. And when this is the case, their sentence may rightly be regarded, by all concerned, as null and void; and it is generally so very obvious, that none are in danger of being deceived, except those who are willing to be so. I need not go so far back, for an instance of this, as the anathemas of the Vatican upon the first reformers.

The Church of Scotland condemned and deposed the fathers of the Secession, (I believe she would this day be far from such a sentence,) for what was not a fault at all, but a most necessary duty; while she did allow the radical errors of Professor Simpson, and the blasphemies of Professor Campbell, to pass with very slight and inadequate censure. And both these cases have continued, to this

day, so clear, that none, who are willing to know the truth, can be at any loss to find it. The facts, in each case, were admitted on all hands. The General Assembly never denied the tenets of the two professors to be errors, and such as did unhinge the Christian faith. And Ebenezer Eiskine and his brethren never denied the preaching of the sentiments laid to their charge, or that they meant in it to reprove the prevailing sin of patronage in the ruling party, so destructive to the church, and so dishonourable to her exalted head; and they speak for themselves. Equally plain were the grounds on which they refused to submit to the decisions of the Assembly, and to return afterwards when invited. They embrace the very grounds on which the Associate Church continues to stand as a distinct body at this day. Let no man call himself a Seceder, who either professes ignorance of them, or questions their validity. Therefore, although they were deposed by the ruling party in the General Assembly, they continued to claim and to exercise their ministerial authority; and their claim was admitted by a large body of the most serious, grave, and deliberate, both of the people and the ministers. And when a sensure of an ecclesiastical judicature cannot be submitted to without suppressing testimony against prevailing sins, or any sins, it ought not to be submitted to—"For we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth."

But, on the other hand, people ought to beware of concluding, respecting any particular case, hastily. Because church courts are fallible, and have sometimes condemned the innocent, it would be false and unjust to say, *therefore*, they have done so in this case. Or, because the fathers of the Secession resisted the sentence passed on them as unjust and incompatible with their ordination vows, (in whose case it was true,) and were sustained, *therefore* it is true of every sentence that is resisted; and the person, or party, resisting it, is as righteous and innocent as they were. A case like theirs is a very rare occurrence.

First, They were men of unblemished morals. They abhorred *lying*. They did not *slander* their bitterest enemies. They did not take up or make *false reports*. They were far above the art of *anonymous letters*, or publishing *ribaldish, anonymous pamphlets*.

Secondly, They waited, in an *orderly manner*, upon the process of church courts, until their regular issue: although they knew, from the first, the justness of their cause, and the character of the court by whom they were to be tried; and, moreover, that a multitude of its members (namely, all the friends and abettors of patronage,) were deeply interested in their condemnation.

Thirdly, They stood manfully by the charge, which, in a respectful manner, they brought against the prevailing party. They shrunk neither from the proof nor the responsibility. And now, when it is a hundred years and more past, their statement of facts stands unconfuted.

And *fourthly*, they were slow, deliberate, and prayerful, in their seceding. They met for a length of time to confer together, and to seek Divine direction. It was in November, 1733, that they were deposed by the commission; but it was not till May 16, 1739, that they gave in *their Declinature*: that is, almost six years. The people who may be anxious to make out a parallel case, in some deposed favourite, never can succeed until they identify these points. They will do well, therefore, to *begin* with them.

When the question is put to the members of any ecclesiastical body, whether the sentence of the court ought to stop a minister from exercising his office, or whether it has really put him from his office?—(for sometimes this question will come up; sometimes the people have no adequate means of judging; sometimes they do not understand the transactions of the parties, nor their bearing; and sometimes no small pains are used to perplex the minds of plain people, and to bias their judgment;)—when the question comes up, it ought to be considered as a very grave matter, not to be hastily decided. It is important, in every point of view, that their judgment should be according to truth and righteousness; for if they sustain an unjust sentence on the one hand, they sustain a perversion of Christ's authority, which can operate, so far as it goes, only to the oppression of the innocent, the destruction of the church, and the dishonour of Christ. On the other hand, if they should oppose a just and righteous sentence, by countenancing a scandalous minister in his course, so far as their influence, and his together, extend, it goes to mislead the public mind—to countenance wickedness, under colour of zeal for pure religion—to support schism—and to prostrate all order in the church—and, I may also add, to perpetuate strife and animosity for generations. If church courts are fallible, and do often fail in matters of this kind, it ought to be remembered that the *people*, in judging for themselves, are not less so. It will not be thought by the attentive observer too much to say, that attachment to a minister, and sympathy for him in trouble, often carries the judgment away captive. Some people go to the opposite extreme, and decide with the multitude. Others are so sensitive, that they would decide almost any way that would make for an external peace. Not a few are determined by motives of interest. The main question with them is, how will it affect conveniency, property, and the purse? I need not say, that whoever is guided by any of these motives, he will, almost inevitably, throw his weight into the wrong scale. *He* is in no less danger of going wrong, who brings to the question a cold indifferent heart, or an ignorant mind. The decision of such may be deplored, but cannot be prevented by any thing short of the grace of God. But to the conscientious professor, on whom this painful duty, so common of late years, may devolve, I will say, seek earnestly the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Remember that church government and discipline are some “of the things of Christ,” which it is promised, “he shall show unto us.” Look for this guidance, first, and chiefly, through means of the word. Carefully review your profession, especially all those parts of it that bear upon government and discipline. Examine again the solemn promises made by ministers and elders at their ordination. Endeavour to obtain the highest kind of evidence of the truth of the facts, and of the merits of the case, and if possible be an eye and ear witness to the trial. Trust implicitly to no man's judgment, much less to the mere *ex parte* statements of the offender himself, who is under the strongest temptations to favour his own side. And then, even a heathen would advise you, in such a case, “to do nothing rashly.” Acts xix. 36. You may safely concede that the court has, most commonly, more opportunity of knowing the true state of the question than others. Neither will you hazard any thing by deferring your judgment until the whole trial be issued. I have never known a

person, who used these means, in any difficulty to know on which side truth and justice lay.

But I may suppose, that sometimes there may be honest people who have not all these means within their reach. Perhaps they live at a distance, or their occupation will not allow them the requisite time, or they hear so many different versions of the case, or their minds are entangled by their feelings, or, through misrepresentations and falsehoods, from quarters whence they cannot allow themselves to look for such things, the case appears to them so intricate and perplexed, that they are unable to decide; yet duty and spiritual interest both require that they *should* decide according to truth. Difficult as this may be, if in addition to the means that may be in their power, they attend diligently to the mark which Christ himself gives to detect false prophets, they may still be able to accomplish it. "Beware," says he, "of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. *Ye shall know them by their fruits.*" Mat. vii. 15, 16. I do not consider it improper to apply this to the case of a teacher who has been deposed from his office; for if righteously deposed, and yet persisting in teaching, what is he different from a false prophet? If unrighteously, and therefore no false prophet, the application of this test to him will only serve to make that truth more clear. While various classifications of the *fruits* in question might be given, we prefer to comprehend them all under *words* and *actions*, as it is by them that we are to be determined. With the motives and principles of the heart, any farther than they are identified with these, we have nothing to do. Setting aside then, for the present, court proceedings, let us attend to the *words* and *actions* of the deposed; the certainty of which may always, by a little pains, be known; and when known, they will enable the plain man, without any comment, to judge for himself pretty near the truth.

It is both necessary and proper, however, to take into the account the conduct of the accused while his trial is in progress, as well as after it. Because it often happens that his behaviour, at that time, alters the complexion of the case so much, that what was originally but a very small offence, meriting only the lightest admonition, becomes so great, by subsequent aggravations, that the very weightiest censure becomes indispensable. Every honest man must perceive, that when this is the case, it would be manifest injustice to the court to say they inflicted their weighty sentence upon the man merely for the offence in its original form. In order to arrive at the truth, you must add to it his subsequent denials, and prevarications; his justifications and repetitions of it; his injuries and his insults; his evasions, shifts, and artifices; his protests and declinatures; and all this, that he may *not* confess what truly was a fault. This wickedness is, indeed, so startling in one who is called a minister, or in other words, an example of sobriety, righteousness, and godliness, that for a moment we distrust the evidence of our own senses, and question the *possibility* of it, and hastily conclude that there *must* be some other way of accounting for the facts. Here is the very point where many begin to stumble, very unjustly, at the court, and to fall victims to the most grievous deceptions. Now it is that a dense cloud begins to rise upon the whole case, which defies all human power to dissipate. But why? Is the human heart incapable of issuing such

things because the man is clothed with office? or is it more probable that the minds and sense of the *whole* court should be enchained by some illusion, than that *one* man should act according to our common nature? Have such things never happened in the history of official men, that we startle at it? Let us beware. We have come to the very confines of *skepticism*, which believes *nothing at all*, the moment that we decline to believe good and sufficient testimony. In viewing the man's subsequent conduct, it is necessary to take both a general and particular survey. He must be weighed in his *own* balance. If he claims to hold the position of an innocent man, who has been unjustly deposed, but who is so *obedient* to Christ and so *faithful* to his ordination vows, that he continues, in the face of all opposition, to exercise his office, let him be judged according to this. If this be truly his position, we shall find him more than ordinarily *humble and circumspect* in his walk, and *watchful* not to give the very least occasion of stumbling to any, and least of all to the court that deposed him, whom he aims to reclaim by his persevering steadfastness from their errors. He will be more zealous for the purity of the order, worship, and discipline, to which he vowed at his ordination, than ever. He will readily, and at once, acknowledge any slips which he may have made in the course of the trial, without limitation or reserve. He will show a forgiving spirit. And, although he is unjustly deposed, yet he will look upon it as a very heavy affliction sent upon him in God's holy providence, and carry himself accordingly. If these marks of honesty are found in him, in some good measure, those honest people to whom this is addressed may safely wait for more light, and they will not wait in vain. But if, instead of this, we see the man going in the face of truth, and persevering in his denial of facts incontestably proved, and find him trampling over the first principles of church government to sustain himself, they need no longer doubt. Does he break through all the rules of common decency to accomplish his ends? Does he welcome every fugitive from discipline, every apostate and miscreant that will ring all his changes? Does he lay himself out to work trouble to neighbouring congregations? Does he heap reproaches and slanders upon his brethren, without any advantage to his cause, real or apparent? We need no hesitate an instant, for the half of these things are enough to sustain his deposition as valid.

In a word, let the reader consider that when one is righteously deposed, God ordinarily leaves him to himself, and then he adopts some course, like the above, that plainly shows it.

ΔΙΑΚΟΝΟΣ.

ART. V.—*Voluntary Associations.*

MR. EDITOR:—In your number for January you propose the following query:

“Have we any warrant from the word of God to form voluntary associations for the performance of social and moral duties which lie within the appropriate sphere of those civil and ecclesiastical institutions that are of divine appointment?”

This inquiry relates to an important practical matter, and deserves to be calmly and dispassionately considered. This I will endeavour

to do; and, if my remarks take the form somewhat of a criticism upon your own, I ask to be excused for two reasons: first, you have really presented the whole strength of the negative of this question; and, secondly, you have set an example of the right spirit of controversy.

Your argument is, summarily, this: "God has appointed institutions to accomplish the very objects contemplated by voluntary associations; to appoint, or form others, is a disparagement of the Almighty, and is prohibited." I think this is a fair statement of your general argument: to answer it is now my purpose; reserving a brief reply to your objections to the Anti-Slavery Society in particular, to the close of my communication.

The difficulty which many experience on this subject, I apprehend, arises from a double mistake as to matter of fact, as to the appropriate and *exclusive* sphere of civil and ecclesiastical institutions; and, as to the real aim and design of voluntary associations. Now, as to the first, civil government has been ordained of God, and ought to be set up by man, for the promotion of God's glory, and man's good, by the enacting of wholesome scriptural laws, and their faithful execution.

To make civil laws and execute them, is the business of rulers and magistrates *alone*. For any others to attempt this, is to disregard a divine ordinance. To administer the laws of the church's Head, to exercise church discipline, to preach the word, and to administer the sacraments, are duties devolving upon office-bearers in the church. For any voluntary association to take upon it such ecclesiastical affairs would be usurpation. Objectors do not certainly intend, being Protestants, and freemen, to enlarge the sphere of the *exclusive* rights and prerogatives of these divine institutions much beyond this. They will hardly consent to allow them the sole monopoly of uttering truth, reproving sin, diffusing knowledge, &c., &c.

No one would be ready to say, that our information upon all or any important matters, doctrinal and practical, *must* come through the resolutions of an ecclesiastical tribunal, the mouth of a gospel minister, a president's message, or a congressional report! The intelligent editor of the Religious Monitor would not affirm that Bibles can be circulated lawfully *only* by church courts and officers; that *none* but civil and ecclesiastical officers have any right to circulate information on such a subject, for instance, as slavery. Rather than adopt such a doctrine, better by far have a censorship of the press at once. Such a principle would be binding us with a witness, to the chariot wheels of civil and ecclesiastical tyranny. But circulating Bibles is "a means of religious and moral improvement," and sounding an alarm on the subject of slavery may compel civil governors to change their course, or be driven from their stations by an indignant community.

It is not necessary to argue this farther. All must perceive that, while some duties belong *exclusively* to public officers, there is a large class which *may* be performed by them, but *may* also be performed by others.

But, it will be said, "Granted: individuals may do many things, such as those specified; but they may not associate together to do them." Why may they not? Scripture tells us, that, "two are better than one," "and a three-fold cord is not quickly broken." If

I may buy and give away a Bible, it is really impossible for me to discover any reason why two, ten, or a hundred, may not pay over sums of money to me, to be expended for Bibles; these Bibles to be distributed according to the intention of the donors, and an account rendered to them how their business has been managed. If I may speak and print upon the subject of slavery, it is equally clear to me that I may call in the aid of two, ten, or a hundred, to assist me. Notwithstanding what appears in your magazine, I must still say, that it appears perfectly plain to me, that whatever an individual, *as such*, may do, individuals may associate to do. An individual, *as such*, may not enact laws, nor take upon him judicial or executive authority, in the state; nor preach, nor exercise government and discipline, in the church. Of course, to associate for any of these purposes, is treasonable, or revolutionary. An individual may buy and sell; may investigate truth; may publish truth; may warn his neighbours, and even the church and the state, of danger; may give them advice and counsel; may assist them in forming and accomplishing what may be, in its end, good, and, in its means, right. Is there any law to forbid union, for the better effecting of any of these objects? "Two are better than one."

It will be said, perhaps, "All this is not authority—not a divine warrant." The authority, the warrant, then, is in the law of our social nature. Man is weak; joined to his fellow, he becomes stronger: there is a principle implanted in his bosom by the hand of his Creator, that impels him to seek aid from others when he is unable to accomplish otherwise his ends; or can, in this way, accomplish them more readily. Let us take an example.—You have the right to publish "the Religious Monitor." It is a right that is so far from being derived from either civil or ecclesiastical authority, that you would not surrender it tamely at the call of either. Now, suppose that you hold the truth on some subject in morals or politics, which you wish to bring before the commonwealth, your faithfulness drives from you much of your present support. What is duty? To allow your periodical to drop, unless you can sustain it by your own resources, or to accept the proffered aid of others, like yourself, interested in the truth? What harm would there be, in such a case, in forming an association for the avowed object of sustaining you in your cause? None in the world. Were the subject, in the case supposed, Anti-Slavery, you would have around you an Anti-Slavery Society.

Is this all? Do they really design to do nothing more or less by these associations, than to bring truth before the public on topics that have an immediate bearing upon the public interests? * This I believe is all. And, until this is denied, I offer no proof. I am sure that those who are at all acquainted with the measures of the Anti-Slavery Society, (this I have chiefly in my eye,) will assent at once to this remark. The opponents of Slavery, who desire the immediate emancipation of these "poor oppressed," have established presses, and sent abroad lecturers; they have taken measures to collect information upon this subject, and to scatter it widely over the land. All this, as well as petitioning the higher powers, they might do as

* The Colonization Society and some Missionary Societies are exceptions. The former has for its object the transportation of coloured citizens, the latter sends out ministers. These I do not justify.

individuals, and encroach upon no right, no privilege, no prerogative, of either civil or ecclesiastical officers; and no reason can be given why they may not unite their efforts.

But still it is difficult, to get rid of any misconception that has once taken possession of the mind; and the very simplicity of this whole matter, when looked at with an unblemished eye, is apt to generate a suspicion that, after all, there may be some undiscoverable point on which voluntary associations infringe upon divine ordinances. To my mind, however, it appears plain, that no doctrine which would not introduce as its *immediate* consequence all the tyrannical restraints upon individual action that ever tyranny or popery contained, can condemn associating, for good ends, in the use of means lawful to the individual as such.*

I will endeavour to remove any suspicion that may exist, by adverting to one or two principles, sometimes stated in reference to this subject.

It is said, in substance, that "the delinquency of public officers is not sufficient cause for undertaking their duties; but only for their removal." What is the principle of this remark? When we turn it round, I think we will find it to be, "that sacrifice is better than mercy!" There is some interest of morality, (which an individual can do something to promote,) such as the duty of emancipating bondmen, not only neglected, but absolutely opposed in the high places of power and influence in church and state. If those in office did their duty, it is admitted that there would be no occasion for the exertions of individuals in many cases where such occasion now exists. But delinquency proved to our satisfaction, what is to be done? Remove them, say some. Very well: let us begin. We must first convince the majority that they are delinquent. Ah! true. How is that to be done? Why, it must be by spreading the matter on which they are delinquent before their constituents, and then by convincing more than half of them that their public course is wrong. But how is that to be done? For my part, says the projector of reform, I know no other way than to put our shoulders to and push altogether, that we may set the ball rolling. But will not that be a voluntary association? True; and what else can be done?

So much for state officers: let us try the Church. Here we have all other circumstances just as in the state: we must argue, and, if we can, persuade. And, besides, the additional circumstance that these officers are in for life. What then? Nothing for it but to do our best to persuade them of their error, or, for the sake of the prerogatives of delinquent public officers, permit darkness to reign, and the interests of morality to be trampled under foot. I ask—does any objector believe that the Almighty puts more honour upon positive institutions than upon his moral law; and that he requires us to do so? That he esteems it a sin in any of the community, or laity, to effect that moral end, and to publish that truth, which rulers would neglect or hide? And here I remark again,—this objection takes for granted, what has already been referred to, that to promote morality, by *any* means, is the duty and right of rulers ex-

* The case of individual delinquency is not presented here; but of great, and general national or ecclesiastical neglect of some part of moral duty; such as in reference to slavery in the United States.

*clusively.** Now, while I believe that it is their right and duty, I know it is not theirs to the *exclusion* of all action by all others. Let this last remark be dwelt upon; for it is, in fact, the hinge of this whole controversy. Rulers have had committed to them the interests of morality and religion. Granted; but to affirm that to them *solely* are these interests intrusted, would be going a little farther than most tyrants have gone, and about as far as the pope would ask any one to go. And, moreover, it must be remembered, that it is not to any *abstractions*, called civil and ecclesiastical institutions, that these great interests must be affirmed to be committed *entirely*, if the anti-association doctrine be true, but to the *officers* who administer these institutions. Fix your attention on this point.

Some, who have no scruples respecting the principle of these societies, may have a fear hanging about them, that, by their magnitude, their activity, their zeal, and efficiency, they may, in fact, come to fill the place in the mind and heart, that should be reserved for God's ordinances. This is a suspicion which I would treat with respect, and handle with due caution; and yet I am fully convinced, that it is entirely groundless. As to civil government, while it performs its duties with any measure of wisdom and diligence, office has so many charms, and, moreover, civil enactments being fortified by penal sanctions, it is in little danger of falling into disrepute: the danger is, that even bad governments will hardly ever want many flatterers. As to the church, (and it is for the church that these fears principally arise,) the same remark holds good. Let the gospel ministry but do their duty faithfully, and go before the people in the course of reform, and it is difficult to conceive that they should fall into the background compared with any association. The church lays hold of every moral and religious interest, when she is in the way of her duty, and carries them on together. We might as well be afraid that the light of the stars would rival that of the sun. If the church neglects her duty, and puts herself, as, alas! in many of her branches, she is now doing, against the interests of morality, I can entertain but little sympathy for any loss of reputation and influence she may experience.

I omit the remarks on the subject of the Anti-Slavery Society, with which I had intended to close this communication, as it has already grown to too great a size; and merely observe, that, while I defend what I believe to be a lawful mode of doing good, I long for the time when voluntary associations will be unnecessary, when civil rulers shall all rule righteously, according to the scriptures, and when Zion shall be a united and quiet habitation. This time will never come, I am well assured, until "the oppressor shall cease from the land," and that blessed gospel, which "proclaims liberty to the captive," shall be acknowledged as the *only* gospel. B.

ART. VI.—*The Minister wholly in his Work, by the Rev. Dr. Woods.*

How often do we hear it said, and said truly, at the present day, that *the ministry is not duly respected!* And have we not here one

* As to what belongs to rulers exclusively, such as enacting laws, &c., I do not now refer to it; nor is it called for in this part of the discussion.

of the causes of this? *Ministers have not kept in their place.* They have more or less neglected their sacred trust, and gone into other employments. This has opened the door for other men to thrust themselves into *their* place, and assume *their* office. Is not this one of the reasons, that the sacred office has lost so much of its sacredness? Open your eyes, brethren, and see how the enclosures of the ministerial office are broken down, and (I am sorry to say it)—broken down chiefly by ministers themselves; so broken down that no one can find the line of separation between the ministry and secular employments! And who of you, brethren, are prepared to meet the natural consequences of this?—Who of you are willing that every one called an *evangelist*, and every one called a *lecturer*,—that every man and woman, who are puffed up with pride and self-sufficiency, should thrust themselves into your pulpit, and assume the work or any part of the work of moral and religious instruction, which belongs to you?

You see, that the principle above stated is one of special moment, and that consequences of no ordinary importance hang upon it. Let this principle then, with its obvious bearings, be stated again, that it may be well fixed in our minds. Our powers of thought and action are all limited; so that we cannot, if we would, do every thing; and we can do only a few things well. Of course, there must be a division of labour; and in order to make the division advantageous, the bounds of each department of labour must be definitely settled. This being done, those who go into the ministry ought scrupulously to confine themselves within the just bounds of their office, and to lay out their time and strength upon their appropriate duties. If we would do the work of the ministry in the best manner we are capable of, we must abstain from all other employments that would interfere with it. We are bound to do this, whether the work, in itself, is considered to be of more or less value. If it has such a *degree* of importance, that it ought to be *done*, and if God *commands* it to be done, and to be done by *us*, we should devote ourselves to its accomplishment, even though there might be other employments, which, in themselves, are of higher value. How exceedingly strong then is the obligation which holds us to our appropriate work, when we take into view its superior value and excellence! In the judgment of God, angels, and men, it involves interests of supreme importance. No other office is conversant with objects of such magnitude, or has so direct a bearing upon the present and future welfare of the world. If our sacred work were destitute of attractions,—or if it were possessed of only an inferior degree of intrinsic value;—then, though we should be bound to pursue it as a matter of *duty*—it would be in the way of submission and self-denial. But what shall we say when we consider the paramount value and excellence of the work, its exalted honours, and its many powerful attractions,—a work in which we co-operate with angels, and the Lord of angels! In this view it is the object of our deliberate *choice*, and our cordial *attachment*. It comes indeed to our conscience with its solemn *obligations*; but it comes to our *heart* with its divine *charms*. We embrace it as a precious privilege; and we find it a source of pure, unearthly pleasure. We would gladly engage in the work, if *permitted*, though not *commanded* to do it. True, it puts a yoke upon us, but the

yoke is easy; a burden, but the burden is light. If then we *might* leave our sacred work for some other, how could we make such a sacrifice? Who would willingly descend from a higher to a lower employment?—Who would willingly practise such self-denial, as to give up, even for a time, the blessed, honourable business of a gospel minister for any other business which can be named, or for any place which the world can offer! Other works, I admit, are honourable. But how much more honourable is this? The throne of a king is a *high* place, but how much *higher* is the *pulpit*!

But the precept of the apostle in the text, which is at all times important, seems to be specially seasonable and necessary at the present day. A great variety of objects have, in every age, tempted ministers to turn off their attention from their proper work to other employments. But there are more than common, at this day. It is impossible to count up the multitude of objects and interests, some of which are wonderfully exciting, that solicit a minister to transgress the limits of his calling, and to engage in employments which do not belong to the sacred office,—and some of them do not belong any where. There is no end to the solicitations of this kind which work upon a minister. And they are the more apt to prevail, because they are addressed to him under the *appearance*, and sometimes with the *real feeling* of benevolence and piety.—Now if a minister yield to solicitations of this kind, how often will his mind be divided and his attention be turned off from his proper work! The utmost watchfulness, resolution, and fixedness of purpose will be necessary to keep ministers within their own province, and prevent them from passing over, in one way or another, the appointed boundaries of their office. And such watchfulness and resolution are the more necessary, because, as I said before, the fences are broken down, and you can scarcely see where they were; and because the temptation which will arise to draw you aside, will attack you frequently, and very artfully, and with great urgency, and with the authority of great names. And you will find, brethren, that a very strict, uniform, inflexible adherence to your proper work is indispensable, because your yielding even once, though in a small degree, will naturally lead on to other and wider deviations. Give yourself then to your holy calling. And let not any ambitious aspiring in your own breast, or the spirit of controversy and strife, which is abroad in the world, or even the spirit of benevolence and piety, lead you astray. Pray, what have you to do with the thousand speculations, disputes, strifes of words, jealousies and ambitious projects, which mark the present era? Respecting all these, your Lord says: "*What are they to thee? Follow thou me.*"—*Give thyself wholly to thy proper work, and leave other works to fall into other hands, or to fall to the ground, as divine wisdom shall direct.*

ART. VII.—*Essay on Family Worship.*

By the Rev. W. H. Barna, of Kilsyth.

PART III. ANSWERS TO OBJECTIONS.

THE first is, that there is no express command in Scripture to the effect that each day, and twice each day, the head of the family should assemble its members for social worship. The answer will

be found in the arguments set forth in the first part, which must be answered, and found irrelevant, ere this objection can be sustained. The arguments are, that family worship is founded in man's social and domestic relationship; that it is implied in many scriptural injunctions; that the prayer usually called the Lord's prayer, expressly adapted for social and daily use, authorizes family prayer; and that the examples *approved* in Scripture have the force of a law, which examples have been followed by the pious and consistent members of the church, down to the present times. And now, would it, let me ask, be lawful or safe for any Christian head of a family to gainsay these arguments, and to take up the cause of those who neglect systematically the performance of this duty?

Another objection is, that every one in the situation of a head of a family is not qualified to discharge the duty properly; and that it is better that each member should in secret attend to devotional duties, than that the head of the family, who may be less qualified than several of the members, should be the conductor of their joint devotions. To this the answer is, 1st, that gifts improve by exercise; 2d, that a chaplain or substitute, qualified properly, is, by the reason of the thing, and expressly by a law of our church, allowed to take this delegated duty or place of the head of the family; and, 3dly, that excellent forms are to be obtained, and in great variety, which may be very lawfully, yea, edifyingly and profitably used, until the disqualification, whether real or only feared, may be removed. At any rate, nothing surely can be said of validity against the use of such sound devotional manuals, rather than that the duty should be neglected, or unsuitably performed.

Another objection to the *every-day* family worship is, that it is apt from frequent occurrence, to become formal, or at any rate, to lose somewhat of that solemnity which impresses the hearers. We answer, that this proves too much to be safely regarded as a valid argument. Upon the same principle the public acknowledgment of God at our meals, would require to be laid aside as of too frequent recurrence; all religious conversation would be discarded as making sacred things too common; "pray without ceasing," "seven times a day do I praise thee," &c., would be set aside as encouraging irreverence; whereas the Bible teaches us to *walk* with God, and in all our ways to acknowledge Him. The realizing the divine presence habitually, the cultivation and the exercise of a devotional spirit and language, are plainly and undeniably more scriptural means of correcting and counteracting irreverence than *infrequency* in religious exercises. In all cases, doubtless, formality and every degree of irreverence is to be watched or *prayed* against; the Bible should be read, and prayer uttered with much solemnity. In all this, wisdom and grace are most profitable to direct; and the head of the family, as well as the members, should earnestly seek grace whereby to serve God acceptably, with reverence and godly fear. The great rule in all is, "be in earnest."

A fourth objection is, though not avowed, that it is too rigid and strict a practice to be carried through; it may do on a Sabbath ("of a Sunday,") or on occasions when there is sickness in the house; but really to have it every day, still more to have prayer morning and evening, savours of puritanical or methodistical preciseness. Now this is just the opposition of the carnal mind to every thing that is

spiritual; it is just as much as saying that religion is a severe yoke, that its services are a weariness, that they impose too great a restraint upon the *freedom of life* and of *hours*. On such as feel or express themselves thus, we have to press the previous question, Do you believe the gospel? we must address the call to the unconverted, "Marvel not that it is said unto you, Ye must be born again." You may indeed submit to the kind of religion described in a *certain Manual* of the morning and evening sacrifice, a kind of sentimental piety which has no foundation in genuine conversion, or the precious faith of God's elect; but you have need yet to begin at the beginning of the Christian life.

Another objection to regular family worship, akin to the former, is, that it is not easy to observe so uniformly the rules of strict sobriety of practice as to maintain consistency, and so as not to bring a reproach upon religion, as too many have done. Now this just resolves itself into the same objection as the last noticed. It is most certain that, as one quaintly but tersely expresses it, "praying must make you give over sinning, or sinning will make you give over praying." The shocking practice of so conducting the rites of hospitality as to make it almost out of the question that the host should keep himself within the mark of sobriety, is now happily obsoleting. It is not, as in days gone by, considered to be indispensable that the entertainer and his guests should be intoxicated before parting; and so to be unfitted for female society, and for all rational as well as religious duties. It is scarcely credible now that this was the practice quite current in the days not long gone by. But let all sinful practices be abandoned, let the life and conversation be such as becomes the gospel; and, O, do not shut out from the circle of duties and of privileges the truly delightful and profitable exercise of family worship.

I am not aware of any other objection being urged, and these we think are satisfactorily answered. Still we fear that indolence or false shame, or worldly conformity, or some other of the evil principles or practices which operate powerfully in opposition to the interests of the kingdom of light, will keep too many from engaging in the service we have been recommending. I will conclude by referring to an anecdote of Mr. Hervey, or of G. Whitefield. A lady asked the question, May I not be a Christian, and yet go now and then to the theatre, or an assembly? the answer was, "Madam, get converted, and then ask the question." So would we say to the head of a family who should ask, "May I not be a Christian, and yet want family worship?" "Get converted, and then ask the question." At all events, the words of our Lord seem to be powerfully applicable to such as neglect, through false shame, this most incumbent duty. "Whosoever is ashamed of me or of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him will I be ashamed before my Father, and his holy angels."

If from any sinful indulgence you cannot consistently keep up the worship of God, then on you the dreadful sentence is announced, "Depart from me, ye that work iniquity; I know you not."

But yet there is room for repentance. O turn, turn, and live. "Behold he prayeth!"

[From the Edinburgh Christian Instructor.]

ART. VIII.—*Essay on Christian Watchfulness.* (PART II.)

IN entering on this part of the essay, I would just hint at two or three of the qualities which ought always to characterize watchfulness. For example, watchfulness should be *strict*, and not of a *general* indefinite kind, which has neither place, nor precise and definite aim:—*constant*, and not every now and then intermitted, like the conduct of the tradesman who, it may be, for a succession of weeks will labour assiduously, and then relax, and lose almost the whole of his gains by rambling. What kind of sentinel is he who is only now and then at his post?—Watchfulness should also be universal, that is, we are to watch *in all things*, as saith the apostle to Timothy, at every entry, and against every ambush, and to seize every opportunity of doing good.

There is such a thing as watching against some *one* evil, or some *one enemy*, or snare, while others are allowed to escape. One door left open is enough, although all the rest were shut, to admit a host of enemies. Watch therefore in all things, against every sin, and snare, and evil work: for example, watch against *pride*, as well as *covetousness*: against omission of duty, as well as *commission of sin*: against first and second table transgressions: against *week day*, as well as sabbath day vanity: against injuring yourself as well as hurting your neighbour. Watch when abroad, as well as at home; and watch in your own family and in secret, as well as when many eyes are upon you. Keep guard at every avenue—at all the five senses, and likewise, and above all keeping, “keep the heart, out of which *are the issues* of life.”

First, Watchfulness is the command of our great Lord and Master, frequently and powerfully repeated.

I do not know any duty more frequently pressed upon all the servants of Christ by their Master, than this, and especially towards the close of his ministry; and by the apostles, Paul and Peter, and in the Apocalypse of John the divine, it is most powerfully and affectionately enforced.

It is not then, by men like ourselves merely, (although they are commanded to watch for our souls) nor by angels, who are ministering spirits to the heirs of salvation; but by the Lord of all “whose we are,” by our Master, and Friend, and Shepherd. It is his frequent, and loud, and earnest charge, “Watch,” “be ye ready,” “Watch and pray.” And what is the design of all the means of grace, and of all the divine dealings with us, and of all the changes and trials with which we are visited, but to be so many charges to watch?

Again, *Watch*, for your enemies are numerous. You are not yet arrived at the land of rest; you are in an enemy’s country. You cannot safely lay aside your armour, but are still to watch. It would not be safe or wise in you to sleep while your enemies are lively. Your adversary, “the devil, goeth about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour; therefore be sober, be vigilant.”

The world is also inimical in its friendships, as well as its enmities: its blandishments, still more than its frowns: its successes, as well as its disappointments. Its joys and its cares are each and all of them, calls to watch and to pray. Besides all this, and more than all this, we carry an enemy within—a bosom foe, much more dangerous

than all the rest. O then watch and pray, and be sober. Fight, and *agonize* to enter in at the strait gate.

Farther:—You have many eyes upon you. The omniscient eye which searches the heart and the reins: the vigilant and malignant eye of Satan: the envious evil eye of many who curiously observe and watch for your halting; and the eye of your own conscience, which none of your actions can escape, unless through the most deplorable and dangerous somnolence, the image of spiritual death. You are surrounded, too, with a great cloud of witnesses; therefore watch.

I would suggest a motive of another kind; it is that of the apostle to the Thessalonians, (1 Thes. v. 8.) “Therefore let us not sleep as do others, but watch,” &c. It is indeed but too common to make this an argument to ease and relaxation. Others are indulging themselves, and taking their rest; and why should not we? Why be singular? why morose? why so serious? But such language does not at all comport with the character and profession of Christians. It is a virtual denial of the faith. It is a laying down of your colours as soldiers of Christ, to make what others do our rule. Beware of this *neighbour-like*. “I must have my daughters to the sacrament, that they may be like other folk,” said a mother once; to which a godly man replied, “O woman, they will be too like other folk, and that will be their loss.” You must be of another spirit; exemplary: not only in decency, but in *liveliness and watchfulness*, against not only the grosser, but also the more specious practices of professors and of the world. You have perhaps read or heard of a reply of Walsingham, the famous secretary of Queen Elizabeth, when rallied for his want of gaiety in former days, “All is serious around me: God in calling to repentance; the Lord Jesus Christ in inviting to come to him; the Holy Spirit in striving with us, and wooing us to the paths of peace; the great adversary is earnest to ruin us, as Christ’s ministers are to save us; all in heaven, and all in hell are serious; why then should I be gay?”

And so we may truly say—heaven, earth, and hell are awake and active, why then should we be sleeping, *we* who profess to belong to the living army of the faithful?

Again, Be exhorted to watch, for many have suffered for want of it: witness Lot both in his going into Sodom, looking no farther than its sweet, well-watered vale; and on his going out of it, when he lost so much, and incurred farther guilt. Witness Sampson, the strongest of men, made weak and like other men, through want of watchfulness. Witness Simon Peter in going into the high priest’s hall, and in the company of enemies of his Lord, shamefully denying him. The list, alas! is numerous in every age of those who have fallen altogether; or greatly impaired their strength, and usefulness, and comfort, through defect of watchfulness.

And is not this also an argument that you yourselves have lost much time, and much good, through the same guilty cause? And surely these words (1 Peter iv. 4,) are most salutary, and most reasonable; the past of life is more than sufficient to have wrought the will of the flesh; to have prosecuted a careless and self-indulgent course. O let the short remains be vigilantly and earnestly improved! But,

There is one argument which is more than all others urged by

our blessed Lord, and that is, his own second coming, *certain, near,* and yet neither the day nor the hour known to any. "Watch, therefore, for you know not when the Master of the house cometh, whether in the evening, or at midnight, or at the cock-crowing, or in the morning, lest coming suddenly, he find you sleeping."*

Finally, By every thing around us, and within, and about us, we are exhorted to watch: by every beating pulse; by all the dangers which surround us, (and they are many, *seen and unseen, corporeal and spiritual,*) by every tolling bell, and opening grave: by every returning day, and every closing night; the entering on the active scenes of the one; and the unseen dangers of the other. Every morning we are called to watch, that we lose not our time and opportunity of serving God and our generation: and every evening, lest we sleep the sleep of death. In short, it may be said of watchfulness, as of prayer, that there is every argument *for it* and none against it; that there is no time, no place, nor season in which it would be unsuitable or superfluous to exercise watchfulness. If it was necessary even in paradise, surely there is no scene, however sweet, or still, or sheltered, in which it is unnecessary. In the church, and in the market; going on, or resting; preaching or hearing, or praying, or working, or buying, or selling, conversing with God or with man, we are ever to be watchful, for every where there are calls to listen to, and snares to be avoided. Till we enter heaven's gate and the rest which remaineth for the people of God, we must *watch*.

W. H. B.

ART. IX.—*Popery in Philadelphia.*

"He shall speak great words against the Most High,—and think to CHANGE TIMES AND LAWS," Dan. vii. 25.

THE history of Popery is written in the prophetic writings of the Old and New Testament. The exact fulfilment of prophecy in the history of our Lord and his apostles, and in the dispersion and continued existence of the Jews as a distinct people, is regarded as indubitable testimony to the truth of divine revelation; but, to this evidence should be added the continued existence of Popery. It is equally unequivocal and striking. Prophecy reflects the image of Popery no less truly than a mirror the features of the human face. An incident recently occurred in this city,† amounting to an exact fulfilment of the text standing at the head of this article, which is referred to only as a small item of that flood of evidence which has, from time to time, been placed before the public, and which demonstrates the Romish Church to be the BLASPHEMOUS

* The allusions to the uncertain time of a master's return, and the celebration of marriages at night, and the arrival with torch-lights, and the loud summons at the actual moment of the bridegroom's coming, are circumstances familiar to the readers of the New Testament. Let us not dismiss the subject as merely illustrating eastern customs, but learn the *great, the serious lesson*,—to be girded with truth, and to have the lamp burning, so as to be ready for the coming of our Lord. Watch therefore.

† See *Public Ledger*, January 11th, and 14th, 1840.

MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND OF ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH. Happy would it be for our countrymen, did they more generally examine the evidence on which this assertion rests.

The facts of the case alluded to are briefly these:

About two years ago, John Cassidy was married to Mary M'Shane by Bishop Kenrick, of the Catholic Church; Cassidy, who was a Protestant, resisted the entreaties of his wife, who belonged to the Catholic Church, to attend service at the latter church, and become a convert to the faith which she professed. She applied to the bishop for advice, who, as she declares, represented to her that, as they were first cousins, and had contracted marriage without the necessary dispensation, the marriage was invalid, according to the laws of that church, and drew up a paper to that effect, which she called a divorce, signed with his name, as follows:

"Mary M'Shane states that she is the first cousin of John Cassidy, with whom she contracted marriage without the necessary dispensation, which marriage is invalid, according to the laws of the Catholic Church.

† FRANCIS PATRICK KENRICK,
Bishop, &c."

Philadelphia, Jan. 7, 1840.

He told her that she committed a sin by living with him any longer, and her child was a bastard, and all their children would be such. The wife, therefore, left her husband, taking her child with her. On Thursday, her husband was arrested on a charge of abandoning her child, and brought before an alderman. The husband, of course, denied the charge, and asserted his willingness to maintain them both; but that she had left him without sufficient cause, and, until she returned again, he did not think himself bound to maintain them. The magistrate, on hearing the evidence in this singular case, advised her to go home and live with her husband—that they had been legally married, according to the laws of the country, and no bishop had power to divorce them—and that, if she were to contract marriage again, during the lifetime of her present husband, she would be liable to imprisonment for bigamy. She would not consent, however, to live with him, after what the bishop had said, but agreed to deliver the child to her husband's keeping, who readily consented to take it, and the parties then left the office, each to their separate homes.

The editor of the Ledger regarded this transaction as "an unwarrantable interference between man and wife, and an attempt to set the laws of the church above the laws of the land." This remark called forth the following note from the bishop, which the editor seems very meekly and complacently to think "will have a tendency to correct any misapprehension which may have existed concerning the matter."

To the Editors of the Public Ledger:

DEAR SIRS:—A friend has just handed me your paper, in which my name is introduced in reference to a case lately brought before a justice of the peace. As he informs me you professed your willingness to correct any mistake which the statement may contain, I beg leave to state that, as far as I am concerned, the matter is a mere affair of conscience, on which my advice and instructions were solicited. The parties are, I believe, both professors of the Catholic faith, though the man is said to pay no regard to its practical duties. The laws of the Catholic Church forbid marriage within certain degrees of kindred, and any marriages contracted by Catholics within those degrees, without a dispensation from the ecclesiastical authority, are considered as of no force in the ecclesiastical forum. The parties in question neglected to seek that dispensation, having concealed the fact of their relationship.

Shortly after the marriage, the conscience of the woman being disturbed, she applied to me, when I offered to grant the necessary dispensation for the relief of her conscience, if she could induce the man to come forward. After a long interval she returned, declaring her fixed determination to live with him no longer, when I again offered the dispensation. She said he would not believe her assertion that the impediment existed, unless I gave it under my hand. This is the whole of the affair, which is purely a matter of conscience. Yours, respectfully,

† FRANCIS PATRICK KENRICK,
Bishop, &c.

Philadelphia, Jan. 13, 1840.

This incident is quoted, as already intimated, to illustrate the fulfilment of the text in Dan. vii. 25: *He shall think to change laws.*

1. *The laws of the Catholic church forbid the marriage of first cousins.* The word of God contains no such law. "Even as the Lord commanded Moses, so did the daughters of Zelophehad; for they were married unto their father's brother's sons," Num. xxxvi. 10, 11.* "The only *collateral* relations, which are forbidden to marry, are brothers and sisters, by whole or half blood, or by affinity legitimate or illegitimate."† *He shall think to change laws.*

2. *Without a dispensation from the ecclesiastical authority, are considered of no force in the ecclesiastical forum.*" It seems then that this law, which has deprived a man of his lawful wife, and a child of the affection and care of its own mother, can be dispensed with either before or after the consummation of the marriage contract; and all that is requisite for the attainment of this object is a little money placed in the bishop's hand! Thus, while this "mother of harlots" *makes* laws contrary to the laws of the God of heaven, for money, she also claims and exercises the power to *dispense* with those laws, concerning which the Son of God has aid, "Till heaven and earth pass away, not one jot or tittle shall pass from the law till all be fulfilled."‡ Yes, money will procure from the Church of Rome a *dispensation* for perjury, adultery, incest, criminal abortion, and murder; but the want thereof shall disturb the peace of families, defy the righteous laws of the land, and pluck asunder those whom God has joined! *He shall think to change laws.*

3. *But it was a mere affair of conscience, purely a matter of conscience.* So it seems the *conscience* of the bishop dictated to him to nullify the marriage relation, in defiance of the laws of God and man. The conscience of a Romish priest is the most curious phenomenon in nature. It dictates celibacy; and, for money, concubinage, breach of vows, murder, sedition, and blasphemy! But are we, in the United States, to suffer our laws, our social and domestic relations, to be trampled upon with impunity, merely to gratify the consciences of the Romish priesthood, the sworn vassals of a foreign power? We should like to see this question started before our civil tribunals; and hope, therefore, that the man, whose temporal happiness has been sacrificed by Bishop KENRICK'S conscience, will resort to the laws of his country for redress. If he has not the pecuniary means, will not some of our public spirited gentlemen of the bar step forward to his relief? If not, those who feel interested in preserving the marriage relation inviolable, should contribute a sum sufficient to defray the expenses of a suit. Will

* The Papists have no right to plead that this was a *Jewish* law; for their whole system of priesthood, so far as it has any foundation, rests on the abrogated ritual of the Jews.

† Scott on Lev. xviii. 6—18.

‡ See the *Taxæ Chancellaria* in our last number.

not the editor of the Ledger notice this subject? Or is he *entirely* satisfied with the bishop's explanation? Or, like most of our editors, has he too many Roman Catholic subscribers to undertake such a hazardous enterprise?

By disregarding the law of the land, the bishop has shown himself a worthy son of the Romish Church. For it is an authoritative doctrine of that church, that papal ecclesiastics are not subject to civil laws. "The clergy are not subject to the laity, not even to the king." *Panormitan.* ad Dict. Cap. Solicitæ. "The person of every clergyman is sacred, so that he cannot be subject to any secular power." *Cajetan.* "Kings have no coercive power over ecclesiastics." *Colleg. Bononiensis* Respons. pro libertat Eccles. Sect. 21, 46. These, and many other similar sentiments, are selected by McGavin from laws, bulls, decretals, &c., enacted by councils, and sanctioned by popes, whose infallibility Bishop Kenrick will hardly venture to deny.

The poor woman is, therefore, less criminal than the bishop; for her conscience depended entirely on his, on the pain of forfeiting her privilege to absolution, and extreme unction, without which there is no salvation for a papist. She supposed, according to the bishop's instructions, that she had no alternative but to choose between her husband and the salvation of her soul; both she could not possess. And this affair is not a new thing with papists. About twenty years since, a papist, who had married a protestant wife in Glasgow, resolved to convert her to the faith. Having failed in this attempt he abandoned her, with a view of going to Ireland; he did not, however, live to reach the place of his destination, and the following is a copy of a letter found upon him after death:

"Glasgow, Dec. 5th, 1818.

DEAR MARGARET:—This comes to let you know that I am left this place, and gone to Ireland. You have yourself to blame in this, for if ever I was determined to go to the devil for any woman living, I would do it for your sake. Dear Margaret, I am very sorry you stand so much in your own light, as not till agree to my principles, for you said you would not never turn from your ways of thinking, so by that means you and I shall never agree. So therefore I bid you adieu, dear Margaret, for evermore across the main you need never look for me in Scotland again. As I said before, I will never send my soul to the devil for you or any other woman. I sincerely give my blessing to your son James. No more at present, but farewell for ever."

Some of our readers will, probably, think we have devoted too much room to the case of an obscure individual; but it illustrates one of the many abominations of Popery. Neither is it probable this notice will fall into the hands of those who have the greatest necessity for reading it; but it seems a duty to keep such things before the few that do read and reflect. All the superstition, ignorance, and cruelty, of which the Romish priesthood are now, and have so long been, the guilty authors, will probably soon be re-enacted in this country, especially in our large cities, in all their repulsive deformity.

Our political papers abound with complimentary notices, and indirect commendations of the doings of papists; and should an article be offered with the benevolent intention of disabusing the public mind, and exposing their solemn fooleries, so destructive alike to the temporal and eternal interests of our fellow men,—*they cannot admit religious controversy into their columns!*

Perhaps, as a general rule, it is not desirable they should engage in religious controversy; but we deny their right to poison the public mind, by their apologies for popery, frequently accompanied with implied, if not expressed reflections, disparaging to the Protestant religion. This cringing, fawning disposition, manifested so frequently towards the Romish priesthood, is conclusive evidence that the word of God is but little read, and less understood, by the great mass of our countrymen. But we know the days of Popery are numbered, and this shall be our consolation. After one more brief triumph, this mystical Babylon shall go down like lead in the mighty waters, to rise no more. For he who says, "My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure," hath spoken it.

ART. X.—*To Correspondents.*

THE attention of the critical reader is directed to the first article of the present number. It appears to us a satisfactory solution of a difficulty that has long been a source of perplexity to the Biblical student.

"*HESPERUS*," and "Farther Remarks on Societyism," in the next number.

Our Anti-Slavery friends must bear with us. We cannot possibly find room for one half the articles which have been received on that subject. If all were published, they would fill our pages to the exclusion of every thing else. This would not only defeat the design of the writers, but destroy the Monitor. They shall receive their full share of room and attention. We have been reluctantly compelled to omit the extracts from the Rev. J. Patterson's address, which had been marked for the present number. In the next number we design to give, though lengthy, the Address of the Committee of Synod on this subject entire, that our readers may have the whole of this able paper before them at once. It will supersede the necessity of publishing many other articles. The recent numerous demonstrations of the ferocious spirit of slavery, both in the church and in the world, both within and without the halls of legislation, ("they speak wickedly concerning oppression,") has roused a spirit in the Secession Church that speaks well for her piety and patriotism. In this she may anticipate no small share of obloquy; but our God abhors the oppressor, and will make his punish-

ment wonderful. "He that oppresseth the poor reproacheth his Maker." "Behold the tears of such as are oppressed, they have no comforter! On the side of their oppressors is power, but they have no comforter!" But what of all this? Shall the poor bow down the neck always? Shall the cry of millions of the human race created in the image of God never be heard in heaven? Shall the Book of life be for ever withheld from these immortal souls? This cannot be. "Cursed be he that maketh the blind to wander out of the way. And all the people shall say, Amen." Wo to this land! for "she is wholly oppression in the midst of her." Again we say, and not we, but the Spirit of the living God, Wo to this land! Pride and avarice are the passions that feed and fatten without restraint on the tears and groans and innocent blood of the defenceless! In connexion with which, the beastly lusts of drunkenness, gluttony, and uncleanness, are rampant in the land!

We are pleased with the article of B. It is ingenious, and in the right spirit. We have not room for a formal reply. As the question is admitted to be "an important practical matter," it is hoped our correspondents will probe it to the bottom; that love may be the impelling power, the glory of God and good of men the object, and truth the victor. The advocates of voluntary associations appear resolved to meet the question candidly and manfully; the objectors, therefore, must also take the field, or surrender at discretion. We give no pledge to sustain the negative single-handed. We can, however, by no means concede, that "the whole strength of the negative of this question" was presented in the few hints thrown out by us, chiefly with the design of leading to profitable discussion. But we must content ourselves at present with a few brief observations without attempting to illustrate. And,

1. Our query is not limited to "officers, nor" to any *abstractions* called civil and ecclesiastical institutions." Its language embraces these institutions as substantial existences, possessing both "a name" and "a local habitation." It supposes bodies legally and perfectly organized in all their parts, moving onward under a divine charter, by which they exist as public bodies, the end of whose association is instruction in the knowledge and mutual assistance in the practice of all the social, relative, and moral duties connected with their temporal and spiritual interests. It supposes, farther, that superiors, inferiors, and equals, are alike subject to their constitutional law. That certain duties belong *exclusively* to the head, hands, or feet of these bodies, and certain others in common to the whole body; which embrace every thing proposed to be done by voluntary associations. It is not supposed the head can say to the feet, "I have no need of you." Consequently, "the great interests of these institutions are not committed *entirely* to the *officers* who administer them." Here, then, we discover the Divine goodness

and condescension in giving us institutions adapted to "the law of our social nature," which B. makes the warrant for voluntary associations. We also discover the true import of the Divine maxim, "Two are better than one."

2. Respecting the Bible Society, so far as relates to the multiplication and distribution of copies of the scriptures, it clearly comes under our second classification; but we are by no means certain that its existence is necessary. Both the British and American Bible Societies have been greatly abused. To say nothing of the large sums expended on buildings, officers, agents, &c., the money of the Christian people has been misapplied to the publication of Apocryphal books, while a metrical version of the inspired Psalms has been excluded. Thus they have given countenance to Romish superstition, and thrown the whole weight of their gigantic influence into the scales against a pure dispensation of gospel ordinances, while they stand before the community the violators of the hallowed precepts of that Book which they are so zealous to place in the hands of others! What is likely to be, nay, what has been, the moral influence of their example upon the church, and upon those who have received the scriptures at their hand? Can the authority of the Bible be supposed to bind the consciences of the ignorant, the indifferent, and depraved, so long as they perceive it has no binding influence over its most zealous patrons?

Respecting B's. allusion to the Religious Monitor, it is only necessary to say, that we found an Association existing under a Divine constitution, which answered the purpose much better than any new one which we could induce others to assist in forming, and we hope to leave this Association, as we found it, standing on the immutable basis of Jehovah's word.

If the design of these Associations be nothing more than the procurement of means to diffuse information, why all this parade of constitutions, by-laws, officers, and agents under salary, and ministers of the gospel descending from the sacred desk to participate in the emoluments of these stations? If a political editor wishes to support some great principle of public policy, he issues his prospectus, calls upon those who think with him to sustain the cause he has espoused by contributions of the pen and the purse: and he seldom fails. But we cannot enlarge.

3. We think there *is* danger that these Associations will draw off the mind too much from Divine institutions, especially from the church. That they have already produced this effect, to an alarming extent, can hardly be denied. It will be seen by a reference to page 489 of the present number, that Dr. Wood appears to look with frowning aspect upon Societyism. He does not, indeed, speak very intelligibly. Probably he went as far as was deemed prudent for the meridian of New England. The Dr. evidently refers to the

influence of these societies, as contributing to swell the tide of popular prejudice against a faithful and stated ministry, which already runs so high that it threatens to sweep away and bury, in one common vortex, all the long-cherished attainments of our reforming ancestors. The editor of the Presbyterian, in his paper of February 1, 1840, says, "voluntary societies is a misnomer, so far as it is used as a term of discrimination—*ecclesiastical* organization being as *voluntary* as any others." What does the editor mean? A volunteer is one who enters into any kind of service of his own free will, without compulsion of law, which always supposes he may or may not engage without incurring guilt. Is not this placing voluntary associations on a par with ecclesiastical? Is this the only basis of our ecclesiastical organization? If this editor is correct, then Voltaire and Hume were right; and, of all men, we are the most miserable. And, if such be the fruit of voluntary societies, we have seen enough of them. The day is, probably, not far distant, when the church will weep in bitterness over this folly. When it will be seen, with the exceptions already made, that those societies, which are now the idols of the day, so that all the world is wondering after them, are,

1. Unnecessary.

2. Inexpedient.

3. Destitute of a Divine warrant. And,

4. A peculiar and distinguishing mark of the Romish Antichrist; that the *principle* on which they are based enters into the very essence of Popery; namely, that the end justifies the means; and that their existence among us is one of the saddest evidences of our present defection from the cause of God, and the almost universal corruption of morals in the community. Indeed, this is virtually implied in B's. concluding paragraph. He "longs for the day," &c. What is the import of this? The Divine institutions which God has given us are not adequate to correct existing evils. We will invent others. And when we have accomplished by our own inventions what we could not do by Divine institutions, we will abandon the former and return again to the latter. From this an inference arises which need not be named.

We know, indeed, that many who are now involved in these associations would shudder at these results. They do not view them in the light we have done. Perhaps many have never seriously reflected either upon their warrantableness or ultimate tendency. Perhaps we are wrong; but know that we are earnestly in search of truth. These associations are already sanctioned by such a formidable array of great names, that there is a fearful odds against us; and the danger is, that men who have inadvertently fallen into them, through the influence of those to whom they look as guides, may give a verdict different from what they would in different circum-

stances. If, however, we can succeed in calling the earnest attention of thinking men towards a practical subject of no small magnitude, it is the most we can hope to accomplish in our present condition.

ART. XI.—*Queries.*

MR. EDITOR:—In the last three numbers of the Religious Monitor, an individual has attempted to prove that occasional hearing is sinful, because contrary to the word of God, and the doctrines of the Associate church. It is for others to say how clearly he has proved the doctrine, even from his own premises; and yet he may be required to show *where* this doctrine is so plainly taught in the standards of the said church, that it cannot be mistaken by the humble inquirer after truth. Few have been able to find the subject even mentioned in any of the articles of their public profession, and they maintain that the doctrines professed by a church should be so plainly exhibited, that all may read and understand them; for, when they are so obscure as to depend on inferential and feeble arguments, they will necessarily be denied by some who can neither see nor feel their force. Is, then, occasional hearing a doctrine so clearly taught by the Associate church that it is censurable, because sinful to act contrary to it in any case? Is it the door by which her members are to go in and out? Is it *the term* by which applicants are to be admitted or rejected from her communion, according as they may agree or disagree with it? Or is it a doctrine professed by some in the church and denied by others? If this be true, can they hold communion with one another while they disagree in their belief of this doctrine? Or is it as one eminent in the church, considered also in favour of the doctrine, has said, "*a disputed subject—only a bone of contention?*"

As the subject has been introduced into the Monitor, it is hoped, that, if these questions are of any importance, they will be admitted, and fairly and satisfactorily answered, that all in the same communion may enjoy equal rights and privileges, and that the church may be uniform in the belief and practice of this doctrine, which, in some places, cannot be so much as mentioned without serious consequences to her peace and prosperity. If it is a scriptural doctrine, let us fearlessly support it; if it is not, let it fall to the ground. Yours, respectfully, QUERO.

It is not our design to answer queries addressed to a correspondent; but it is respectfully proposed to "Quero" to write an essay, proving that occasional hearing is a *DUTY*. In the mean time, it may not be amiss to let our readers hear the sentiments of the Christian Intelligencer, a paper devoted to the interest of the Reformed Dutch Church.

Such practices [the practices of attending, occasionally, on the ministry of heretical teachers,] cannot be indulged without both guilt and danger to the soul. The mind that relishes poison is already vitiated. He who can give the sanction of his presence and attention to those who wrest the crown of his divinity from our adored Lord, set at naught his atonement, and discard the fundamental doctrines of grace, occupies a position fearfully perilous. He belongs to the class of those who, "*after their own lusts, heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and who turn away their ears from the truth, and are turned unto fables.*"

In a community like this, where the human mind is subjected to so many excitements, mere *novelty*, however erratic, unhallowed, and wild, has attraction to draw away a certain cast of religionists, who are settled in nothing except the propensity to change.

But a far larger class is, to an extent greatly injurious to themselves and religion, infected with a spirit of religious gossip, are perpetually gadding about, and seem to have no ecclesiastical home. They pay no due respect to the regular order of the house of God; and were all like themselves, the Church would be dissolved. They really do nothing to sustain the privileges which they enjoy; nor do they aright cultivate the communion of saints, co-operate in Christian duties, or sympathize in the condition of Zion. They live unconnectedly. So far from adorning society, they are its blemishes; and in their own souls are unsettled, comfortless, and barren. "*These are spots in your feasts of charity, when they feast with you, feeding themselves without fear; clouds they are without water, carried about of winds.*"

ART. XII.—*The Secession and Relief Churches.*

A MEETING was held here on the 26th ult. of the joint Committees of the Secession and Relief Synods, on the proposed union between these two respectable bodies

of Scottish Dissenters; the Rev. Dr. Thomson, of Paisley, in the chair. The meeting was well attended, and the utmost harmony prevailed. After every one had been called upon to state their sentiments, a motion, which had been made by the Rev. Dr. Brown, Edinburgh, and seconded by the Rev. Mr. Auld, Greenock, was cordially carried, and the one or two who declined voting on the occasion, expressly declared that they had a sincere desire to promote the union, and that nothing but conscientious convictions made them differ a little from others, as to the mode or time of effecting the thing itself. The purport of the motion adopted was, that a Sub-Committee be appointed to draw out a few leading principles, as the ligaments of the proposed union, and that they be submitted to the General Committee for their consideration, and, if approved of by them, they may be submitted to the respective Synods, and thence sent down to all the Presbyteries and congregations of the bodies, that every member may carefully examine them, so that the union may be consummated in due time on good principle and in happy feeling.—*Glasgow Argus*.

The Man of Sin.—The Catholic Register draws the following parallel :

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| 1. God is one. | 1. The Catholic Church is one. |
| 2. God is unchangeable. | 2. The Church is unchangeable. |
| 3. God excludes every other. | 3. The Church excludes every other. |
| 4. God is infallible. | 4. The Church is infallible. |
| 5. God exercises a ruling authority. | 5. The Church exercises a ruling authority. |
| 6. God subdues every intellect. | 6. The Church subdues every intellect. |
| 7. God is independent. | 7. The Church is independent. |

The writer of the above was not aware, perhaps, that in drawing this parallel he was but drawing the character of that "man of sin," the "son of perdition," of whom Paul prophesied, saying that he would sit in the temple of God, "SHOWING HIMSELF THAT HE IS GOD."

N. B. It would be well enough to remark that, in the vocabulary of papacy, the church and the pope are convertible terms.

Ecclesiastical Jurisprudence.—A pamphlet has recently been published at Albany, in opposition to an application of the Shakers to the legislature of New York, for a special grant of power in relation to their property. This pamphlet discloses some very curious particulars in relation to these singular people. It seems that the leaders, by retaining in their hands an absolute control of the property, and by pretended revelations from heaven, maintain an iron despotism over their respective communities, extending to the most trivial affairs. The people are kept in the grossest ignorance, are compelled to act as spies on each other, and if they go away can take nothing with them. Confessions are required at short intervals, which are rendered more effective by the pretence of *supernatural information*, which the system of espionage enables the elders to keep up. We give below, their "orders," which were disclosed at the legislative investigation.

"Orders"—It is

- Contrary to order for any one to write the orders.
- Contrary to order to inquire into the order of other families.
- Contrary to order to inquire into any bargains that the deacons have made.
- Contrary to order to open your mind out of the line of order.
- N. B. To open your mind, is to express your grievances, or confess your sins.
- The line of order, is the elders of the family.
- Contrary to order to expose counsel, or tell what the elders say.
- Contrary to order to go to church with your sins unconfessed.
- Contrary to order to receive or write a letter, without the elders' perusal of it.
- Contrary to order to take a book without liberty.
- Contrary to order to go out among the world, or among families, without permission of the elders.
- Contrary to order to have any money privately.
- The preceding orders illustrate the nature of the organization of the society: the following, frivolous and absurd as many of them are, illustrate the slavish minuteness of the supervision and control to which the members are subjected:
- Contrary to order to shake hands with a world's woman without confessing it.
- Contrary to order to shake hands with the world, unless they first tender the hand.
- Contrary to order to play with dogs or cats.
- Contrary to order for a brother and sister to ride together in a wagon, without company.

- Contrary to order for a brother and sister to pass each other on the stairs.
 Contrary to order for a person to go out of the door yard, after evening meetinig.
 Contrary to order to have right and left shoes.
 Contrary to order to pare the heels of shoes under.
 Contrary to order to read newspapers in dwelling-houses at any time, unless indulgence for that purpose is granted by elders.
 Contrary to order to hold the left thumb over the right in prayer, or when standing up in worship.
 Contrary to order to kneel with the left knee first.
 Contrary to order to put the left boot or shoe on first.
 Contrary to order to kneel with handkerchief in hand.
 Contrary to order to put the left foot on the stairs first, when ascending.—*Troy Whig.*

THE FRUITS OF GENUINE CHRISTIAN LOVE.—Let him that hath ingenuity, plan; and him that hath strength, labour; and him that hath money, give; and him that hath none of these, as well as him that hath all of them, bow the knee, and, with the faith of Abraham and the fervour of Elijah, pray that the kingdoms of this world may become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ.

To believe our neighbour immortal, and yet in our love to regard and treat him only as a mortal—to know he has a soul, and yet to feel no concern and take no care of his soul—to feed him with the bread that perisheth, and yet never offer his famishing spirit a morsel of the bread of heaven—to find him fainting with thirst, and yet give him none of the waters of life—to help him along through this brief world, and yet never seek to throw one kindly influence upon his immortal course, cannot be to love our neighbour as God has commanded.

OUR BLESSINGS MORE THAN OUR CROSSES.—Consider that our good days are generally more in number than our evil days, our days of prosperity (such, I mean, as is suitable to our condition and circumstances,) than our days of adversity. This is most certain, though most of us are apt to cast up our accounts otherwise. How many days of (at least competent) health we enjoy, for one day of grievous sickness! How many days of ease, for one of pain! How many blessings for a few crosses! For one danger that hath surprised us, how many scores of dangers have we escaped, and some of them very narrowly! But, alas! we write our mercies in the dust; but our afflictions we engrave in marble: our memory serves us too well to remember the latter, but we are strangely forgetful of the former. And this is the greatest cause of our unthankfulness, discontent, and murmuring.—*Bishop Bull.*

LOVE FERVENTLY.—Let the love of your brother be as a fire within you, consuming that selfishness which is so contrary to it, and is so natural to men; let it set your thoughts on work to study how to do others good; let your love be an active love, intense within you, and extending itself in doing good to the souls and bodies of your brethren as they need, and you are able.

It is self-love that contracts the heart, and shuts out all other love, both of God and man, save only so far as our own interest carries, and that is still self-love: but the love of God dilates the heart, purifies love, and extends it to all men; but, after a special manner, directs it to those who are more peculiarly beloved of him.—*Leighton.*

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,
AND
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

APRIL, 1840.

ART. I.—*To the Congregations, settled and vacant, under the Inspection of the Associate Synod.*

DEAR BRETHREN,—The inclination of the church of Jesus Christ to apostatize, in all ages of the world, must be manifest to such of you as have even a tolerable acquaintance with her history. This begins by a cold indifference for the great doctrines of the Bible, and then progresses by a sinful compliance with the fashionable maxims, tastes, prejudices, and predilections of the age, whose tendency is to supplant divine revelation. These become, in due time, so incorporated with the principles and profession of the church, that, however plain and evident the errors and vices may be, it becomes almost impossible to wake up the attention of the church to a sense of their magnitude. So callous do the minds of many professors become to the claims of truth and justice, so inveterate in their prejudices, and so strongly wrapt up in their own opinions, that any attempt to present and enforce duty must be expected to be met, not only with the rancorous opposition of enemies, but also with the more dangerous deceptions of luke-warm, moderate, and paralyzing measures, which are calculated to stupify the church and blunt all her sensibilities.

Such is the fact respecting the sin of slavery, to which we are called to direct your attention. In the progressive course of this crime, tolerated by the church of Christ, whose members are bound to mutual love, sympathy, and tenderness, and, regardless of all the laws by which the great God has regulated society, it has broken up the most sacred ties among men; it has severed, at pleasure, husband and wife, parent and child, and reduced men, on whom God has stamped his own image, to a mere article of traffic. It is *approved* by every branch of the church of Christ which has not removed slave-holders from her communion, though, by the DIVINE law regulating the punishment of crime, under the Old Testament, the guilty were *judged worthy of death*: “And he that stealeth a man, and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death,” Exodus xxi. 16. And in the New Testament it

is classed with the most abominable offences, 1 Tim. i. 10. And though the Secession Church did, by an act passed in the year 1831, exclude slave-holders from her communion, still the work of cleansing the house of God of this polluting crime is but half done. We have removed the sin in practice, yet it is found among us in principle. There are many who are willing to confess slavery a sin, who offer apologies for it, and, under a variety of pretexts and expedients, are willing to allow its continuance. Thus the sin is virtually among us, and exists in full force, except the practice; and the majority of professing slave-holders practise the sin under the cloak of those apologies which are found in the mouths of many of our members in the free states. With such we are anxious to deal faithfully and plainly. And, first, let us inquire into the causes of this deep defection.

It arises from an ignorance of the true character of the church of Jesus Christ. She is JEHOVAH'S witness for all revealed truth, and is bound to bear a clear and explicit testimony against all error, either in principle or practice. Yet, forgetful of this high station she occupies, and her members, forgetful that they are "kings unto God," suffer themselves to be disgraced by a cowardly and shameful surrender of their testimony, to please the world, in the following manner:—

1. By engaging in the conflict of political party, when the matter of contention has little to do either with moral or religious principles or practices. They engage with faithful servility to political aspirants, to exalt men, and yet dishonour God; because these are often "vile men," who despise the church of the living God. Nothing is gained in principle by these political strifes; and yet, by these, members of the church are brought to angry feelings with one another, their spiritual frames marred, their usefulness hindered, and neither church nor state profited. Thus our attention is diverted from the great duties we owe one another, and the important work of reformation is seriously retarded. We refuse to hear the groanings of a poor heart-broken brother, labouring beneath the weight of the galling chain, and bleeding under the lash, unjustly inflicted; and yet, to gain the *pitiful* object of a mere political party, we refuse not to become the *creatures* of this tyrant oppressor, and help to bind the "heavy burden," and rivet the chain which our Lord commanded us to *undo* and break.

2. By becoming a creature of the state, instead of maintaining a faithful testimony against all its sins. The church of the living God is a city set on a hill; her light should be diffused through the state, and they should profit by it. Hence the blessed change effected in the different nations of Europe by the reformation from popery. The church developed the doctrines of the Bible concerning the rights of God and man, which had lain concealed for ages under the rubbish heaped on them by the "man of sin." While church and state are kingdoms entirely distinct in their nature, yet in all things common to both, they should co-operate in maintaining the glory of God and the rights of society. In the history of the world, the church has always preceded the state in matters of reformation. The "rod of Christ's strength" proceeding out of Zion, and his rule in the midst of his enemies, has ever taught men their duty, and inspired them with resolution to perform it in the face of the most arbitrary opposition.

But how wofully is the church degraded when she sinks from her high station as a witness, when the state dictates her terms of communion, regulates her testimony, and makes her ministers and members the mere creatures of her craft and policy. How remarkably is this true with respect to the sin of slavery. How frequently are these *popular* difficulties, arising from this very source, cast in the way of the action of the church on this subject:—

(1.) “The American constitution, at least *indirectly*, favours the sin of slavery, and you are bound, as good citizens, to submit to that constitution.” We answer, that the holy scriptures affirm the sin of slavery *directly*; and you are bound, as good church members, to maintain this *constitution* of heaven above all others. It is positive rebellion against Heaven for professors of the Christian religion to bow implicitly to any covenant they ever made in time, which violates their contract with Christ. Those noble patriots who framed this constitution were *men*, and *not God*; and they have all passed to judgment, to answer for any thing wrong in that instrument. And if this constitution does support slavery, will you make it the supreme rule of your actions, as witnesses for Jesus Christ? Will you exchange your testimony in behalf of *God* and *his truth* for a human constitution? Will you ignobly lay down the principles of the Bible at the feet of a human fabrication? “Whether this be right in the sight of God, judge ye.”

(2.) “What can you do? the civil law, in many of the states, throws such obstacles in the way of emancipation, that it is almost impossible to liberate them.” We answer, that you are to treat all such laws as your reforming ancestors treated those that prohibited the spread of the Christian religion; you are to consider them a dead letter, because made in opposition to the laws of Heaven. The state tells you how you may treat the poor and innocent—you may *sell* them; you may separate husband and wife; you may tear the babe from the bosom of its mother, and, regardless of the tears and sighs of that woman that “cannot forget her sucking child,” deliver it to perpetual bondage. But your Lord tells you to “feed the hungry;” “clothe the naked;” to “bring them that are cast out into your houses;” “to give them justice and equality;” and “to pay them their wages.” The point at issue is, which will you obey, God or man? Do your duty, according as the Lord has commanded you, and if the state will again throw them into prison, it is their crime, not yours. No consequences should make us do *wrong*.

(3.) “It would never do to turn them all loose at once.” But oh! fellow professors, are you aware of the infidelity and extreme wickedness of this objection? Will it not do to return wives to their husbands, children to their parents, and a human being to himself, the only lawful owner? These are the relations by which the Creator has organized society, and what right had the avarice and cruelty of man to trespass on God’s plan? Now all we ask is that you just *replace* what you have *displaced*, and let society stand as God has fixed it. It is only in this sense that any human being should be turned loose. We should all be compelled to move in that moral tract required by the divine law, and never be left at liberty to exceed that boundary. Besides, all the fears which are entertained respecting the danger which would result from this restoration to the *wronged* of their *rights* are wholly imaginary. The laws, if well

executed, are amply sufficient to guard against any dangerous consequences.

(4.) "You had better wait until they can all be removed to their native country." We answer: all men have a right to choose their own country. There is, we grant, a strong prejudice against them; but this is wrong. It is pride of colour. It is setting up our colour as a standard by which God *must* make all men, or *we* will not receive them into our houses, nor suffer them to inhabit *our* land. We have taken away their character by robbery, and then we declare they have no character. We declare they are not persons, but property, and then we refuse them citizenship. We withhold those rights with which the God of nature has endowed them, and then tauntingly assert they should be removed far hence, into more inhospitable climes. This is adding mockery to insult. Do we so treat the natives of any other country, or their posterity? But the poor, afflicted posterity of Africa among us are uneducated, down-trodden, and dumb. It is only adding abuse to all our former wrong to expatriate them. This is their home, and the country of the nativity of all born among us. And they have, before God, as good a right to form societies here, and to remove us to the land of our fathers, as we have to remove them. Make them citizens; give them all the rights God gave you, and then let them choose their country. The declaration that you will remove them with their own consent cannot be true, unless you remove that disability from *them*, which is removed from you. Make them *men* in every sense of the word that you are made *men*, and then they can remove to such country as they choose. But we shall not weary your patience by noticing any more of these difficulties; suffice it to say that most, or all of them, arising from prejudice, or a perverted view of the matter, bear no weight whatever in opposition to the performance of justice and equity between man and man. The difficulty which the church of Christ has, in carrying out her testimony, is no reason why she should relinquish it. We are well aware that in parts of the United States, should the testimony of the Secession Church be enforced, it would raise as keen a persecution against her as ever raged against the church during the darkest ages of Anti-Christianism. Yes, in America, declared *ostensibly* to be the freest country on earth; whose fundamental principle is, that "all men are created free and equal," should this principle be carried out, or that declaration of the Great Head of the church, "All things that ye would that men *should do to you, do ye even so to them*," the storm of persecution would be raised, and the cry of "away with such a fellow from the earth" would be heard, and as promptly executed by the infuriated *mob*. Hence, in consulting our personal safety, we must continue our testimony in the free states. When we are persecuted in one city, we are commanded to flee into another; but not to ease and silence, but to labour and travail, until God send deliverance to our afflicted brethren in bonds.

Suffer us now, brethren, to urge upon your consideration a few reasons in defence of the views of the Associate Synod relative to this enormous evil. In 1831 the following resolution was passed by the Synod: "That as slavery is clearly condemned by the law of God, and has been long since judicially declared to be a moral evil, no member thereof shall, from and after this date, be allowed to hold

a human being in the character or condition of a slave." To see the force and bearings of this resolution, we have only to show what constitutes the integral elements of slavery, and what language the Bible holds upon these principles.

(1.) It is an elementary principle of slavery, that the slave is never to be considered a *sentient* (thinking) *being*, but a *thing*, an *article of property personal*, to all *intents* and *purposes* whatever; and that the master may *sell him*, and *dispose of his person*, his *industry*, and *labour*. Thus, by civil enactment and general consent, the slave is considered merely as an *article of merchandise*, occupying no other relation to reasonable existence and human society, and possessing no higher claim upon humanity than the "beasts that perish." Upon this property principle, the slave undergoes every species of cruel treatment which the caprice, brutality, or lust of the master deems expedient to inflict. And why not? If they be, to all intents and purposes, the master's property, they are under the master's absolute control. The slave cannot claim the protection of law, for, in the eye of law, he wants all the properties of a sentient being, and is precisely upon the same level with the irrational animal.

(2.) It is an essential principle of slavery, that the slave can neither *sustain* nor *fulfil any of the social or domestic relations*. These are never recognised by slave law, and, consequently, are utterly disregarded by slave-holders. To do this would be incompatible with the property principle, because, being reduced to the grade of irrational beings, it would be a glaring contradiction to allow them to sustain any *relation*. Hence, the relations of husband and wife, parents and children, brothers and sisters, find no place among slaves. If they did, there would be, at once, an end to the slave-holder's *absolute* power, for the same law which guaranties these relations is bound to secure, defend, and preserve them inviolate.

(3.) It is a universal principle of slavery, that the slave *may be bought and sold*. Every *slave-dealer* practises upon this principle. The slave being considered *an article of personal property*, there can be no restrictions laid upon the traffic in "the bodies and souls of men." A law which would impose restrictions upon the sale of horses and cattle would be every where decried, because this species of property is not possessed of rationality, and the disposal of them, for purposes of profit, is recognised by the law of nature. Now the slave, occupying, according to civil law, precisely the same situation, may *legally* be made the subject of barter and trade.

(4.) It is a fundamental principle of slavery, that the slave is *entitled to no recompense for his labour*. A human being cannot be the property of another, and be entitled to any remuneration for his services. To grant this would be to destroy the property principle. They cannot co-exist, for either the master's claim must be abolished, or the slave must labour without wages. To grant the slave a right to wages is to concede to him the right of making a contract, which would be equivalent to an acknowledgment of his freedom.

(5.) It is an integral principle of slavery, that the slave can neither *possess nor acquire any thing but what is wholly the master's*. He is, himself, the personal property of the master. His liberty belongs to his master. His wife and his children are alike the master's. His bones and sinews, and all the labour of his hands, yea, his time, his eternity, and his accountability belong to his master.

(6.) It is a crowning principle of slavery, that *the slave must be kept in utter ignorance*. Slave law is based upon this principle, that ignorance fosters slavery; for the general diffusion of knowledge is directly at variance with absolute bondage. Hence the heaviest penalties, fines, imprisonment, and death, are imposed upon all who attempt to convey "mental instruction" to the slaves.

This enumeration is but an imperfect sketch of some of the leading features of slavery, whilst we pass in silence the horrid cruelties, the maiming, branding, cropping, shooting, lashing, yoking, cat-hauling, debauching, starving, hunting, and driving, which are continually practised upon them. It requires but little discernment to see how glaringly inconsistent are all such principles and practices with the dictates of divine law and natural justice. Compare this system, so fraught with iniquity and deeds of darkness, with the unerring standard of truth, and you cannot but conclude that it is unequalled in the catalogue of crime.

(1.) The Bible *most clearly condemns slavery under all circumstances, and denounces the most terrible judgments of Heaven against oppressors*. Without illustrating farther this position, we refer to your careful consideration the following passages of scripture:—Ex. iii. 9; Ps. xii. 5; Prov. iii. 31; Ezek. xxii. 7; Job xxvii. 13, 14; Jer. xxx. 20; Is. lviii. 6; Jer. xxi. 12; Jer. xxxiv. 16, 17, 18.

(2.) The Bible *never recognises the right of property in man*. See Gen. i. 28; Ps. lviii. 5, 6. Man was at first crowned with glory and honour, and was constituted lord of all the inferior creation. His dominion was limited and restricted to the inferior creatures in the firmament of heaven, and in the earth beneath, and in the waters under the earth, but not one word enjoining or empowering him to subjugate or exercise dominion over any of his posterity, however much multiplied or diversified. The same dignity and honour still adorn the head of every one of Adam's posterity; they have the same extent of power and authority, and the same rights and privileges. No one can claim absolute superiority over another, or say that he is his property. They might hold and retain, as property, the lower orders of creation, but man, being made in the image and likeness of God, must wear the crown of dominion and hold the reins of government, and therefore he cannot be property to be bought and sold like beasts of the earth.

(3.) The Bible *fully recognises the sacredness of those relations which the supreme Creator has constituted in the human family*. The relation of husband and wife is declared to be inviolable, except for the cause of adultery. "What, therefore, God hath joined together let not man put asunder." Matt. xix. 6. Now it is notorious that slavery has abolished the sacredness of the marriage relation among near three millions of our fellow men, and that nothing is of more common occurrence than the separation of husbands and wives. It has set aside the performance of every duty between husband and wife; the wife owes no obedience to the husband, nor the husband any love to the wife, because they are both under the absolute control of the master. The law of God enjoins parents to "command their children and their households," and to "train up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," and children "to be obedient to their parents in all things," but slavery disannuls both. The master separates parents and children at pleasure, and disannuls all parental and filial duties.

(4.) The moral law forbids all "*theft, robbery, man-stealing, extortion*; all unjust and sinful ways of taking and withholding from our neighbour what belongs to him." It is *theft*, according to divine law, to take or withhold from a man his wages, (Levit. xix. 13; Jer. xxii. 13; 1 Tim. 5:18,) and in this manner slavery deals with all its subjects. Every man has a supreme right, under God, to himself, to the full and free use of his limbs and faculties, in order to advance his happiness; but slavery deprives a man of his right to himself, and bestows this upon another; takes from him his just earnings; oppresses him with hard servitude; therefore it is a manifest *robbery*, committed upon the person, estate, wealth and happiness of another. According to the divine law, all dealers in the *persons* of men were judged worthy of death. Exodus xxi. 16, compared with 1 Tim. i. 10. The word translated men-stealers in the latter passage properly denotes *persons who deal in men, slave-traders and slave-holders*, and all others who uphold this system, which perpetually engenders man-stealing. Now, slavery had its origin in theft and robbery committed upon the persons of the innocent Africans. They were stolen from the land of their fathers; they were stolen from themselves, and deprived of their dearest natural rights. And this man-stealing, or slave-holding, is no more justifiable now, by its long continuance, than it was at its first commencement; but rather its guilt is a hundred fold more augmented, because no restitution has ever been made for the protracted injuries which they have sustained. Now, as slave-holding was introduced by man-stealing, and is upheld by man-stealing, a moral prohibition of the one is an explicit prohibition of the other.

(5.) The sum of both the law and the prophets clearly condemns the holding of a "human being in the character and condition of a slave." "Therefore, all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets." Matt. vii. 12. Whilst this passage gives no countenance to the law of retaliation, it directs men, in their dealings with others, to act just in the same manner, and with the same upright, kind, and compassionate temper as they would reasonably expect from them, were their circumstances exchanged. This is founded upon the great precept of the law, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." As we must bear the same kind feelings toward our neighbour that we desire him to bear toward us, so we must do the same good offices. We are as much bound to deal justly and equitably with others, whatever be their situation, as they are to deal so with us. If the abettors of slavery would, for a moment, apply this rule, and place themselves in the condition of the poor and oppressed, they would at once see that they were utterly irreconcilable. And if the slave-holder and dealer would do the same, the dumb and brutalized would soon need no other advocates than the enlightened consciences of their oppressors, and this blighting evil would only be among the records of the past.

(6.) The *law of love* is entirely inconsistent with slave-holding. (See Rom. xiii. 8—10.) This law constrains every man to seek the welfare of his neighbour in his person, goods, and good name, as he would his own; to be as careful of his neighbour's chastity, life, property, liberty, and happiness, as if he was personally concerned. Whoever, then, walks in love, and is governed by a principle of

love, will neither contrive nor practise any ill to his neighbour, for "love worketh no ill;" but, on the contrary, will devise and practise all the good he can, both to his person, estate, and good name. Now, slavery does *all the ill it can* to its subjects. It robs them of all their just earnings, blasts their good names, debauches their persons, murders their souls, kills their bodies, sunders their relations, scatters their families, and violently wrings from them all that is justly theirs.

Many other equally important and weighty considerations might be presented, to show you that slavery is a crime of the deepest colours, and altogether a masterpiece of infernal machination to ruin eternally both oppressor and oppressed, but these we deem sufficient to direct your attention to this subject.

We shall now call your attention to the part which we, in the free states, have in this matter. It is often inquired, "What have we to do with slavery?" and it is argued, that because slavery is not practised in the north, we are free from all participation in the sin. How far we are concerned will appear from the following considerations:—

(1.) An evident determination pervades the whole north to consider as *inferior* all who are, in any way, descended from African blood. We look upon them as only fit to sit at our footstool; to occupy the lowest and most degraded stations in society, and perform the most menial services. So deeply rooted are our prejudices, and so strong our antipathies, that to associate in the most solemn acts of devotion with any of that race is deemed a high insult to our refined sensibilities. How entirely dissimilar is the condescension and humble deportment of our divine Master, who refused not to be the instructive companion to the most degraded publicans and sinners! But we, pluming ourselves upon our noble *Anglo-Saxon* extraction, as if this were superior to African, will not condescend to become "all things to all men, that we might gain some." This is the spirit of slavery, and the presumptive evidence which will not fail to bring on us the judgment of God, in common with slave-holders.

(2.) There is almost a universal disposition to keep them in *ignorance*. They are basely precluded from our common schools, and denied admission into our colleges; and every possible barrier is thrown in their way to the acquisition of that knowledge which would render them ornaments to society. That eternal life which is granted them, in common with the rest of mankind sinners, is concealed from them. Hence, the greater part of their population belong to those religious societies which are the most illiterate, among whom the grossest errors abound, and where feeling, rather than divine revelation, is the standard of a true profession; because their ignorance disqualifies them for discerning between truth and error. The guilt of this chiefly rests upon us, who have thrown every obstacle in the way of their education. With one consent we blame the conduct of slave-holders, who prevent them from reading the word of God, and yet we do the very same thing, *negatively*, which they have done *positively*, and conspire together to keep "the light of the glorious gospel from shining into their hearts."

(3.) There is a universal disposition to prevent *elevation of character* among any of African descent. When we withhold from men any of their natural rights, we are not only guilty of a deep and

dreadful trespass upon the original laws by which God has organized society, but we remove those inducements which men have to rise above every thing low, wicked, and degrading. We need every stimulant given us by our common Parent, to excite us to take a correct and elevated stand in society. Down-trodden and abused, we lose all that impulse possessed by freemen to assert and enjoy their rights. Men need all the ordinances, civil and religious, which God has appointed, and all the privileges to which they are entitled, to raise them above those temptations to crime to which the human family are exposed. And that government which has degraded them, without crime, and all those who justify that degradation, will be found guilty before that God who has written the same law on the hearts of all men, and entitled them all to the same privileges.

(4.) There is a general *indifference* concerning the *wrongs of the oppressed*, and a general attempt to *extenuate the conduct of the oppressor*. The man who excuses the sin of another, and justifies its commission, would pursue the same course of conduct if placed in similar circumstances. There are many such advocates of slavery among us. They will, perhaps, admit that, measured by divine law, it is sinful; but, when sanctioned and established by civil law, it is *right*; or, in other words, that it is *morally wrong*, but *politically right*. But never was there a greater absurdity. What the divine law prohibits must, in all cases, and circumstances, and latitudes, be wrong, unless the supreme Lawgiver makes some exception. What is wrong in England, is wrong in America. What is wrong and immoral in the free states, possesses a similar character in the slave states. If it be wrong to hold a man in involuntary bondage in one place, it is wrong in every other place. Whoever, then, defends slavery under the shield of civil enactment, when it is clearly a violation of divine law, is, to all intents and purposes, equally guilty with those who practise slavery.

(5.) There is no *general effort* among northern freemen to *prevent this crime*, either in *extension* or *continuation*. The magistrate, the judge, the minister, the legislator, and every one, are under the highest moral obligation, in their respective spheres, to prevent the commission of crimes, such as profanation, blasphemy, violation of the Sabbath, murder, adultery, perjury, &c. But are they not similarly obligated to prevent *theft*; stealing, and kidnapping, and holding men, women, and children "in the character and condition of slaves? And are they not bound to make restitution by restoring what was stolen to its original owner and possessor? Now, are all these classes of persons pursuing this course? Are they reproving their neighbours, and not suffering sin upon them? Are they doing all in their power lawfully to prevent the continuance of legalized oppression and robbery? No! instead of this, a detestable silence pervades the pulpit, the legislative hall, the judicial bench, the press, and the people; and every unlawful means, by mobs, insults, persecution, and reproach, are used to suppress the liberty of speech, and crush those who, proud of their liberties, and jealous of the blessing, wish to perpetuate and extend its enjoyment to others. And will not God, when he makes inquisition after the blood of the oppressed, require it from those who possess the means and power to prevent this horrid abomination, and yet wrap themselves up in indifference and neutrality, and vainly attempt to conceal themselves behind the

idle theories of state-rights and non-concernment, from the discharge of known duty.

(5.) The free states have always had the majority in Congress, yet their *weight and influence has ever been thrown in favour of perpetual slavery*. By this means the internal slave trade is sustained, and slavery, in its worst forms, exists at the seat of government, in opposition to the known interests, honour, and reputation of the country, and public auctions are legalized and licensed for the sale of rational and immortal beings. In a word, by the direct connivance of northern freemen, slavery receives all that legal sanction and permanent security which the combined power and influence of these confederated states could afford, were they all harmoniously progressing in actual slave-holding, or in bartering and making merchandise of their fellow men. If these considerations were not deemed sufficient to show that we are all deeply involved in the guilt of slavery, we might present a black list of the various ways in which northern freemen have manifested their *friendly feelings*, and *tender sympathies*, and *base servility* in supporting this dreadful evil. We have, therefore, some concern with slavery; and when the Ruler of the universe arises to "deliver the poor from him that is too strong for him," to "rid them from ill men's might," and to "plead his controversy with the inhabitants of the land, because there is no truth nor mercy in the land," he will visit us, who have disregarded the cry of the oppressed and spoiled, who would show no pity nor mercy for our poor and afflicted brethren. "Shall I not visit for these things, saith the Lord of hosts; shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?"

But that we may be saved from the danger incurred by connivance at this dreadful crime, and in order that you may be directed to your duty, in reference to your fellow men in bonds, permit us to give you a few directions.

(1.) Let the ministers of the gospel not fail to lift up their warning voice against this sin, and instruct their congregations in the duties they owe to their fellow men. Ezek. iii. 17—21, and xxxiii. 4—9. Would this be deemed necessary, if two millions and a half of Europeans, from the land of our fathers, were reduced to all the sufferings and sore degradation of abject slavery? or if our wives and children were the victims of the brutal lust and sore oppression of slave-dealers? What credit is due to that minister who boasts that he seldom touches this delicate subject; or who, from the fear of the frowns and menaces of man, maintains a dead silence? Surely, when the sin of *man-stealing* stands portrayed before him, in all its crimson colours, *that man* is its apologist who, when the God of heaven is charging him "to lift up his voice like a trumpet, to cry aloud and spare not," is recreant to the trust committed to him, and refuses to give a faithful exhibition of the glorious gospel.

The defections of the ministry must be great when it yields to, or is regulated by public opinion. How weak and trifling must it appear, compared with a reforming ministry in former ages of the church; men who stood in the breach, and who counted not their lives dear to them, that so they might, in all good fidelity, fulfil their ministry. Ministers can preach with freedom and boldness against the sins of former times; and they can expatiate largely and expose boldly the dreadful calamities brought upon individuals, families,

and society, by drunkenness, debauchery, murder, perjury, &c., but concerning that *evil* which combines the murder of soul and body, which reeks with licentiousness and dark deeds of brutality every day perpetrated in our midst, they are silent as the grave, "dumb dogs lying down, loving to slumber."

(2.) Let every member of the church occupy the station in which God has placed him in testifying boldly against this sin. We are well aware that some of you are ready to reply, Are there no other sins we should condemn? Shall the whole attention of the church be directed to this sin alone? This objection is mostly offered by those who seldom, if ever, touch the sin of slavery; or who are apologists, and are making their whole influence, public and private, subservient to slave-holding principles. Many are willing to stand upon this very principle, and because there are many evils in the land having an equal claim upon their labours and untiring efforts, they will oppose none. Their manly fortitude is abated by the greatness of the difficulties to be surmounted in the work of reformation, and they, in despair, cry out, "there is no hope." All attempt at reform, in any department, if this be the true method of procedure, would be effectually paralyzed, and the church of God would be forced to suffer the blackest crimes that ever disgraced the earth to go uncensured, and the vilest transgressors to remain in her communion. Excuses of the most frivolous character are often framed to quiet the conscience, under a sense of neglected duty. The church, by declaring against the evil, has done all that is necessary, says one. We have lifted up our testimony against it, says another, and therefore there is no necessity for either ministers or people to say any thing more on the subject! But if the professed witnesses of Christ were to act upon either of these conclusions, there would be an end to the diffusion of information upon any point which has been made the subject of a judicial testimony. The sonship of Christ, particular redemption, the work of the Spirit, and all other kindred doctrines, would share the same disgrace, by being passed over in silence, with the sin of slavery. Thus, many truths embodied in the testimony and synodical deeds must remain concealed among ecclesiastical records. But what good will be obtained by such judicial deeds, when the majority of church members are either totally ignorant of their existence, or oppose them by holding principles entirely antagonistic, or become exasperated whenever they are made the subjects of a faithful public exhibition? Are testimonies and judicial deeds to be mere dead letters, and of no farther use after they have passed than merely to exhibit opinions which are never designed to be enforced, either declaratively or practically? If they are not mere shadows, they are designed to be practically carried out by all those who profess subjection, in the Lord, to the lawful and warrantable deeds of such church courts. And if the Associate Synod have, upon the authority of the scriptures of truth, declared slavery to be a heinous violation of divine law, no member can, either in principle or practice, whilst he remains in her communion, sustain this unholy relation, or refuse, upon all suitable occasions, to bear his solemn testimony against it.

"Ye are the light of the world," says the Saviour; "a city set upon a hill cannot be hid," "and do men light a candle to put it under a bed?" The light of truth, clear and glorious, emanating from

the infallible *word*, should never be concealed from the eyes of men. This is often lamentably done by those who are "lights in the world," and should be lights to the world. "The fear of man that shall perish" operates powerfully upon the mind, and often suppresses strong convictions of duty, and induces that opposition with which any mention of this alarming evil is met, both by private members and by public functionaries in the church. Thus, through the fear of incurring the obloquy of the haters of God, and of those who disregard the welfare of their fellow men, this sin, marked with every evil work, is either apologized for, or extenuated, or passed uncensured and uncondemned. Will you not, then, brethren, come up to the help of the Lord against the mighty? Will you suffer your testimony for the *rectitude* of the divine law to be bartered for the earthly commodity of popular applause? Will you yield to a detestable neutrality and indifference, whilst millions of your fellow men are calling and beseeching you "to come over and help" them; whilst they are undergoing a dark, dreadful, and hopeless bondage, yoked with the brute, and fettered to the soil, and, as far as human domination and cruelty can effect, doomed to eternal destruction? "We hope better things of you, though we thus speak." Consider the solemn injunction imposed on you by the high authority of the "God of heaven and earth, to stand up in the defence of the poor and oppressed. "Open thy mouth for the dumb, in the cause of all such as are appointed to destruction. Open thy mouth, judge righteously, plead the cause of the poor and needy." "Seek judgment, right the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow." And "O house of David, thus saith the Lord, execute judgment in the morning, and deliver him that is spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor, lest my fury go out like fire, and burn that none can quench it, because of the evil of your ways."

JOHN WALKER.
JAMES PATTERSON.

ART. II.—*Psalmody of the Presbyterian Church.*

"THE devotional poetry of a Christian people is a powerful instrument of their spiritual instruction and comfort. It holds great sway over all their devout thoughts and feelings. And its influence can never, in either kind or degree, be adequate to its claims, while its character falls below the prevailing standard of piety and taste in the church. No deficiency in the sacred poetry of the church can be of small consequence. It would be next to a deficiency in the language of the holy scriptures."

"It would seem more proper, now the business is in hand, that time be given to have it well done, than to commit to the churches a hurried and imperfect performance, which will give but partial satisfaction, and soon provoke another attempt at amendment. The churches will doubtless be patient, and cheerfully use a little longer the books they have, in hope of an ample reward of their forbearance in the higher perfection of the new edition when it comes."

"It cannot but gratify the friends of the Presbyterian Church that the General Assembly's Hymn Book is coming into more general use in the church. A few years since, its use could not be said to be general. Of late the changes in our congregations have all been in favour of our authorized book. And it seems highly proper that it should be so. For it would produce uniformity, which, on many accounts, is very desirable; and it would show a becoming respect for the General Assembly, by whose authority the book is prepared. Indeed, no reason can exist why the use of the Hymn Book should not be strictly enjoined on all the churches. It is, or ought to be, the best book of the kind; at least the best for us; and if so, no proper reason can be given for continuing to prefer others in its stead."—*Presbyterian*, Jan. 4, 1840.

"Are not our ideas indefinite or incorrect about the needful size of our book? Experience has taught every minister who has used our collection, that the number of pieces ever actually sung in public worship is comparatively small. The reason may be, that much of the poetry does not please. But, be the reason what it may, why print so much for the sake of so little? Why compel every purchaser of one of our books to buy so many hymns which he never has occasion to use? The language of impracticable poetry in every collection of hymns with which we are acquainted, is a serious disadvantage to the book."

"The standard of sacred poetry in the American churches has been greatly modified by revivals of religion. It cannot fail to be noticed as characteristic of certain principles which have extensively prevailed concerning revivals, that collections of hymns, as well as volumes of sermons, should appear, expressly 'adapted to revivals of religion.'"

"Experience, perhaps, has sufficiently taught many of the churches, that hymns, expressing the confused and unbalanced sentiments of high and transient excitement, distinguished more by vehemence than spirituality, are ill adapted to aid the formation of scriptural views of truth, to promote a sound religious experience, and to build up, in due proportion, the religious character. Can any thing be gained to truth or wholesome experience, by preferring the effusions of modern revival poetry to the lively and strong expressions of good old scripture piety? Does the deepest gospel conviction and penitence want any thing more revival-like than the fifty-first Psalm? Does true spiritual longing call for better language than the forty-second, or the sixty-third? Does grateful devotion seek better words than the hundred and sixteenth? Is it a higher or purer religion than David's which is not satisfied with the hundred and nineteenth?"—*Ib. Jan. 11.*

"We sing in public worship for devotional purposes mainly. In this respect our singing differs from our preaching as prayer does. We deem it a perversion of the office of prayer to make it preaching; or to adopt it as a mere form of appeal to the assembly; or a medium of instruction, or of controversy. And singing in public worship is equally perverted when employed for any other end, than to awaken and utter the devout emotions of the pious soul."—*Ib. Jan. 18.*

"Indeed a book of psalmody confined exclusively to the Psalms has several very obvious advantages. We would be certain of the divine warrant for using them, and would not be subject to such frequent and hurtful changes if they were exclusively used; for no one can object to *their* purity, spirituality, devotional spirit, or universal application."—*Ib. Jan. 25.*

"It was remarked in the preceding number, that singing in public worship is intended as an offering of praise to God. The terms in which it is usually spoken of, show that, in the view of all religious people, it is regarded strictly as an act of praise. It is commonly thus announced by ministers of all denominations, at the introduction of that part of divine worship. This fact calls for an adaptation of the poetry, both in sentiment and language, to the exercise of praise. It would seem altogether ludicrous, were we not familiar with the inconsistency, to hear the minister announce the hymn to the congregation by saying, 'let us sing to the praise of God—Come, humble sinner, in whose breast, a thousand thoughts revolve; or, 'Sinners, will you scorn the message, sent in mercy from above?' Yet this solecism has become a characteristic of our devotional formulary; and it comes, on the one hand, from the natural feeling of propriety that singing should be pronounced an address of praise to God, and, on the other, from the entire disagreement of much of our sacred poetry with that exercise.

"This ridiculous discrepancy ought to be resolutely censured. It is not exactly a small matter. By all means let us agree to renounce the pretence of praising God in our sacred music, or let us select poetry which, when sung, will bear some resemblance to an address of praise. If we must (as is certainly very proper) preface the announcement of the Psalm or Hymn with some expression descriptive of the character or design of the exercise we are introducing, let that expression suit its purpose; and say, 'let us sing to convicted sinners of the congregation, the 451st Hymn—'Come, humble sinner,' &c.; or, let us sing to careless sinners, the 501st Hymn, 'Sinner, art thou still secure?' or, let us sing to scoffers, and timorous, and tempted souls, and false professors, the 490th Hymn, 'Sinners, will you scorn the message?' &c. If it be suitable to public worship to sing such addresses, it must be equally so to introduce them by their appropriate terms; and yet very few serious worshippers would hear such an announcement without a shock."—*Ib. Feb. 8.*

On the articles from which the foregoing extracts are made the editor of the Presbyterian has the following remarks:—

"We hope the articles of our intelligent correspondent on the subject of 'our Psalms and Hymns,' will not be overlooked. He expresses an opinion which we have long entertained, that much of the devotional poetry which has been introduced into most of our collections, is unsuitable as a medium of praise to God." "This, we are aware, is not the general impression, and it would probably be diffi-

cult to satisfy the majority of the church with a psalmody on the strict principle. An effort, however, may and should be made, to confine our sacred songs to the legitimate ends for which they are designed. The pruning knife may safely be used."

MR. EDITOR,—You may have observed, in a few late numbers of the Presbyterian, some articles on the subject of psalmody. These articles, from which the above extracts are selected, have been occasioned by the appointment of a committee, by the General Assembly, for the revision and emendation of the Psalms and Hymns now in use, and also the adoption of others that may be considered suitable to be sung in the worship of God.

While reading these articles my mind was subject to feelings both pleasant and painful; pleasant, because they gave to me cheering evidence of a reformation in that church on this interesting and important subject. They show that her ministers and people are beginning to inquire into this subject. And the sentiments which they express are such as are calculated to excite a hope that the claims of the scripture psalms will perhaps, ere long, be acknowledged by those who have abandoned their use. I thought that I could discern the faint glimmering of dawn, and I must confess that, though faint, it was cheering. But these feelings were soon succeeded by others of a less pleasant nature, when I reflected upon the backwardness which the Presbyterian Church manifests in coming up to the true ground, notwithstanding the experience which she has had of the evils of a human psalmody, and notwithstanding these evils are seen and lamented by so many. I wish to solicit attention to these articles, because they serve to illustrate and confirm the principle, *that when once divine institutions are abandoned, all becomes dark and uncertain.* The Presbyterian Church, in the days of her purity, made use of divine songs in the worship of God; but these were displaced by human songs. Now that the substitution of these songs has had an injurious effect upon the purity of that church, must appear evident to any sound Presbyterian, who will give the subject a serious examination. That her purity when divine songs were sung in the worship of God, was greater than it has since been, will not, for indeed it cannot, be denied by any who love the standards of the Presbyterian Church. But antecedence it may be said does not necessarily imply causation. True, but it at least justifies a close and diligent inquiry, and where there is any thing in the nature of the antecedent indicative of a *tendency* to produce such a consequent, it renders the evidence of causation in the antecedent at least highly probable. Now that there is such a tendency in the use of a human psalmody in the worship of God, cannot, we think, admit of a doubt; for when once divine institutions are abandoned, there will be no end to the human inventions that will take their place. A diversity of sentiment, respecting what is suitable to be used in the worship of God, will be the inevitable result. This result is rendered more especially necessary, as it regards the psalmody of the church, from the various views and feelings that are known to prevail on this subject. Accordingly, we find in the articles to which we refer, sentiments expressed, which the editor tells us "he has long entertained," but which he supposes are not general in the Presbyterian Church. Now, wherever this diversity of sentiment prevails, respecting the suitableness of any human invention to the worship of God, the consequence will be, that those which appear the most suit-

able will be introduced; and who is to prevent their introduction? We repeat it—Who is to prevent their introduction? Has not the only ground on which it could be prevented been abandoned? If it be right to adopt one hymn, why not another, and another? Is taste to be the rule? I have my taste and you have yours. Are doctrinal sentiments to govern? I have my peculiar views which I wish to be expressed, and you have yours. Is the authority of the church to settle the difference? I deny this authority, in enjoining institutions that are not divine. It appears evident then that the liberty of making and singing hymns will be claimed and exercised: and has it not been thus claimed and exercised? To this inquiry the experience even of the Presbyterian Church will afford us a ready answer. Has the singing of the church been confined to her present hymn book, although judicially authorized and appointed by her General Assembly to be sung in the worship of God? He who has the least acquaintance with the practice of this church, and especially he who has the least acquaintance with the revivals that have been so “wonderfully rife,” knows well to the contrary. That we are correct in this will appear from the testimony of the correspondent of the Presbyterian, to whose articles we refer. This person being a member, and probably a minister of the Presbyterian Church, must be supposed to speak intelligently on this subject. In the first article, he tells us, that “within a few years since, the use of the General Assembly’s hymn book could not be said to be general,” a fact which he very much laments. In another article, the writer complains that “*the luggage of impracticable poetry in every collection of hymn books with which we are acquainted, is a serious disadvantage to the book.*” Nor is this all; he tells us that “it cannot fail to be noticed as very characteristic of certain principles that have extensively prevailed, concerning revivals, that collections of hymns, as well as volumes of sermons should appear expressly adapted to revivals of religion.” Here then it appears, that there are many hymns in the hymn book not generally used. Nay, that the hymn book itself has not been in general use, and that *special* hymns have been made for *special* occasions, such as revivals. Now permit me to ask, why were revival hymns made and sung? Was it not because those which are contained in the hymn book were considered unsuitable, and others were thought better calculated to promote the cause of revivals? This shows us as the writer of these articles remarks, that “the devotional poetry of a Christian people holds great sway over all the devout thoughts and feelings.” What then does the writer of these articles believe to be the *general* character of these revivals? Do not all old school Presbyterians condemn the *measures* that were generally adopted to promote them, and have they not judicially condemned the *doctrines* of those who have been most influential in promoting them? Can we suppose then that these hymns, which were made for the special purpose of promoting these revivals, would not contain sentiments peculiar to their authors, and those who would sing them? And what are these sentiments? I need not enumerate them—They have been judicially condemned by the General Assembly, as contrary to the word of God, and dangerous to the soul. Have we not then conclusive evidence that the abandonment of an inspired psalmody by the Presbyterian Church has been one great cause of that state of apostasy and defection by which she has, until lately, been

characterized? Singing exerts a most powerful influence in a religious assembly; and where the hymn is pathetic, its effect in moving the passions is almost irresistible. Every one has, no doubt, experienced this effect; would this effect, however, be confined to those hymns, the sentiments of which are orthodox? Experience, observation, and reason, prove that such would not be the case; nay, the ardour of feeling, associated with the charms of verse, would recommend the sentiment, however erroneous, and obtain for it a reception where it would have been rejected, if unaccompanied with these charms. This would especially be the case with the young and uninformed. All who have any experience in these things, or any knowledge of human nature, must admit the truth of this.

But to this it may be replied, that it is not *necessary* that such hymns should be used; that the church should prohibit their use. Now, why is it not necessary? Will not the same diversity of tastes, feelings, and sentiments exist, that have always existed? Will there not always be those in the church, who would be disposed to adopt hymns which they conceive to be more suited to the worship of God? and can we expect the authority of the church to be regarded, so long as the hymns enjoined are human and not divine? No; it will not, and indeed it *ought not*, for the ground upon which this authority rests, is not such as will affect the conscience. So soon as inspired psalms are abandoned, the door is thrown open for the introduction of any others.

But let us suppose that the church enjoins, as is recommended by the writer of these articles, the *exclusive* use of those which are contained in the hymn book; where, I ask, is to be the *standard* by which the church is to be governed in the formation of this hymn book? How is she to ascertain that the hymns enjoined to be sung are just such as become the worship of Almighty God? May she not authorize and enjoin the singing of such as are not suitable? Has she not done this? In answer to this, let the editor of the Presbyterian speak—"Much of the devotional poetry that has been introduced into most of our collections is *unsuitable* as a medium of praise to God." And to this he adds—"The pruning knife may safely be used." Now, if the Presbyterian Church has enjoined the use of hymns which are not suitable to be sung in the solemn act of praise to God, has she not subjected herself to the charge of "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men?" and have not those who have sung them been guilty of *will worship*? We leave the question to be answered by the editor of the Presbyterian, and by the advocates of human psalmody.

But these psalms and hymns are to be altered, and new ones adopted. A committee of divines "sound in the faith" has been appointed for this purpose; and a new and improved edition is expected. Now we would not question the soundness or piety of the reverend gentlemen to whom this trust has been committed; but is it not possible that *their* work may contain something to which the pruning knife also should be applied? Surely, if we may judge from the praises that have been bestowed upon the name of Watts and others,—if we may judge from the experience of the past and the imperfections that characterize all human productions—nay, if we may judge from the acknowledgments of the editor of the Presbyterian and his correspondents, we are certainly safe in saying that there

is at least a *probability* that there will be a second call for the pruning knife.

But we wish to confine ourselves to the remarks of the editor and his correspondent, to show that there is no hope of agreeing upon a *standard* that will satisfy all in the Presbyterian Church, so long as the inspired psalms of David and Asaph, which God commanded his church to use, are thrown aside and others introduced as better suited to the praise of God. In the second article, the writer has these words: "As to the standard by which sacred poetry should be judged, there may be some diversity of sentiment." Now, we would ask this writer, why there should be this diversity of sentiment, when we have a *Book of Psalms* written by the inspiration of the Almighty? would these psalms have been given to the church, had there not been a *necessity* for them? Nay, does not this very *diversity of sentiment* of which the writer speaks, demonstrate this necessity? How long is the church to be left to this diversity of sentiment? When and how is this question as to the proper standard to be settled to the satisfaction of all? I see no other way, but to return to the "*lively and strong expressions of good old scripture piety.*"

The picture which the writer has given us of a prevalent custom of announcing addresses to individuals as *praise to God*, shows in the most conclusive manner the folly, and shall I not say the awful danger of departing from the psalms of divine inspiration. Is it so, that this is a true picture of a common custom observed by "ministers of all denominations,"* and yet this is the first time in which this custom has been exposed. "This fact, the writer tells us, calls for the adaptation of poetry, both in sentiment and language to the exercise of praise." Yes, it does call, and call loudly; but where is this sentiment and language to be had if not in the psalms of divine inspiration? The adoption of these psalms, would at least remove "this ridiculous discrepancy," which the writer tells us, "ought to be resolutely censured."

The ground on which some have opposed the use of the scripture psalms, is, that the language in many cases, is *peculiar* to David and the Jewish Church, and therefore, cannot be appropriated by the worshipper of God. The great superiority in this respect, of those which have been substituted, will readily appear, if the testimony of this writer is to be regarded, for he tells us, "*The great congregation must be called upon to give musical utterance, which not five persons in the assembly can be supposed to feel.*" Such is the character of the hymns which have been in general use in the Presbyterian Church. After this confession, those who make use of scripture psalms, will not be disposed to exchange them for those of the Presbyterian Church, on account of their *peculiarities*.

The writer of these articles thinks, that it would be of great advantage for the church to have a *form* of sacred songs to be in *perpetual use* by the church. We highly approve of the suggestion, and would recommend the Book of Psalms which the head of the church has given her. It is asked, "why we should not aim to make the hymn book in its sphere, what the liturgy is in the Episcopal Church?" We think the church has been *aiming* at this. She has

* The writer seems to have forgotten that there are a few Presbyterian denominations who confine themselves, in praising God, "to the lively and strong expressions of good old scripture piety."

been endeavouring to enjoin the use of a *book* in the worship of God, which, like the prayer book, has an authority merely human. We have nothing to say at present against the *purity* of the hymn book; neither have we any thing to say against the *purity* of the prayer book; but we contend that the use of both in the church, rests upon the *same* foundation—human, and not divine authority. There is, however, one circumstance that renders the use of the prayer book in the worship of the church less objectionable than that of the hymn book. In authorizing the use of the prayer book, the Episcopal Church has not *displaced* a divine book of prayers, but the Presbyterian Church has displaced a divine book of psalms. Now, if it be wrong for the Episcopal Church to enjoin the use of a prayer book in the church, as all sound Presbyterians believe, when the Head of the church has not given her a divine form of public prayers, can we justify the Presbyterian Church in authorizing the use of a human form of public hymns, when the Head of the church has given her a divine form? This is a query which we would like to see answered by the Presbyterian advocate for human psalmody. The writer of these articles, in order to show the incalculable advantage of having a *form* of hymns, asks, "Who can tell the benefits to Christendom of our inimitable translation of the Bible?" What does this writer mean. Does he mean to place the hymn book upon a level with the Bible? Does he wish that it should possess the same authority in the church? Does he wish the language in which it is written to possess the same *charm* to the worshipper of God, as he tells us there is in the language of the Bible? Does he wish the child of God to associate with the words of Watts, or any other uninspired man, "his religious ideas?" We cannot believe that such is really the case, notwithstanding the high veneration in which the hymn book is held by many in the Presbyterian Church. We cannot believe that he would have us associate with the words of any human composition our "religious ideas." As we can, however, attach no other meaning to his words, we shall conclude that we have not understood the writer. Our difficulty, however, in coming to this conclusion, has been increased by following him in his remarks. A little farther on we have these words—"The high and solemn office assigned to our psalms and hymns, renders them worthy of our highest endeavours to make them *perfect*." What shall we think of this language? Indeed we know not what to think; we are astonished that any one should entertain such sentiments respecting this part of divine worship, and not see the duty of using exclusively the scripture psalms; and we are also astonished that any one who is not an advocate for *human infallibility*, and who has the experience of the past for a guide, would speak of making any human production perfect as a medium of praise to God. Surely the writer must have a reverence for the committee who are appointed for this purpose, amounting almost to adoration when he is disposed to cherish the hope of a perfect production; and his confidence in their abilities must be great indeed when he is willing to commit to them the formation of a hymn book to be used in the "high and solemn office of praise to God," especially after declaring that "no deficiency in the sacred poetry of the church can be of small consequence—*It would be next to a deficiency in the language of the holy scriptures.*"

A correspondent of the 25th of February expresses himself as de-

cidedly in favour of "a book of psalmody confined exclusively to the Psalms," and he tells us that "it has several obvious advantages." "We would," he remarks, "be certain of a divine warrant for using them, and would not be subject to such frequent and hurtful changes if they were exclusively used, for no one can object to *their* purity, spirituality, devotional spirit, or universal application." Now this is precisely our sentiment, and this writer has stated the grounds upon which the *exclusive* use of a scripture psalmody has been maintained by our church, in common with others; but we really did not expect to meet with this sentiment from the pen of a Presbyterian. Is the author of the above sentiment a minister of the gospel? We presume that he is. If so, we hope that he instructs his people to do nothing for which they are not certain that they have a divine warrant. And now, we should like to know whether he ever makes use of any other psalms but those for the use of which he says we are certain of a divine warrant. If such be the case, we see not how he can acquit himself of the charge of *will worship* before the bar of his own conscience. Indeed, from the manner in which he has expressed himself, we should not have supposed, had he stopped with this sentence, that he made use of any others; but our feelings of pleasure were exchanged for those of pain by a perusal of the next sentence: "But if hymns are to be admitted," &c. Why does the writer express himself thus? Why does he make any *allowance* for the admission of hymns, for the use of which he is "*not certain of a divine warrant!*" Why does he not keep his ground, and maintain that as they have not a divine warrant, they should have no place in the church of God, whatever might be their character? But no. Instead of this, we find him recommending to the committee hymns "of a sober, grave, and quiet spirit!" O shame upon such inconsistency!

We have an observation to make with regard to the remarks of the editor on this subject. After recommending the articles of his correspondent, and expressing his long-established opinion "that much of the present devotional poetry is unsuitable as a *medium* of praise," he tells us what should be the characteristic of this poetry. The sentiments which he expresses are the same as those which are held forth in the articles of his correspondent. But after this expression of his opinion as to the kind of psalms which should be used, he adds: "This, we are aware, is not the general impression; and it would probably be difficult to satisfy the majority of the church on the strict principle." Now, what does the editor mean by the *strict principle*? Is it the principle advocated by the articles of his correspondent? If so, why is it impossible? The answer is at hand. It is because his correspondent does not take the ground of *divine institution*, the only ground on which the authority of the church is founded, and until this ground is taken and maintained, we need not expect Christians to be *satisfied*, for their views on this subject will be as various as their dispositions, tastes, and feelings. And we see no reason why they should be satisfied on the "strict principle;" as it is called, (though we should rather call it the *loose* principle;) for if I prefer a hymn written by John Wesley to one written by Isaac Watts, I see not why I should not use it, and I see not why the church should interpose her authority to prevent it.

There are many other things contained in these articles to which

we could wish to advert, but we have already protracted our remarks much farther than we intended. In making these remarks we have been influenced by a sincere desire for the purity and prosperity of Zion, and we humbly hope that they may tend to encourage the advocates of a scripture psalmody in their feeble efforts to maintain in the church of God its *exclusive* use. Many of the sentiments which are advanced in the articles to which our attention has been called are valuable, and are such as are often expressed by the advocates of a scripture psalmody: they will not fail to experience a feeling of joy in witnessing even the slightest symptoms of a return, on the part of the Presbyterian Church, to the use of those divine songs by which she praised her King and Head in those days when she is admitted to have maintained a more pure profession than she has been doing since their use has been abandoned. Those who still continue to use the psalms of divine inspiration will, we doubt not, from the testimony of those who have tried the experiment of a human psalmody, be persuaded that it is at least the *safest* plan to continue in the use of "the lively and strong expressions of good old scripture piety."

C.

ART. III.—*Voluntary Associations.*

MR. EDITOR,—As you invite articles on the subject of voluntary associations, I send you this to publish, if you think it will throw any light on that subject. I have always regarded societies whose objects were proper, as harmless things at least, and in many instances very beneficial. I have therefore been much surprised at the objections which have of late been brought against them, but it was your remarks in your January number which induced me to write this article. From a perusal of those remarks, I am convinced that your opposition to them results from what I conceive to be a misapprehension of their true nature. The first thing to be settled then is, what is a voluntary association?

This question being settled, we can then apply that fundamental principle of Protestantism, which you mention, and ascertain whether they are included within its scope: if they are, then of course they should be condemned, but if not, then they may be referred to your second class of associations, and should be countenanced or not according to their usefulness or expediency.

Now, in your remarks, you settle the question at the very outset by your definition. After stating your classification of associations, you say, "if it is correct, then the only debateable ground remaining will be in reference to those associations which are formed with the avowed design of correcting some existing abuse in church, or state, or both, or of performing some duty which appropriately belongs to these institutions, but which they have neglected." From this, together with the query you propose at the end of your remarks, I gather, that your understanding of voluntary associations is, that they are human institutions set up in the place of those that are divine, upon the supposition that those divine institutions are insufficient for the end for which they were established. If this was the character of such associations, I apprehend they would be utterly indefensible,

as it would be the highest presumption for men to say that they can devise means better calculated to accomplish an end than God himself. If this was their character, then I would agree with you that they would be opposed to the above mentioned principle, and therefore wrong. But that this is their character, I deny. I deny that they are designed to perform any duty which appropriately belongs to the institutions of church or state. Some societies of this kind may indeed have been formed, such as the missionary societies mentioned by "a western citizen," in his sensible article on the subject, in the same number of the Monitor; but such I do not advocate.

I define voluntary associations to be, individuals co-operating and aiding each other in the discharge of their individual duties, concentrating their individual influence in order to bring it to bear, with more efficiency and precision on the point proposed—acting in concert, for the sake of acting with greater uniformity and energy. They claim to perform no higher duties than those which individuals may and ought to perform, but are only a more efficient mode of discharging those duties. This I conceive to be the true notion of a voluntary society, (at least it is the only kind which I propose to defend,) and such a society no more clashes with the above fundamental principle of Protestantism, than individuals do when properly discharging their duty.

I admit to the fullest extent, the sufficiency of church and state institutions, for the purposes for which they were instituted; but it is, nevertheless, well known that these purposes are very often not fulfilled, owing to the mal-administration of human agents, and not from any thing defective in the institutions themselves. When this is the case, it will not be denied to be the duty of private individuals to exert whatever influence they may possess to stir up those who have the administration of public affairs to a right discharge of their duty. This may be done in various ways,—by reproof, by remonstrance, by petitioning the constituted authorities, and in short, by the whole process of free discussion. But if this be the duty of individuals separately, and independent of each other, can there be any thing wrong in the same individuals acting together for the same purpose? Can there be any thing wrong in the mere fact of their agreeing to exert their individual influence, and to discharge their individual duties in such a way as not to clash with each other, and to adopt a few plain rules in order to secure uniformity and regularity in their operations, and to give them greater efficiency? This is the whole idea of a voluntary society, and those who can see harm here are a great deal sharper sighted than I am. The principle of association runs through the whole of human intercourse, and it is strange that its propriety is never questioned except when applied to a moral purpose. Among us, in the back-woods, it is common for neighbours to assemble to assist each other in rolling logs, building houses, &c. When a number of men take the field to roll logs, for instance, every individual knows that his business there is to pile them into heaps, but should each one work by himself without any regard to the rest, they would work to little purpose. But let them work together according to some plan, and the work is soon done. Our merchants frequently associate in firms, or companies, to enable them the better to carry on their business; and what is more common than joint stock companies to carry on works of internal improvement, or for other similar purposes?

Now no person thinks of such associations usurping the place of civil government, or claiming to perform duties which are competent only to it; so far from it indeed, they are frequently incorporated by legal authority: thus showing that their existence is considered every way consistent with the safety, and even promotive in a subordinate way of the ends of civil government. And the reason is obvious, they claim power to do nothing, which individuals in their individual capacity might not lawfully do.

Just so it is in the moral world. It is the duty of all the members of civil society, but especially of church members, to use their influence in support of social order and virtue, and to discountenance any prevailing evil. But if this be their duty individually, why may not two act together for the same purpose, and if two why not three, and if three why not ten, and if ten why not a hundred, provided they can make their influence to be more felt in this way than separately? When persons distinguish themselves in their respective neighbourhoods by their opposition to vice and zeal for having it reformed, their conduct is considered praiseworthy; and instead of taking the appropriate business out of the hands of church and state, they are looked upon as approving themselves good members of civil society, and, if they are church members, as consistent professors of religion. Supposing then, that the same individuals, for the sake of increasing their influence, and in order to act with greater uniformity and energy, should agree to act together according to some plan, in other words, should form an association, still having the same object in view, and actuated by the same motives, would they now be acting inconsistently with the character of good citizens and good Christians? Yes, say those who are opposed to societies. But to me it appears very strange that the same persons can in the former case carry out certain principles, and pursue certain objects, and it is all right, and praiseworthy; but in the latter case, when they join together, so as more effectually to carry out the same principles, and pursue the same objects, they are all wrong.

On the whole, then, the conclusion at which I arrive is, that voluntary associations are a means of enabling us more effectually to discharge the duties which our relation to church and state make incumbent upon us. And by the way, I think the position taken by "a western citizen" established, that societies may lawfully do whatever it is morally right for individuals to do; or in other words, whatever it is right for men to do in their individual capacity, they may aid each other in doing, provided thereby they can accomplish a greater amount of good: and I do not think you succeed in setting aside that position by asking if a society may do, what it is right for the President of the United States to do. Western citizen undoubtedly meant an individual in his private capacity. But the President of the United States in the case supposed, would be acting in a public capacity, as the principal executive office of the government. Therefore, the case you suppose, has no bearing at all on the question.

Such then being the nature of voluntary associations, it is clear that they are not included within the scope of that sound principle which you lay down, as they come not in the room of any divine institution, or system of means; and the only remaining question will be with regard to their expediency. This, it is apprehended, will

not be difficult to settle. That mode of action in which we can discharge our individual duties to the best advantage, must be the most expedient. As order and system are always preferable to their contraries, so a systematic, uniform mode of action, against prevailing evils, possesses great advantages over the separate action of individuals without any fixed plan. When men have any common object in view, the social principle of our nature leads them to unite and aid one another in accomplishing it. Why should they not do the same when the object in view is a moral one, and when the powerful principle of duty comes in to the aid of the social principle, urging them to accomplish their purpose in the most efficient manner.

When monstrous evils, such as slavery, for instance, with all its horrors prevails and increases amongst us,—when the constituted authorities will not do their duty with regard to it; when we are called upon in our individual capacity to testify against it, and to stir up those who administer in church and state to their duty, is it not irrational as well as inexpedient not to aid each other in doing what is equally the duty of all? I would not, indeed, plead for the formation of societies to meet every evil existing in the country, but we must exercise wisdom in this matter. In the case of inveterate evils of long standing, sanctified by custom, and supported by public sentiment, and, as with slavery, by law, the influence of individuals opposing them here and there throughout the community is scarcely felt or noticed,—but let these individuals associate themselves—let them raise a united voice against these evils—let them adopt a uniform system of action against them, and presently their influence is felt far and wide, the moral sense of the community is aroused—the evils are investigated, and not unfrequently important revolutions take place in public opinion.

Against their expediency you bring some objections which I will notice as briefly as possible. 1st. They have not the power to accomplish the avowed end of their association. This objection evidently arises from what I conceive to be the erroneous view you take of the end of their association. Viewing them as machines to perform the duties incumbent upon church and state, it is no wonder you object to them that they have not the power. But if their object be, as I have tried to show, merely to embody the influence of individuals and bring it to bear more powerfully on public opinion, what stands in the way of accomplishing this end? So far as they succeed in rousing the public attention, and turning the tide of public opinion against the evils they oppose, just so far they succeed in accomplishing their ends. Did not the anti-slavery societies of Great Britain accomplish their ends when they succeeded in arousing the nation and the government to take such measures with regard to slavery as led to its abolition? You speak of the repeated and signal failures of such societies. I am at a loss to know what you mean by these,—I am ignorant of any such failures. Has not the temperance society succeeded in rendering the ordinary drinking of intoxicating liquors disreputable among all respectable people? Is not even the anti-slavery society of this country continually accomplishing the end of its formation in turning the attention of the people of the United States to the subject of slavery, and turning the odium of public sentiment against it?

2. Your next objection refers to the excitement and agitation which they cause in the community. It is true that the action of the anti-slavery society, which you take as an example, has been attended with no little excitement. But are you sure that the mere association was the cause of it? If so, why do not temperance, Bible, and missionary societies encounter as much popular opposition as the anti-slavery society, since they are equally obnoxious on this score? I apprehend we must look somewhere else for the cause of excitement. It is not association, but the discussion of the unwelcome subject of slavery, and the loud calls to abolish it.

Instead of considering this an objection to societies, however, I view it as a strong argument in their favour. It shows the efficacy of associated action. Perhaps I may be wrong, but I would infer from this objection, that you suppose that the proper authorities of church and state might act upon it without excitement, or opposition. But surely the proceedings of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, of the Methodist Conferences, and of the Congress of the United States on the subject for some years past, might show the vanity of such an expectation. And I find that those ministers who endeavour to do their duty, by faithfully preaching against slavery, raise as much excitement as any others. The whole history of the church, moreover, and especially of the persecutions of the church, may teach us that she cannot faithfully, and vigorously oppose and testify against prevailing evils, without exciting the bitterest opposition. And to me, it seems little less than preposterous to suppose, that the civil authorities will ever act on the subject till it first comes up among the people, and be discussed among them. In our country, public opinion must precede legislative action. Every day's experience proves this. No important measure of public legislation can be carried while it is decidedly unpopular among the people. The abolition of slavery then must first be discussed among them, for the civil authorities will never take it in hands till it becomes in some degree popular; and hence, the expediency of societies as a means of bringing it before the public, and of influencing public sentiment in its favour.

3. With regard to your third objection, I shall say but little; I certainly shall not defend the practice of continuing in the communion of ecclesiastical bodies, which tolerate in their bosom slavery, or any other monstrous evil. Many of those who remain in such communions, however, have not failed to "plead with their mother for a condemnation of this sin," and to "protest, and appeal, till they have actually carried the question to the supreme judicatories of their respective churches;" but what their course would be if they had no hopes of finally succeeding, I know not. But while they see proper to continue their present ecclesiastical connexions, I do not see why they may not at the same time, as citizens, and members of civil society, join associations whose object is to free our country from such evils.

Such are my views on this subject, intended principally to meet your objections in your remarks before alluded to. Should I in any instance have misapprehended your meaning, I hope you will do me the justice to believe that it was not intended. I have endeavoured to treat the subject with candour, and should I seem to have failed in this respect, I can only say, that I did not intend to be uncandid.

I cordially agree with you, that the church is, under God, the great source of reformation, and the state of morals will not long be good when she ceases to be so; but yet think that no small part of her influence is exercised through her members carrying their principles with them in their intercourse with their fellow men, in all the relations of life. It is thus that they let their light shine before men, so that others are sometimes induced thereby to glorify God.

God allows his people to associate with others for temporal purposes, and why not when others are willing to unite with them for the accomplishment of some moral good? In this way the salt of the earth is brought into contact with the mass of human society; so that many, whose hearts are not touched by Divine grace, yet come, in some degree, under the influence of moral principle, and are willing to give their influence to reform the abuses and evils existing in human society. Societies, at all times, and in all cases, may not be proper; but in a country like ours, where so much depends on public sentiment, and where deeply rooted evils of great enormity prevail, which require great exertions to eradicate them, I would especially plead for their expediency. Slavery, especially, concerns us, not only as church members, but as members of human society: it is a social and political, as well as a moral evil, and requires, in order to remove it, the united influence of all the friends of social order and of the welfare of our country. The churches, also, should undoubtedly act, and exclude it from their pale; but we have likewise duties to perform as members of the commonwealth, and of human society at large, and should, therefore, use every efficient and lawful means to remove so monstrous an evil.

HESPERUS.

ART. IV.—*Have we any warrant for expecting a blessing on the labours of men not sent?*

MR. EDITOR,—If you are not wearied of my questions, I propose to continue them. And for a logical reason, I wish to make the fifth follow the third, and make the fourth take its place. It is this:—*Have we any warrant for expecting a blessing on the labours of men not sent, or deposed for immoral conduct?* I have chosen to use the word *labours*, in order to include dispensing the sacraments, admitting persons to communion, and inflicting censure as well as preaching. My question is not, whether all these can be done in due form or not? or whether the Scriptures can be correctly expounded by men who have not the proper authority? For I doubt not but such characters may sometimes, in order more effectually to blind the people to their scandalous conduct, affect to have a more fervent zeal than others for truth and order. But it is—Have we any thing in the word that would authorize us to believe that God will make *their* labours, how correct soever they may be, effectual means of salvation? Will God, the Holy Ghost, *by them*, convince and convert sinners, and build up saints in holiness and comfort through faith unto salvation? These are the chief ends of gospel ordinances. They are the certain fruits of the new covenant love of the Father, the grace of the Son, and the communion of the Spirit,

and the sum of the blessing which was promised to the church; and this is the blessing meant in the question. In the opinion of, perhaps, the greater part of a nominally Christian world, this question would be answered in the affirmative,—If the preacher be popular and esteemed as a speaker, if he speaks to crowded audiences, and if they speak of being deeply affected by his discourses, and reform their manners; and, especially, if very many join his church. Any higher evidence of a blessing on preaching than these things afford, it is thought, would be unreasonable to ask. That such effects as these may be produced by the preaching of such is not denied. But it is denied that they are certain proofs that any saving grace is imparted to the hearts of the hearers—that any sinner is quickened to spiritual life, or any saint made more holy. Nor is it needful here to prove that my question cannot be answered, either yea or nay, by facts of this kind. If we were to determine it by this sort of evidence, we might possibly be obliged, ere all was done, to own that the greatest impostors have been the most blessed. And blessed above all others has been the *Beast*, after which the whole world has gone, and wondered, with a great admiration,—“Who is like unto the *Beast*?”

But let us consider, soberly, that God has, under both dispensations, claimed it as his prerogative alone to send messengers to his church. It must, therefore, be a sin of great magnitude for any man to take this upon himself, and still greater for a man to persist in officiating in direct opposition to a righteous prohibition by the courts of his house. He usurps God's prerogative; and the thought cannot be entertained, without blasphemy, that God would *countenance* him in this. And no greater countenance can be, than making his *labours* effectual to salvation. This is, professedly, the highest reward that a minister looks for; namely, “many, for a crown in the day of the Lord Jesus.” But, if this could be obtained by such men as my question has in view, they would be crowned for taking the crown off the Redeemer's head. It is farther evident, that, if the labours of such were to be blessed, all the authority which God has asserted, and, at various times, exercised, in sending his servants, and all the threatenings which he has uttered against such as go unsent, would be rendered of no effect; or, rather, they would be turned to God's own dishonour. If the unsent is as effectual in his ministry to win souls as the sent, what use is there in sending? This tedious method of examinations, trials, ordinations, and calls, if this doctrine were true, we must regard not only as useless, unmeaning ceremonies, but as retarding the great spirits of our age. But we are sure that the word of God on this head will stand, and nothing which would go to overthrow it is to be imputed to him.

The hope that the preaching or other official labours of the unsent, or the deposed, can be blessed, must rest upon a false foundation. For, before it can be, either there must be a natural and necessary connexion between preaching and saving benefit to the hearers; or the excellence of the proposed end must, in God's sight, sanctify the means; or he must be supposed to have more regard to the salvation of sinners than to his own honour. Unless one or all of these propositions be true, the blessing in question cannot be possible. But they are all false. As to the first, it is only necessary to observe that sound *authorized* preaching is not always blessed, but is, to many, “the savour of death unto death.” “Paul may plant and

Apollo may water," yet nothing will come up but briars and thorns, unless God, of his good pleasure, "give the increase." Even Christ himself, by the prophet, complained thus of ineffectual labour:—"Then I said, I have laboured in vain: I have spent my strength for nought, and in vain," Isa. xlix. 4. These scriptures prove incontrovertibly that neither preaching nor any other ordinance has any other connexion with saving benefit than God's mere good pleasure. The falsehood of the second and third is too obvious to need any remark. "My glory will I not give to another," Isa. xlii. 8. And much of his glory by the redemption of the church arises from *appointing and sending means and messengers*;—which are, apparently, "weak, foolish, base," and despised in themselves, that he alone may be seen in the mighty effects which are wrought by them, and that all flesh may be excluded from a share in the glory. But the above declaration of the prophet, and this design in appointing and sending, would both be defeated if the labours of unsent men should be blessed.

It may be observed, that the scriptures frequently lay ministerial success to *appointment and mission*. "And he said, Certainly I will be with thee; and this shall be a token unto thee, that I have sent thee: When thou hast brought forth the people out of Egypt, ye shall serve God upon this mountain." Exod. iii. 12. His succeeding in bringing Israel out from Egypt and through the Red Sea, and through the wilderness, where there was no water, and at length to Mount Sinai, was a proof to himself and all others that God had sent him, and that he did not take it upon himself. But if another man might have gone, without any appointment, or against an express prohibition, and succeeded in bringing Israel to that place, how then could it be *a token of being sent*?

That great work was a figure of the blessing which is bestowed on sinners by means of gospel institutions. And when we are sure that it is actually bestowed, it is as certain a token that the minister, by whom it comes, is sent.

To this amount the apostle speaks, 1 Cor. ix. 1: "Am I not an apostle? Are not ye my work in the Lord? If I be not an apostle to others, yet, doubtless, I am to you; for the seal of mine apostleship are ye in the Lord."

Gideon, the son of Joash, was called to a very great and difficult work—to save Israel out of the hand of the Midianites. Israel was in great straits, and their enemies were many and very powerful; and he was afraid to undertake it, and evidently doubted whether success would crown the attempt. The Lord, in great condescension, encourages him by repeated assurances that he would be with him. And, as to success, he gives him the following word as a ground of hope: "Go in this thy might, and thou shalt save Israel from the hand of the Midianites:—*have not I sent thee?*" Judges vi. 14.

Saul's military success against the enemies of Israel is clearly ascribed to his being *authorized* to go against them. "To-morrow," (says God to the prophet,) "about this time, I will send thee a man out of the land of Benjamin, and thou shalt anoint him to be captain over my people Israel, that he may save my people out of the hand of the Philistines." 1 Sam. ix. 16. Anoint him, that he may save my people. He cannot otherwise accomplish it. Is not this the plain

meaning? The matter of a people being God's people—their salvation, and all the ways and means by which it shall be done, are wholly of his sovereign purpose. Natural causes cannot effect it. They cannot even subserve it any farther than he has purposed; and how far that is, he has not revealed. The greatest scholars and the ablest men are often the least successful; therefore, unless he appoint and send a man, or a means, to accomplish the salvation of his people, however much they seem to be naturally adapted for it, we have no ground to hope for their success. Saul and David, too, must be anointed before Israel can expect any help by their means. On the other hand, there is no means or person, how deficient in themselves or disproportionate to the work soever they may be, that shall fail of success simply on that ground if they are sent of God. Moses shall succeed notwithstanding his slow speech. 'The sound of rams' horns shall prevail once and again, because appointed, and the Ark of God shall be taken by the proud enemy *because it is not*. We have a very clear and strong evidence for our position in the case of Naaman, the Syrian leper, who came to Israel to be cleansed. The prophet directed him to "wash seven times in Jordan." But Naaman was wroth, and went away, and said, "Behold, I thought, he will surely come out to me, and stand, and call on the name of the Lord his God, and strike his hand over the place, and recover the leper. Are not Abana and Parphar, rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel? may I not wash in them and be clean? So he turned and went away in a rage." 2 Kings v. 11—13. If the deposed or the *unsent* may be as successful as any other, he was plainly in the right. And it is more than probable that he never thought of the virtue of God's appointment in the case. He looked more for some great and imposing ceremony to be used, than to the power of God's word. At any rate, he thought the virtue would come out of the *means*. And if it was to be dipping in water that was to do it, why not the waters of Damascus, which were allowed to be better? I cannot perceive wherein his expectations differ from those who look for a blessing on the ministry of men not sent or deposed. They, too, are saying, "Are not the preaching, &c., of — as good, or better, than those who are sent?" But he was altogether in the wrong in this. However, it would be well if our lepers would follow him throughout, for he allowed himself to be *advised* even by those that were his inferiors; and, upon second thoughts, he went, at the saying of the prophet, and washed in Jordan. "And his flesh came again like unto the flesh of a little child, and he was clean."

What God says by Hosea, i. 7, seems also to our purpose:—"But I will have mercy upon the house of Judah, and will save them by the Lord their God, and will not save them by bow, nor by sword, nor by battle, by horses, nor by horsemen." These were the chief of the means to which men, in those times, looked for safety; and his professing people had fallen into the same error, and looked for safety to the strength of horses and men, even at the time that God was, by his prophet, assuring them that they could not succeed. For these and other aggravated sins the distinct national incorporation of the ten tribes was to be "taken utterly away." But Judah, though he too was to be taken away, was to be saved from his captivity. And to the question how? the words above form an answer. I do not understand the prophet to say that Judah was to be saved abso-

lutely without the use of any means; nor even that any of these means here negatived were not to form any link in the chain of causes leading to it: but that, whatever means should be employed, the safety of Judah was not to proceed from them; it should come visibly, and very conspicuously, from the Lord, who made heaven and earth. What means might be employed in the case, they should be only such as *He* had appointed for the purpose; and what success they might have in it, they should have *only* and *wholly* from Him. Concerning Cyrus, who was to be a chief and leading instrument in this salvation, the Lord says, Isa. xlv. 28: "That saith of Cyrus, he is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure: even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid." Chap. xlv. 1: "Thus saith the Lord to his *anointed*, to Cyrus," &c. The scope of this passage, plainly, is to assure Judah that his safety should never proceed from means of his own *choosing* and *appointing*, but from the Lord, whom he had forsaken. Man has, from the beginning of his fallen state, sought to be or to do somewhat in the scheme for his recovery. But it forms one of the most prominent designs of God in that scheme to cut him off from this very thing, and to shut him up to the alternative of a salvation in which the Sovereign God is *all in all*, or no salvation at all. The variety of man's expedients to break in upon this sovereign determination, and make room for the *thought* of the human heart, is endless; but he cannot possibly succeed. "For the loftiness of man *shall* be bowed down, and the haughtiness of men *shall* be made low, and the Lord *alone* shall be exalted in that day." Isa. ii. 11, 17.

The success of Christ himself could not be separated from his appointment by the Father to his work: were it a conceivable thing that he could have entered upon it without this appointment, success could not have followed. He would not have answered in one important respect to the description before given of him by the prophet, and the Jews would have been warranted in refusing him. But he *was anointed* and *sent*, and therefore he did succeed in "setting righteousness in the earth." And this made the sin of those who rejected him so great as it was. Both these things—his appointment and success—are set down in this connexion in several passages. Thus, Isa. xlii. 6: "I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light to the Gentiles; to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison-house." Again, chap. xlvi. 16—18: "And now the Lord God, and his Spirit, hath *sent* me. Thus saith the Lord, thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel: I am the Lord thy God which teacheth thee *to profit*, which leadeth thee by the way that thou shouldst go. O that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments! then had thy peace been as a river." Also chap. lxi. 1, 2, compared with Luke iv. 17, 18, and his subsequent ministry.

Success is the very end of calling and sending men; which, if it might be obtained without it, would be an impeachment of infinite wisdom. The gifts of Christ would have no peculiar excellence or dignity, (I mean his gifts *of office* as well as qualification,) nor would they be any peculiar proofs of his glorious fulness, or of his love to his church and care for her good. Yet it is by calling and qualifying men to act in his name, that he manifests all this of himself to his

church. And it is to the ministry of such only that the promise of certain success is annexed. "But unto every one of us is grace given according to the measure of the gift of Christ," says the Apostle, Eph. iv. 7. "And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers: *for the perfecting* of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." ver. 11—13.

The passage, Mat. xxviii. 19, 20, is conclusive on this point: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen." Nobody doubts that, in this promise of Christ, all the success that will ever follow preaching to the end of the world is included. To whom is it made? If any think that it is to others besides those to whom Christ has said, either immediately or through the courts of his house, "Go ye," it lies on them to show it. This promise is made to "*teaching all things whatsoever,*" &c. He who *knowingly* teaches more or less cannot claim it. He who teaches, being unsent, teaches one untruth at least. He who teaches, being deposed either for error or immoral conduct, teaches rebellion against Christ. Can *he* claim it? Can Christ be with *him*? No, verily; and therefore he cannot be blessed. Christ sent forth the seventy, and they returned and said, "Lord, even the devils are subject unto us through *thy name.*" Luke x. 17. And when the seven sons of Sceva (Acts xix. 13,) took this work in hand, they had worse than no success.

As I have not room in this sheet barely to touch all the texts that bear on this important point, I shall confine myself to one more. Jer. xxiii. 32: "Yet I sent them not, nor commanded them: therefore they shall not profit this people, saith the Lord." This is said concerning the false prophets. They were false on two grounds: first, in saying that they *were* prophets, when they were not. "I have not sent these prophets, yet they ran: I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied," ver. 21. They "*steal* my words every one from his neighbour—and use their tongues and say, He saith," ver. 30. Secondly, in prophesying false doctrine. "They prophesied in Baal," verse 13. And their doctrine brought forth its own fruits among the people abundantly, as may be seen by reading the chapter.

But it is carefully to be observed that the Lord connects the want of success with the first. "I *sent* them *not*, therefore they shall not profit," &c. There is nothing in this peculiar to any time or place. It is a universal truth. He who is not sent shall, on that account alone, not profit. It cannot be otherwise. There cannot be profiting without faith. This is another universal truth. But on what ground can faith rest when God hath *not spoken*? The man in preaching declares, in fact, that the Lord *sent* him to do so, and that he is delivering the Lord's message. If, in hearing him, you believe this, you believe what is false, which surely cannot profit. At the same time, unless this much be believed in the ordinance of preaching, it will be still impossible to profit by it. If, in answer to this,

it should be said that he speaks God's truth, I remark that he does not come honestly by it. It is theft or robbery, or both. How, then, can it profit, unless the Lord would become a partner with thieves. If the mere enunciation of truth were enough to ensure profit, the devil would have been at sundry times a profitable and successful preacher. What he said was, so far as the matter is concerned, a full and direct testimony to the truth. He said Jesus was "the Holy one of God," "the Son of God;" "that he had power to torment them, or bruise their head;" which was equivalent to saying that he was the promised seed of the woman.

Again, through the damsel at Philippi, he said, "These are the servants of the most high God, and show unto us the way of salvation." These things were most certain truths, and most seasonable for the time: but it was not for the glory of God that the proceeding of them from such lips should be blessed, and therefore they drew down only a rebuke. For they were not said from love to the truth or the souls of men, but from open rebellion against God. And wherein the preaching of such as are deposed for scandalous immoral conduct differs from this for the better, it is for those who can see to point it out.

Much more might be added, but enough has been said to lead them that are willing to be led, to the truth.

The unsent or deposed cannot be of saving benefit, unless God would countenance an encroachment on his own prerogative. If they were to be so blessed, the order for appointing and sending men would be rendered nugatory.

If there is no natural connexion between preaching and saving benefit, or if the end do not sanctify the means, or if God does not more regard the saving of sinners than his own honour, they cannot be blessed. The Scriptures in both Testaments annex the promise of success to appointment and mission, which these have not. And, finally, the Lord declares, in express and absolute terms, that those whom he has not sent shall not profit at all.

If your patience is not exhausted I will endeavour, if God will, to bring my answers to a close in my next. A. G.*

ART. V.—*Farther Remarks on Societyism.*

MR. EDITOR,—We are much gratified to see that Societyism is again presented, in the columns of the Monitor, for inspection. It is certainly an important question for consideration.

Having a perfect rule in God's word both for faith and practice, which not only tells us all things that ever we did, but all things we are to do, either by direct precepts or example, or legitimate inference, it behooves us, then, before we select means, in order to bring about any desired object, either social or moral, to see that it is sanctioned by God's word, in one of the ways above mentioned.

We had the honour and privilege, some time since, to give our views on this subject, through the pages of the Monitor. The ques-

* The signature was affixed to the preceding numbers by the editor, that to the present number by the writer himself. This accounts for the change.

tion being proposed, by a correspondent, for investigation, (see *Monitor*, vol. xiii. p. 384,) and no correspondent thinking proper to give his views on that subject, we were induced to show our opinion, hoping that it might induce some others, better qualified, to give it a fuller investigation. And having some manuscripts on that topic prepared, which had never appeared in public, when the queries respecting voluntary associations came to hand, we intended to send on our manuscript for publication, considering there was a call in Providence, as there had been so much backwardness in the writers of the *Monitor* on that question: Providential occurrences prevented us until the present. We give this as our apology, to a "Western Citizen," why we have at present interfered in this mooted question, which he has under consideration. It is by no means our intention (even had we it in our power,) to prevent him from giving his views farther. Our mite by no means supersedes the necessity of others to give of their abundance; and we have no inclination to pursue this subject any farther. As we do not want to occupy the pages of the *Monitor* by repeating what we have heretofore advanced, we respectfully refer the reader to vol. xiv. p. 153, and 396, and also to a communication by another author, in vol. xiv. p. 346. And, on the other side of the question, the reader will find an article, in vol. xiv. p. 281.

We will first endeavour a solution of the question proposed for investigation; namely, "Have we any warrant from the word of God to form voluntary associations, for the performance of social and moral duties, which lie within the appropriate sphere of those civil and ecclesiastical institutions that are of Divine appointment." First, we answer, that we have no authority to perform any duties, which appropriately and exclusively belong to another. For example: it would be wicked and absurd for any set of men, other than the church, to ordain and send out men into the world to preach the everlasting gospel to perishing sinners, or to administer the seals of the covenant, or to assume the disciplinary authority of the church; and it would be absurd for any set of men, not clothed with authority, to assume to do what was exclusively the business of the civil officer. It would be perfectly puerile for them to assume the duties which belong to the President of the United States; to issue a proclamation to convene the national legislature on any emergency, or enjoin obedience to the laws. It would be equally ludicrous, if not more so, for an individual not clothed with authority, as is the President of the United States, to issue such proclamations. Official duties cannot be performed by any but those who are clothed with the requisite authority. But there are other duties, that are common to all mankind, which we consider can be lawfully performed, either by individuals, or in an associated capacity; among which, are clothing the naked, and feeding the hungry, and raising funds to be appropriated to benevolent and philanthropic purposes.

As we only do part of our duty in a church in a political capacity, these duties hold a momentous stand in our moral code of ethics. Christ allures us to the performance of these by no less a reward than the possession of a kingdom, if they are the fruits of faith; and an awful and appalling penalty is annexed, for their non-performance. These are duties which are to be performed, and no especial rule laid down as to the particular manner of performing them. We know

we are not to select any mode of action inconsistent with Christian principles; but other duties, that are to be performed, in church or state, for which God has given us a special rule, are to be done in an associated capacity; and, reasoning from analogy, it would be presumable that these duties would be also performed acceptably to God, in a social capacity, for which he has not given us a specific rule of action. We are created social beings, and it is not good for us to be alone in any arduous enterprise of great magnitude.

We will now illustrate our sentiments by an example: namely, the parable of the good Samaritan. Suppose there had been ten or twenty men found in the deplorable situation in which that suffering individual is there represented. The Samaritan coming along, finds them in this distressed situation, finds that he is inadequate of himself to render the necessary assistance. He relates their tale of wo to some of the neighbouring community, as he considers it his duty to provoke all to good works; on hearing which, their sympathies are aroused, and a sufficient number go to the assistance of these suffering men, who must be removed to the inn for accommodation. That they may act with more efficiency, as they wish to do all things decently and in order, they appoint one of their number to preside, and knowing there will be necessary expenses incurred, they all contribute a portion for the general fund. They appoint one to act as purser, another is appointed to note down their proceedings on the way. Now this is an organized association. The appointment of these officers, in itself, is mere matter of form, and perfectly innocent, though they give great energy and efficiency to their enterprise, and no more of a breach of the rule laid down, than whether they would carry the wounded on horses or asses, though the Samaritan carried the wounded man on his own beast, those men might be so wounded, that they would have to be removed in some vehicle.

It would have been futile for him, to apply to either the ecclesiastical or civil authorities for assistance for those wounded and robbed men. The civil authorities, Gallio-like, would care for none of those things, they would be no judges of such matters, would drive them from the judgment-seat, would not even look at their petitions, they should not be "read nor debated,"—nay, these depredators had a license from them to commit their depredations, and it would be a breach of good faith, to do any thing for the relief of those wounded men. What a strict regard for veracity among thieves! It was equally in vain to apply to the ecclesiastical authorities, as the priest and Levite had already passed by on the other side, which augured bad for success with them; and more than that, there were of their number, that devoured widows' houses.—They were by no means governed by the principles contained in the law and in the prophets, supreme love to God, and evidencing that love, by doing unto their brethren of mankind, whatever they would wish done to them, in similar circumstances,—no, they bound burdens on others, they would not touch with one of their fingers. "They sell the righteous for silver, and the poor for a pair of shoes, that pant after the dust of the earth on the head of the poor," and could not be expected to sympathize with those robbed men: (we allow this to be applied to slavery in our country,) with some honourable exceptions as it respects the church. But it was not necessary to apply to civil or ecclesiastical authorities, as he had high authority to administer

relief himself, and to adopt the means requisite. "Go thou, and do likewise," is the command of our Lord. Nor would it be necessary to inquire into the religious creed of those men thus employed, whether they were Arminians, or Calvinists, or whether they had adopted a religious creed or not. Be this as it may, we are satisfied, they were impelled to this act of humanity by some motive,—the act, in itself, was pre-eminently good in its character, and the mode of performance was in perfect accordance with Christian principles, the law of God no way violated: where there is no law, there is no transgression. "There was a thing," saith the Lord, "for the performance of this labour of love;" and the means to effect this object to be devised by human prudence, not inconsistent with Christian principles. Though we are to hold no fellowship with the wicked in their unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them; yet notwithstanding we are to walk with them, as far as they walk aright. God has given an example of this in civil government, though civil government is so momentous a concern to mankind, both as it affects our civil and religious liberties, yet we are not prohibited from associating with the wicked in its administration.

The church is God's select family, where the unholy and profane are to be utterly excluded from any participation. But the apostle says, We must needs go out of the world, if we do not associate with the wicked. Wicked men have often subserved the interests of God, though their motives being carnal, they would at best obtain but a temporal reward: although they are unholy themselves, yet their touch does not pollute every thing they are engaged in, provided the action they are employed in is good. The sacred temple was no less glorious because that vile wretch Herod, most splendidly rebuilt and ornamented it. It was more glorious than Solomon's, not on account of its outward structure being more magnificent, but because the Divine Redeemer honoured it with his sacred presence. We could give many examples of wicked men, being the means of effecting much good; but let this suffice.

It may be said that these voluntary associations have no power to consummate their desired object. They have it in their power at least to call public attention to these suffering individuals, which means we will show in the sequel have been signally blessed. Females, as well as males, can help to hide this leaven of Divine truth, in the community, till the whole lump is leavened.

So much for the abstract question of voluntary associations. We are persuaded, if we are so happy as to make ourselves understood, that we have shown conclusively that their authority can be deduced from scripture by good and necessary consequence. To evince the practical utility of these associations, we will select the Anti-Slavery Society, which has for its object the abolition of slavery, and the elevation of our coloured population to that stand in creation which God designed they should occupy. As our authority for performing this labour of love, we refer you to the following portions of scripture, with many others of a similar character: Matthew vii. 12; Hebrews xiii. 3; James i. 27; Proverbs xxxi. 8, 9; Proverbs xxiv. 11, 12; and as it respects our duty to their oppressors, Leviticus xix. 17; Proverbs xxvii. 5, 6, and 1 Timothy v. 22.

(To be Continued.)

ART VI.—*Paucity of Candidates for the Holy Ministry.*

THE great Head and Founder of the Church had this subject in his mind, and urged it on the attention of his disciples, while he was on earth. His commandment on this point, which is as obligatory now as it ever was, is, "Pray ye the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth labourers into his harvest." It is evident, from these words, that the Lord of the harvest is able to supply the deficiency of labourers; and that He will only do it in answer to prayer. Christ could have offered a prevailing prayer for this gift, but no: Christians must pray: "*Pray ye.*" He will be inquired of for this blessing, that he may do it for us. When there is a great deficiency of faithful labourers, does it not suggest a reason for an inquiry, whether this command has been obeyed? In some cases, we cannot be certain that what we ask is agreeable to the mind of God; but here, all room for doubt is removed. It is not often that Christ, in exhorting his disciples to the duty of prayer, informed them particularly what to pray for; but, in this case, he puts words, as it were, into their mouths: "Pray ye the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth labourers into his harvest." It cannot be, then, that He would omit to answer a prayer thus expressly dictated by himself. If there be a want of labourers, the neglect must be in the church. The blessing has not been asked with due importunity and perseverance.

Formerly, pious parents dedicated their children to sacred service from their birth, and were incessant in their petitions, at a throne of grace, for ministerial grace and gifts for their devoted sons; and such prayers God has heard and answered, in thousands of instances. But where now do we find the consecrated Samuels, growing up under the light of the sanctuary? Where are the Hannahs, to wrestle with God in public and private, until they obtain their hearts' desire? This ought to be a weighty care with every church of Christ. The church cannot exist without a ministry; and where are we to look for candidates for the ministry but in the churches? Can that church have done its duty, in which few or no candidates for the sacred office have been reared up? Or what judgment must be formed of those large and flourishing churches, with their hundreds of communicants, which once had a succession of men in training for the harvest, but now have none? Perhaps it will startle some of our good people to hear it alleged as a fault, that particular churches are rearing no candidates for the ministry. But I will maintain it. There must be a grievous fault somewhere, in relation to this important concern; and as it is a matter of common duty, where there has been a continual barrenness, there must have been a want of due culture.

Every church, rich in members, as well as worldly substance, which has no young men in a course of training, ought to appoint a day of fasting and humiliation, to inquire into this matter, and beg of God not to leave them like a barren tree, in his vineyard. You say that you contribute every year to the education fund. This is well; but it is not all, nor the half of your duty on this subject. You must furnish men, as well as money; and the men are by far the most important part of the means. Without suitable men, money in this concern is worthless. You must bring forth pious and promising

men. Do you ask how you can accomplish this? I answer as before, "Pray ye the Lord of the harvest." Do not forget to pray this prayer, as you have too often done. Think much of it, and lay it before God in secret, in your families, and in the church. And be not contented until you receive this blessing of the ascended Lord, to be the honoured instrument of furnishing the harvest field with at least one labourer. There are a few churches in our land, which can number more than one devoted missionary in the foreign field. The writer knows a church of moderate size and little wealth, in a remote situation, which, within his recollection, has furnished five or six faithful men for the work of the ministry, the bones of one of whom lie among the heathen. He could designate another place, where at least a dozen of ministers have proceeded from one church, and some of them, men of eminence. But alas! the glory is departed; for years past, this fruitful spot has been barren, in this respect. An able and excellent minister in Virginia was snatched away from his family without a moment's warning. His children, mostly sons, were then small—now, *five* of them are labouring in the field; and possibly the sixth may enter. Do you not suppose that this was in answer to the prayers of the father?

Some people say, that there is no real deficiency, or we should not have so many unemployed ministers. It may be admitted, that if the sacred office be viewed as a secular trade, by which men may make a comfortable living, the profession is already overstocked. At any rate it is overstocked with men who will not work—or will only work where they can find every thing ready prepared to their hand. The church wants no *cumberers* of the ground; but *labourers*—not men who wish to enter on and enjoy the fruits of other men's labours, but *working men*, willing to break up the fallow ground, and ambitious to preach the Gospel even where Christ has not been named. No class of educated men are more to be pitied, than those clergymen who are not occupied with the proper business of their profession. Although they may grow rich (though Providence commonly thwarts their schemes and disappoints their hopes) they are not to be envied. In fact, they lose all respectability in the eyes of the world. What would be unnoticed in another, public opinion will not tolerate in them. But to bring up such, as a proof that there are supernumerary ministers, is as absurd as to plead, that reapers are not wanted for a great and ripe harvest, because many idle loungers, or busy triflers may be found in the country. The Lord has spoken it, "The harvest is great and the labourers few, *Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that He would send forth labourers into the harvest.*"—*Dr. Alexander.*

ART. VII.—*Sanguinary and infuriated Character of Idolatry.*

WE find the following description in the report of Rev. J. Thomas, a missionary to India, published by the London Missionary Register. This morning, on returning from my ride, I saw idolatry in one of its most horrible forms. The sun had just risen, and I was hurrying home. On the side of the road stood a devil or demon-temple;

and I saw at some distance a crowd of people assembled around it. When I came up to the place, I stopped and turned aside to see what they were doing. There were several men and women apparently objects of attention beyond the rest. One old woman at once drew my attention; and I shall never forget her figure, and the fury-like air and expression of her countenance. She was tall, and more than ordinarily masculine in appearance, and was smeared with ashes and saffron-water: her long black hair hung dishevelled down her cheeks, and her motions indicated a state of mind in the highest degree frantic. While she stood thus in the centre, a sheep was brought and laid at her feet: she looked wild, muttered her oracles, and, to my surprise, the neck of the sheep was nearly severed with one stroke of a large knife. Four men held the animal by its legs; and instantly, on the gash being made, the sheep was lifted from the ground, and the fiendish-looking wretched old woman pressed her mouth and face between the severed head and body of the sheep, and drank its blood warm, as it flowed. I felt quite stupified for a moment, and saw the condition of these wretched people in a point of view which I never had any conception of before. How indescribably horrible is idolatry when seen in its real character! I thought if the people of God knew the real state of things, they would never cease to pray and weep until these dark places of the earth, which are so full of the habitations of cruelty, were enlightened. While I waited overwhelmed with what I saw, and scarcely knowing whether to go or stay, another sheep was brought, and laid on its back on the ground: it was slain like the one before, and the very same old woman drank its blood! As soon as she had done so, a chatty of saffron-water was dashed on her face. Her face to the eyes, her neck, and breast, were smeared with blood, which also clotted in her loose hair. She reeled to and fro, and seemed to have every muscle of the body in action. The accompaniment of all this was the tom-toms and the harsh noise of a species of clarinet used by the natives, interrupted occasionally by the wild shouts of the crowd. I turned away; but turned back again, and told them of the sin they were committing against God. All they had to plead was, the custom of their forefathers. While I was talking to some of the men, the crowd left the demon temple in procession. In this there were two children, who had been devoted to the demon, or were the subjects of some vow, led by strings fastened in the skin of their sides: before them the men danced, as if they were raging with madness: and I observed the old woman carrying on her bare head a copper chatty, full of charcoal, with oil, burning fiercely. This struck me with surprise: and to-day, on making farther inquiries, I have been told that no one who is not possessed with the demon can even touch it without being hurt; and that to dance with the burning chatty in the hand, and carry it on the head, is a necessary proof of demoniacal possession. The people regard with great reverence the "possessed," as they consider them—whether they are really so or not is a question I will not enter upon—and they are saluted with all the respect which would be paid to a priest! I learnt, farther, that the blood is offered, not to the woman, but to the evil spirit by which she is supposed to be possessed. The people, one after another, men and women, worship before the devil-dancer; and to each of them some oracles are delivered, in hurried broken sentences.

The following description is most exact :—

—Aloud she cries,
 This is the time; inquire your destinies!
 He comes! behold the god! Thus while she said,
 (And shiv'ring on the sacred entry staid,)
 Her color changed; her face was not the same;
 And hollow groans from her deep spirit came;
 Her hair stood up; convulsive rage possessed
 Her trembling limbs, and heav'd her lab'ring breast.

Æneid, Book IV.

ART. VIII.—*A Letter of Calvin, written just Three Hundred Years ago, on the Treatment due to Ministers.*

IN the year 1538, Calvin was banished by the Senate of Geneva, for his unyielding fidelity in church discipline. Other preachers, more pliant, were appointed, but the pious members of the church were unwilling to receive them. Calvin, then in Strasburg, remonstrated with his friends in the following letter, bearing date of June 25, 1539 :

“First of all, lay aside all personal feeling, and consider the dignity of the office of those to whom God has committed the promulgation of his word. He not only requires us to listen with fear and trembling when his word is proclaimed, but to honour and respect his ministers, whom he has commissioned as his ambassadors, and whom he would have us recognise as *his angels*. If these suggestions meet your views, you will adopt it as a fixed principle, that those whose office it is to preach the gospel to you, and who have the care of your souls, are to be received as holding a parental relation to you, and are to be honoured on account of the office divinely conferred upon them.

It is not my design to take from you the right which God has given to you, and to all his people, the right of subjecting every preacher to an examination, in order to distinguish between the true and the false, and to be able to exclude those who, under the appearance of shepherds, are but prowling wolves. I only desire that you should conduct in a Christian manner towards such as do, in some good measure, fill the place of preachers; and consider rather what you owe to them, than what they owe to you. I conclude that we ought to be satisfied that the minister discharges his duties, and I would be far from introducing any kind of despotism into the church. But as I hear that our brethren, who are your appointed preachers, do preach the gospel, I see not how you can justify yourselves before God in disregarding or rejecting them.

If you hear one and another say, “I dislike this thing in their preaching, and that thing in their manners,” I beg you, in Christ’s name, to consider the nature of this procedurc. For, if the law of love requires of us that we do not censure our neighbour for slight causes, but that we be as mild and as favourable as possible in our judgment, how much more ought we to guard against trifling with the character of those who are set over us in the Lord! If there be any thing exceptionable in their deportment, (of which I am not able to judge,) you should remember that there is no person in the world who has not his faults.

I exhort and entreat you, therefore, that you turn away your thoughts from these *men*, and direct them to your Redeemer, and reflect upon his commands. If you contend with your ministers so that bickerings and criminations ensue, as I hear, their office, which should be honoured, and should honour Christ, is disgraced. Beware lest ye contend against God, while you think you are only disregarding man. Do not imagine that it is a small thing to create feuds and parties in a church: it is a sin of such magnitude, that we ought to shudder at the thought.

Finally, if you regard me as a brother, if the bond of brotherly love unites us, be entreated not to reject these preachers, whose appointment I myself have recognised, but receive them to your own profiting and edification.—*Christian Watchman*.

ART. IX.—*Survey of Protestant Missions.*

1. **THERE** is a general increase in the number of missionaries. Without giving a particular statement of their distribution, it is gratifying thus to observe that there is no falling off in the missionary zeal of the church, but, on the whole, a decided increase, taking the means employed as an index of the degree of interest which is felt for the conversion of the heathen.

2. All the principal branches of the church of Christ are engaged, more or less extensively, in the support of missionary efforts. These, efforts are commonly made by different bodies of Christians, through such organizations as they consider best to accord with their forms of doctrine and church order. This minor difference seems to us lawful and even expedient, as thereby Christians communicate the blessings of the gospel to others according to their own enjoyment of them; while it may, and we trust it does, consist perfectly with respect and Christian love for those who prefer a different mode of proceeding. But the general agreement of all the faithful in the one object of spreading the knowledge of Christ throughout the world, is worthy of devout and heartfelt gratitude. It is, indeed, a strong proof that the missionary cause is the cause of God. It is not to be supposed that the great mass of intelligent and humble Christians should be left, either to a gross mistake about a plain subject of duty, or on the other hand to an uncalled for and fanatical enthusiasm.

3. There is a substantial agreement among missionary institutions and missionaries, as to the mode or plan of conducting Christian missions. Diversities doubtless exist, both in practice and in opinion. Some bestow a larger amount of time and labour on one branch of missionary duty than on another branch. Some limit their efforts to the direct preaching of the gospel; others give their labour chiefly to schools; some missionaries employ much of their time in translations.

4. Opposition must be looked for. The Prince of the power of the air will not resign his sway over the minds of men without a mighty struggle; nor will the natural heart of man yield to the power of true religion unless controlled by divine grace; and if the restraints of that grace be merely withheld, its enmity to the pure doctrines of the gospel will soon be displayed in acts of violence

against the followers of the cross. Brahmins and priests, and all official teachers of false and corrupt religions, will be found in strong array against this sacred cause. Hence the continued persecution of Christians in Madagascar, and the bitter opposition of the Greek, Armenian, and Roman ecclesiastics to all Protestant missionary efforts. There is reason to believe that the entire power of Rome will be directed, sternly and openly, or secretly and with deception, as may best serve the end in view, to the embarrassment and ruin of Protestant missions. The influence of Roman priests was exercised in the recent expulsion of the British Episcopal missionaries from Abyssinia; in the Sandwich and Society Islands, where their services were surely little needed, Roman priests have been stationed by the disgraceful interposition of French armed vessels; in India their number is largely increasing; in farther India and China, the Roman missions make a larger and more expensive establishment than the united missions of all the Protestant churches in those countries. But God will protect the truth, and He will make the cause of truth finally to triumph.

5. There has been abundant evidence during the last year of God's blessing on the missionary labours of His servants. We refer now particularly to that kind of evidence, which results from the hopeful conversion of persons to a sincere belief in our holy religion, and the practical reception of its truths in the heart. Not only have there been single instances at many stations of heathens thus embracing Christianity, but in connexion with some missions large numbers have been induced to place their confidence in the Lord Jesus, and to devote themselves to his service. Times of almost unprecedented general interest in religious things have been witnessed among the Druzes of Western Asia, the Batlapis and the Griquas of South Africa, the Hindus at Kishnagur in the district of Burdwan, and the inhabitants of the Sandwich, New Zealand, and Friendly Islands in the Pacific.

6. The increasing spirit of inquiry among the Jews should not be overlooked. It is one of the signs of these times. Contemporaneous with this is the deeper interest which Christians are beginning to feel in their conversion. The British Episcopal Church has taken the lead in those efforts; the Presbyterian Church of Scotland has recently instituted inquiries in order to engaging in this good work.

7. While it is a matter of sincere thankfulness that so many places, and places of such influence, are occupied as mission stations, it should not be forgotten that the missionary force among heathen nations ought to be greatly increased. In India the present is a critical time, as many, especially of the more influential classes, are in a transition state, passing from a belief in idol gods to something else—it may be to atheism or skepticism, it may be to error under a Christian name; through the blessing of God on the efforts of his people, it may be to the true knowledge of Christ Jesus. But we need not go farther into particulars. "The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few. Pray ye, therefore, the Lord of the harvest that He will send forth labourers into his harvest."—*Foreign Missionary Chronicle*.

ART. X.—*Extract of a Letter from one of the Editors of the Episcopal Recorder, travelling in Europe.*

OXFORD, Sept. 16th, 1839.

OUR second Sunday in England was spent in Oxford, without the opportunity, however, of hearing any of the official preachers in the great University, the season of vacation allowing them all to be absent. We did hear, however, but rather unexpectedly, a clergyman, who, with several others, has become specially notorious in the Church of England, I mean the Rev. J. H. Newman, one of the editors of the famous "Tracts for the Times," or Oxford Tracts as they are commonly called. Having no knowledge whatever of the personal appearance of Mr. Newman, and not being assured that he was to be the preacher on that occasion, we were not certified that we were listening to one of the editors of the famous publications referred to, until the discourse was nearly finished. The subject was the delusive grounds upon which men rest their souls' peace, (Ezekiel xiii. 10.)—"They have seduced my people, saying, Peace, and there was no peace." The discourse was directed chiefly against the notion that sin will not be punished hereafter, and some such line of argument pursued as that of the author of the "Analogy of Religion." If one should notice the sermon as defective in the first part, its negative character might be observed. It stated nothing positively evangelical. The arguments were striking and fitted to awaken serious reflections in unawakened minds. I thought, however, it was not specially adapted to the mass of the congregation, who seemed to be a plain people, not trained to profound argument. There were some exceptions, no doubt. But the greater part, (the whole assembly was small,) we judged to be of persons not from the University. We were told, however, that Mr. Newman's notoriety and the novelty of his doctrines induce many of the students to hear him in term time. After the preacher had stated what are the grounds on which men are seductively led to say, "Peace, when there is no peace," he made no delay in speaking his own sentiments as to the proper ground of peace with God. And then we had full demonstration that the person who stood before us could be none other than an author or a disciple of the Tracts of the Times. Mr. Newman himself was the preacher. He certainly did not use doubtful words, but clearly and verbatim affirmed our justification to be "by baptism and good works." He repudiated the doctrine that a man is justified upon his believing, simply believing in Christ. He held that an interest in the virtue of the atonement is needful, but that this interest was to be assured "by means of baptism and good works." His last sentence was, "We are justified in the beginning of our lives by baptism, and shall be judged and justified in the last day" (not according to, but) "by our good works." The time has been when clergymen of the Church of England could affirm the doctrine of justification by works without being thought singular, because the standard of evangelical religion was then very low. But an open and unequivocal avowal of it in a pulpit of the established church was hardly to be expected at this day. Many who do not hold the doctrine of justification by faith in the proper sense, that sense which makes faith the simple instrument of justification, or "the hand by which the believer layeth hold on Christ,"

as King Edward's Catechism has it, are yet unwilling to affirm that we are justified by works, because such language is in open hostility to the entire phraseology of all the articles and homilies of the church which treat of the subject, and what is of more importance, to that of St. Paul's epistles. I knew in general what are the doctrines advocated by the Oxford Tracts, but I was hardly prepared to hear, even from one of the editors, such language as that of the discourse to which I allude. The preacher did not merely let fall some words which might imply that he held opinions at variance with the doctrines of the Articles and Homilies, and of the apostles, but expressed himself in set and meditated phrase, and endeavoured to shut out all misunderstanding of his meaning. Were Mr. Newman's opinions those of an individual merely, and confined to the locality of his own parish, it would not be worth while to notice them in a publication on the other side of the Atlantic. But they are the opinions of men who have personal and official influence in the Church of England, and are put forth as the only true doctrines of the Church Catholic. Besides they are likely to become, if they have not already become, the doctrine of a very considerable class of persons in the church. The manner in which they are propagated and received, and the legitimate results of those doctrines themselves, are likely to be of very serious moment to the general interests of religion in this country. The Church of England at this time is ill able to bear the effects of such a division of sentiment within itself as that which grows out of the publication of the Tracts of the Times. It is attacked by ecclesiastical and political dissenters of various classes; the Church of Rome is watching for every door of advance upon the ground from which she was driven by the reformation, and infidels, Atheists, and Socialists are armed against the church establishment. In these circumstances the Oxford Tracts are raising up a controversy in the pale of the church itself which is fitted to convulse the whole fabric. The doctrines of those Tracts will of course be strenuously resisted by some of the best friends of the church. There are many, very many in the Church of England, who do not think that Cranmer and Latimer, and their fellow martyrs, lifted up the voice of remonstrance against the Church of Rome "without a cause," and laid down their lives in vain. The doctrines of the gospel which were settled at the reformation as the tenets of the Protestant Church of this country are the inheritance of our times at the cost of many a martyr's testimony, and even though the day should come when authority would again overbear them, there will be found witnesses to testify for those precious truths which are needful for the peace of every soul groaning under a burden of sin.

J. M.

[From the Presbyterian.]

ART. XI.—*Mode of Baptism.*

MR. EDITOR,—In your paper of the 29th ultimo, I find an article taken from the Protestant and Herald, with which I was much pleased. The examination of the passages of scripture, where the ordinance of baptism is referred to, were to my mind, and, I should

judge, to the mind of every serious inquirer after truth, perfectly satisfactory, if you except *one*, and that is the case of the eunuch. The writer of the article says, "There is no evidence that it (the baptism of the eunuch,) was done by immersion." Again, he remarks, "there is not on record a solitary instance, if *we except that of the eunuch*, in which the account does not strongly favour the doctrine of pouring or sprinkling. Now, it seems to me, Mr. Editor, that, of all the cases mentioned in the Bible, there is not one, where the whole circumstance more strongly favours the administration of the ordinance of baptism by pouring or *sprinkling* than that of the baptism of the eunuch. Let us look at the case, as we have it in the 8th chapter of the Acts. It appears that the eunuch was returning home from Jerusalem, whither he had been on a visit, and where, doubtless, he had heard much of Jesus of Nazareth. That, by some means, he had secured a portion of the Prophet Isaiah's writings, and was diligently studying the prophecy relative to our Saviour. That Philip embraced the opportunity of aiding this inquirer after truth; that the Spirit had turned the mind of the eunuch to the 53d chapter of Isaiah, or rather to that portion of truth found in the close of the 52d and continued in the 53d chapter of Isaiah; (for I need scarcely inform your readers that, in the days of the eunuch, the Bible was not laid off in chapters and verses;) that Philip, like a true evangelist, preached to him, Jesus, from "the same scripture." And, in opening up the subject, the eunuch suggested the propriety of his baptism. Now, what in that scripture led to the subject of baptism? I cannot find any thing there which would suggest to the mind of the eunuch this subject, except it be the first clause of the 15th verse in the 52d chapter: "So shall he *sprinkle* many nations." *Who* sprinkle many nations? and *when* and *how*? why, Jesus. Thus Philip taught, and thus all, who are commissioned to preach the Gospel and baptize, should teach. But how would the eunuch have been amazed, if, with this scripture before him, and Philip acting as expositor, when they came to the water, Philip had *plunged* him under the stream, in fulfilment of that scripture: "So shall he *sprinkle* many nations!!!"

PRESBUTEROS.

ART. XII.—*Have me excused.*

DR. FRANKLIN is said to have had a servant, who was never in the wrong. At length the doctor's patience was exhausted, and he said, "My friend you and I must part. I never knew a man who was good at making excuses, good at any thing else." And who that has been conversant with the development of men's minds in regard to religious duties, will not see the propriety of the doctor's remark. There are those who cannot be approached in the way of enforcing any serious religious obligation, but they are prepared for you. They are guarded as by a flaming sword that turns every way, and effectually prevents every successful assault. It is a matter of melancholy curiosity to witness the sagacity and skill with which almost every form of religious obligation is prevented from gaining any hold upon the heart. A man is angry; but it is honest and rational indignation at what is wrong. He is covetous; but it is that he may

aid more worthy objects than any he has yet seen. He is extravagant; but his station in life requires it. He is slothful; but active exertion would ruin his health. He neglects his family; but some noble enterprise of science or philanthropy calls him away. So every self-denying duty of religion, in its turn, knocks in vain at the door of his heart. He must be excused.

Here is a constant process of self-deception. The man who is armed at every point with an excuse, is the very man who will toss all these pretences to the winds wherever his own heart is deeply interested. He who cannot speak of Christ to a little circle of friends, or to a neighbour, through diffidence and modesty, can utter himself boldly and with power when any worldly interest presses him. He who cannot pray because he has no gift, can engage in any of the forms of social intercourse with facility and delight.

The self-excuser is a self-deceiver. He is inflicting injury on his own soul by all his attempts to evade the transitory inconvenience which religious duty imposes. He weakens his own moral power. He reduces himself to a miserable impotency in the church of God, if unhappily he is connected with it. If he is good at excuses he is "good for nothing else."—*Boston Recorder*.

ART. XIII.—*Pious Sayings.*

THE DAY OF JUDGMENT.

ALL the senates that ever were convened, and all the assemblies that ever met upon business or pleasure; all the armies that ever were conducted into the field, and all the leaders who conducted them; in a word all the men and women that shall have lived, from the first pair to their last born son and daughter, are to appear together, and to take their respective trials at the day of the great assize. High and low, rich and poor, learned and unlearned, will then be distinguished only by their virtues and vices; so that the whole world shall perceive and acknowledge that "God is no respecter of persons." The injured virgin, the afflicted widow, and the oppressed orphan shall see those, face to face, who have spoiled them of their innocence, their reputation, or their substance. There men shall meet all those who have seduced them, or whom they have seduced into the ways of sin; and all those who they have directed and encouraged to proceed in the paths of righteousness. From the former they shall turn away with shame and fear; the latter they shall behold with joy and rejoicing. There they shall view the wisdom of religion in the persons of the religious, and wonder why they did not see it before, and give themselves up to the study of it; there they shall clearly behold the folly of irreligion in the persons of the wicked, and be astonished at their insensibility in following so hard after it. Amidst all this unimaginable multitude, there shall not be one idle and unconcerned spectator; not one shall have leisure to trouble himself with the affairs of his neighbour. Every man will have a cause to be heard, and how will he be straitened until it be determined!—*Bishop Horne*.

"Christ's sheep are not to be debased into the state of animals so called. They are of the same species with their shepherds, under Christ. They have not only eyes but understandings of their own;

and the directions of the chief Shepherd, the great Shepherd of their souls, lie open to them in writing. The assistance, and advice, and warning of the shepherds under Christ, may be of great use to them in many cases, but they are to be led, and not driven. They are to be led to the food prepared for them by Christ, and not driven to rank and unwholesome weeds instead of it. The greatest respect he ought to pay them, and therefore the only true regard due to them, is to compare their instructions with the doctrines of Christ, and either to receive or reject them, as they are agreeable or disagreeable to his word. Without this comparison of men's doctrines with the Divine rule, he may be of such or such a particular denomination or Church, but he is not, in that neglect, truly nor uniformly a Christian, because he forgets his close relationship to his only Lord and Master. It would be a deplorable consideration, indeed, if the great and important points of Christianity, those upon which men's eternal salvation depends, could not be judged of without learning, or were to be determined for men, not by their own capacities, but by the decision of others called learned men, who are constantly differing and wrangling with one another."—*Bishop Horsley*.

"Little sins are pioneers to hell. The backslider begins with what he foolishly considers trifling with little sins. There are no little sins: there was a time when all the evil that has existed in the world was comprehended in one sinful thought of our first parent; and all the evil now is the numerous progeny of one little sin."—*Howels*.

"Never will I admit that our religion has in it any secret doctrine from the hearing of which the illiterate laity are to be excluded. The notion of the incompetence of the common people to understand the whole of the revealed doctrines is false and abominable. It is the very principle upon which the sacred text was, for so many ages, kept under the lock and key of the dead languages."—*Bishop Horsley*.

ART. XIV.—*Trial of Rev. J. Breckenridge for an alleged Libel.*

THE following is the paragraph which has produced so much excitement:

"The County Almshouse has been converted, not only into a papal mass house, but into a papal prison. An aged German Catholic, in the western end of Baltimore, whose wife was in the almshouse, became uneasy about his soul, and asked for Protestant instruction. His priest heard of it; told him his wife was dead; sent him to the almshouse to see about her burial; and wrote a line to the *papal keeper*, lately put over the institution, that the man was mad, and must be confined! He was confined, till it was, by mere accident, heard of by some Protestants, and the man rescued.

"There is a great excitement about the matter, which we are assured is as stated above. We hope to get a full statement of the particulars. What have the priests and medical faculty to say to this case? Is it a '*perfect maniac*,' or only *mono-maniac*?"

It seems that Mr. James L. Maguire is the *papal keeper* alluded to, who procured the indictment against Mr. Breckenridge, and his

arrest, in the name of the state, as a common felon. He is charged with nothing except being a *papist*, and yet avowed himself to be such on the trial. The trial occupied the court more than a week: the jury were unable to agree—two for conviction, ten for acquittal. The counsel for the prosecution then saw fit to enter a *nolle prosequi*, and thus terminated the farce. For it can be called nothing else. But it will do good. It will convince some, at least, that *Romanism* is naturally, and necessarily, the indomitable enemy of civil and religious liberty; and that it still cherishes towards Protestants the same spirit which gave birth to the Spanish Inquisition, deluged France with innocent blood, and lighted up the fires of Smithfield. It only wants the power.

ART. XV.—*The Theatre.*

"BOOTH is said, in several of his recent exhibitions, to have surpassed even the best personations of his palmiest days. His elocution is extremely beautiful, in spite of deficiencies of voice; and he reads with the author throughout the character. How deeply to be regretted, that he should 'put an enemy into his mouth to steal away his brains.' Unless he alter his course, his career will be speedily brought to a close.

"James Wills, the comedian, recently committed suicide at Natchez."

The above notices are both copied from one paper. They illustrate the *happy* condition of those gifted persons, who resort to the stage merely to "raise the genius and mend the heart" of their countrymen. What though they live in debauchery, profanity, and drunkenness; die in an almshouse, or lunatic asylum, or by their own hands, and plunge quickly into hell, where the "smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever;" other men do the same thing, especially many of their devoted patrons, whose hearts have been *mended*. What though the word of God denounces awful threatenings upon them, the multitude applaud, and the public press cries *bravo*, and liberal Christians echo the syren song; and even some Christian ministers have, as authors, aided their benevolent design to *improve* the morals of mankind. What though many hundreds of precious youth are annually immolated upon the altar of licentiousness, it is their own fault: they refused to have their hearts *mended*; they went beyond our instructions; we only intended they should become *moderately* licentious. What though the earnings of young men, which should be husbanded with sedulous care, in order to commence, in due time, the business of life in their respective callings, are squandered upon us; yet this is counterbalanced by the *free* admission of a certain class of persons, for the convenience of country merchants, and other strangers, who may chance to visit us, which makes our city a desirable place of resort.

But we have no heart to pursue this subject any farther. Thoughts of the broken hearts, and crushed hopes, of many a doting parent, make us sad. Eternity, only, can unfold all the secrets of that accursed synagogue of Satan, the play-house. Eternity, only, can disclose the number of immortal spirits that have fallen victims to this devouring monster. But, for "all the kingdoms of the world, and all their glory," I would not incur the tremendous responsibility of those conductors of public journals, who are its willing and constant panders.

ART. XVI.—*Ancient Christianity.*

ANCIENT CHRISTIANITY, AND THE DOCTRINES OF THE OXFORD TRACTS, by Isaac Taylor, Author of *Spiritual Despotism, &c.*, Philadelphia. Herman Hooker, Chestnut Street, 1840.

Our readers are aware that the Church of England has been agitated for several years past, by a controversy arising from certain publications called *Tracts for the*

Times, by members of the University of Oxford. These tracts began to be issued about six years ago, and from that time to the present, these members of the University of Oxford have been filling the world with the noise of their writings. Treatise after treatise has started from their teeming minds, upon all branches of doctrinal, ritual, and practical Christianity, evincing extensive erudition, profound research, and a show of piety, until their discussions have touched upon almost all the important topics that agitate the religious world. There is another and most remarkable feature to be noticed in this singular movement,—namely, the strange infatuation which possesses the Oxford Tract writers in regard to the rites and external forms of religion. Their leading design evidently is, to bring the Church back to the doctrines, forms, and practices of the Ante-Nicene period,—a period, indeed, which a portion of the Christian world has been too much accustomed to contemplate with reverence, as the most highly favoured and spiritual age of the Church. The blaze of glory which surrounds the names of the martyrs has dazzled our eyes, and prevented us from scrutinizing closely their religious principles, and those of the times in which they lived. “The primitive Church” and “primitive Christianity” are phrases which suggest at once to the mind all that is substantial and glorious in the religion of Jesus Christ. But we have gone too far in our indiscriminate admiration of early Christianity. It was well enough perhaps to eulogize the Ante-Nicene Fathers, when we were not called upon to admit all their superstitions and absurdities;—but now that the most distinguished prelates of the Church of England are setting forth these very superstitions, and arraying these very absurdities, in the fairest garb with which eloquence and erudition can invest them, it is high time to stop and inquire into the true state of the case. So at least, it seems, thought the author of *Spiritual Despotism*; and the volume before us, clearly shows that he has thought and studied to some purpose. One object of Mr. Taylor in this work, is to point out the errors of the Ante-Nicene Fathers in regard to the formal and ritual elements of Christianity, and to show the effect of these errors upon their theology. In pursuing his investigation into the moral and spiritual condition of the ancient church, the author, instead of “carrying forward a multifarious inquiry concerning twenty topics of early opinion and practice, selects in this first instance, a particular topic, clearing a path right onward to the highest antiquity.” This topic is found in the ancient and universal opinion entertained in the Christian Church, concerning the merits and spiritual efficacy of celibacy, and especially of uncontaminated virginity. Mr. Taylor shows that the celibate was a principal element of ancient Christianity, and inseparable from the system;—that it corrupted the notions of the fathers in regard to the Divine nature;—that it vitiated the notions entertained of the scheme of salvation; and, in fact, that the entire quality of the Nicene Theology was changed by this corrupting element. The results of a careful investigation into the general value of Nicene Christianity afford sufficient reasons for looking with jealousy, and even suspicion, upon any attempt to lead the modern Church back to the spirit and practice of former times. Some of the opponents of the Oxford Tract writers have charged them with a bias towards Romanism, and they have repelled the charge with considerable success; but Mr. Taylor affirms, fearlessly, and indeed his researches warrant the affirmation, that the period to which his investigations were chiefly directed, contained nearly all the elements of the Romish Superstition.

But we are dwelling too long upon this book. We do not hesitate to pronounce it a masterly production, although it is marked by the errors of style and extravagances of taste, which have disfigured all the writings of Mr. Taylor. We have yet to see the effect which this work of his will have upon the existing controversy,—but we certainly believe he has destroyed the Oxford Tract writers with their own weapons.—*Pearl and Repository*.

ART. XVII.—*Grammar of the Greek Language.*

A GRAMMAR OF THE IDIOMS OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, by Dr. Geo. Benedict Winer, Professor of Theology in the University of Leipsic. Philadelphia, Herman Hooker, Chestnut Street, 1840.

The translators of this work, (Messrs. J. H. Agnew and O. G. Ebbecke) remark in their preface, with great truth, that it is the result of the most laborious investigation, and the most extensive research. The recommendations that accompany the Grammar are from high sources, and carry with them very great authority;—and our own examination of the work has been sufficient to produce in our minds a cordial coincidence with these opinions of better and wiser men. It may, indeed, be objected to Dr. Winer's book, that it is not as systematic as the nature of the subject demands; but as it is, it forms a great store-house of philological facts and criticisms which the student of the Greek New Testament cannot value too highly.

And although a slight tinge of rationalism may be detected in some of the interpretations, the author has generally avoided that rock on which the German Theologians split. We cordially recommend it, being fully satisfied that it will be practically useful to all who will employ it carefully and judiciously as a book of reference, in studying the New Testament.—*Pearl and Repository*.

ART. XVIII.—*To Correspondents.*

“J. W.” and “Aspasio” in our next. Some other valuable favours of correspondents are necessarily deferred till the commencement of the next volume.

We solicit attention to the remarks of “A. G.” His argument appears to us altogether conclusive. And, if conclusive, its seasonableness will be generally conceded.

Our unknown correspondent, “Hesperus,” is welcome to a place. His article possesses the charms of modesty, good sense, and good writing. The observant reader will perceive that the advocates of voluntary associations have, as yet, the best of the argument. We freely acknowledge ourselves instructed by all the writers on that side of the question. We intend to offer a few more points for consideration in the next number, and then, so far as we are personally concerned, give them undisturbed possession of the field.

ART. XIX.—*Hope.*

BY THE LATE DIVINE BETHUNE.

“I ask'd the charmer, HOPE, to stay
And chase my hov'ring fears away;
She faintly smil'd, and bade me show
Where Hope could rest her foot below.

I look'd for strength to build her seat,
Uprightness to uphold her feet,
My mind display'd her utmost stores,
And nature marshalled all her powers.

When these the heav'nly charmer eyed,
She ceas'd to smile, and quick replied,
'On creature powers Hope cannot rest,
Nor build on sin her airy nest.

'Astray from God, no heavenly guest
Can lodge in mortal sinner's breast;
They breathe a pure celestial air,
And love the Lord who plac'd them
there.'

Soon as I heard this dread reply,
I mourn'd for sin with weeping eye;
Hope turned from her suspended flight,
And thus her soothing words invite.

'One home for me earth can supply;
There came the tenants of the sky

To look, admiring, on the tree
Where Jesus bled, to set man free.

'On that blest mount I love to dwell,
There Fear, and Sin, and Satan fell;
There I can spread my sportive wing,
While God's rich love to man I sing.

'There on the sinner I can smile,
No longer weak, no longer vile;
Cloth'd, as he is, by Jesus' grace,
In strength divine and righteousness.'

I heard, I wonder'd, I ador'd—
I sought the mount—I saw the Lord;
Hope smiles on me since that blest hour,
And grace descends, a heavenly shower.

Hope spreads her wings, points to the
sky,
Alluring all my thoughts on high;
She opens all the gates of Heaven,
And all her joys are richly given.

My spirit rises at the sight,
Longs for that world of heavenly light;
I see my God, and would remove,
To that eternal world of love."

November 11, 1823.

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,
AND
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

MAY, 1840.

ART. I.—*The Act of Synod respecting the Baptism of adopted Children.*

“THE natural relation of parentage *alone* warrants the presentation of a child for baptism, and this relation entitles a child of a professing parent in all cases.”

On the passage of this proposition Mr. Walker dissented, and was afterwards joined by Dr. Bruce: these brethren immediately offered their reasons of dissent; these reasons were given to Messrs. Donnan and Allison; and, after the lapse of ten years, this committee, at the last meeting, offered answers to reasons of dissent by Dr. Bruce and Mr. Walker.

The controversy between the Synod and the dissenters is of vast importance. The question is not, “Does the natural relation of parentage warrant the presentation of a child for baptism?” On this all agree; but the word “alone” in the act is the whole ground of controversy. The question is, shall the orphan, whose parents never made a profession of the Christian religion, and who is now made legally a member of a religious professing family, be presented by its adopted parents for baptism?

The arguments for depriving this child of a privilege so important as the sacrament of baptism, should be weighty—should be plainly scriptural. It is raised in the family; it feels itself to be a member; it loves its adopted brothers and sisters; it feels, in common with the rest of the family, the duty of obedience to its adopted parents; it is catechized with the children; receives the same exhortations: it is taught to pray and learn all the benign acts of devotion; it, perhaps, excels all the rest, in drinking, with avidity, the doctrines and practices of the Christian religion. This child sees its brothers and sisters held up to God in baptism; and while, in common with them, it has received all these religious privileges, it must, by the Synod’s act, now stop. It is compelled to look at itself—a poor deserted leper—a *filthy mass*; without having any possible access to

this cleansing ordinance of baptism, having no warrant that it shall live until it arrives to such years as it shall be entitled to it by a personal profession of the Christian religion. Could it speak, it would naturally inquire, why this difference? These are my brothers and sisters: God, in his providence, has made these parents mine: they faithfully discharge their duty to me: why must my privileges stop here? To satisfy this child, the act of Synod would be read to it; and the answers to reasons of dissent by Messrs. Allison and Donnan. Would the child, or its adopted parents, be satisfied that, while they are bound to perform all other moral duties, here is one, namely, baptism, they must not perform?

No question of *title* should be hastily decided. Even when it regards earthly property, it is not easily yielded. And much more, when the title to a divine ordinance is in dispute, property of *infinite* value. When our Lord *has* authorized his ministers to "preach the gospel to all nations, baptizing them," &c., those who believe themselves, or their children, entitled to any of these privileges, will not easily give up the title; nor, indeed, as candidates for eternity, should they easily yield it. We do not controvert the right which the children of religious parents have to baptism; yet we will attempt to prove that the reason why their children have this right, will also warrant them to present their adopted children. That this whole subject may come fairly before our readers, we will distinctly view the reasons of dissent with the committee's reply. As the Synod has not adopted the report, so we hold the committee alone responsible; yet we believe their answers were well prepared, are ingeniously composed, and are, perhaps, as good a reply as that act will admit.

First Reason of Dissent.

"That circumcision, in the room of which baptism came, was administered to the members of the household, and not confined to the natural posterity of professing parents."

Before the committee present their answer to this reason, they offer quotations from the standard books of the Secession Church, establishing the doctrine that the children of professing parents have a right to baptism. The quotations are fairly offered, and prove all the committee desire; and, so far as the doctrine is asserted in these acts of the church, we agree. We never asserted that we have an express warrant from any public act of the Secession Church, or from any of her subordinate standard works, declaring that adopted children have a right to baptism through their professing adopted parents; yet we hope to show, before we have done, that this doctrine is acknowledged throughout the Westminster Confession of Faith, as well as the word of God, and that the blessings of the covenant of grace were never exclusively founded upon any earthly relation of one individual to another; that this is not the ground of new covenant entailment.

Our action, however, upon this subject, is in the supreme judiciary of the Secession Church; the only court in our communion that has a right to declare terms of communion: a body possessing a power so to change, amend, and repeal all her former acts, as that they shall agree with the word of God. We do not feel at liberty

to violate this act of the Synod, so long as it stands unrepealed; still we are anxious to call the attention of our brethren to an act which some of us believe has no warrant from the word of God, and in its practical bearing calculated to deprive one class of infants, to whom God has pledged himself by promises the most cheering, and for whom every sympathy of the human bosom should be aroused, from admission into the visible church. Should we succeed in convincing the Associate Synod that the word "alone" should have no place in their act, we shall then have gained our purpose; we shall have the pleasure of admitting a host of fatherless children into His family, who declares that he is a Father to the fatherless. The dissenters think He will not refuse them.

The committee, however, in answer to this first reason, assert that the right which children bought with money had to circumcision, was founded on the right of their natural parents, who were professors.

The public, as well as the dissenters, would have been glad that the committee had not contented themselves with the bare assertion of this fact, that the children of such parents were exclusively entitled to this ordinance. Such a scripture proof would have gone far to have decided the controversy; but they did not attempt it. So far as such facts may have occurred, that the Gentile children had professing parents, we would agree that they had a right to baptism through their parents. But, in the families of the neighbouring nations, who joined themselves to the Israelites, and agreed to serve them for wages until the jubilee, (bought with their money,) there were, perhaps, orphan children: the matter of controversy is respecting them. To such the committee make no allusion whatever. We think the following observations will be founded on common facts:

1. That as mortality prevails among the human race, so there will be, in every country, orphans, that have to be committed to the care of surviving relatives, or to such others as will undertake to raise them beyond their minority; or children, especially among the heathen, may be deserted by unnatural parents; or they may be in circumstances too indigent to raise them, from a great variety of causes. There were, without doubt, many orphans among these families, as wars in that period of the world were very frequent. There would be many fatherless children taken captive with these Gentile families.

2. That every male in these families, whether orphans or not, had to be circumcised. "He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, (agrees to serve for money,) must needs be circumcised." Gen. xvii. 13. We suppose that all will grant that, if, among these, there were any orphan males, they, too, had to be circumcised.

3. That from the usual course of Divine Providence, from the very frequent mention of children of this class in the scriptures, and the numerous promises made to them by their heavenly Father, if they had been excluded from this initiating seal of the covenant of grace, we should have some intimation given us of such exclusion. Grapes were left for them; handfuls of sheaves in the gathering of harvest were left for them; "the fatherless," Deut. xxiv. 19. It is probable they were numerous in that country, when this statute made

provision for them. Will the Associate Synod, or their committee, deny that their males were not to be circumcised? They cannot.

But it is also evident that the Westminster Assembly judged that such *wards*, servants, or adopted children, (their title in this controversy matters not,) were often constituent members of a family. In their act for family worship the head of the family is called "the master of the family," to intimate not only his authority over his natural children, but also over those who were legally ingrafted into his family. Now, how is this "master of the family," bound to discharge his duty equally to all the members of the family, to see that they equally receive public and private instruction; and yet those over whom he is only the adopted father must be uncircumcised Philistines among his professing children? Does this great omission imply no defect on his part? Not any, if the Synod's act be true.

Reason Second.

"That the reason why the members of the household of Abraham were entitled to the privilege of this seal, was, that they were under his particular command, and that he had engaged to 'train them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.'"

In answer to this reason of dissent, the committee spent some time as critics, in supposing that the dissenters founded the right which Abraham's household had to their privileges upon his authority. The doctrine of the dissenters is here misrepresented. They did not say that any privilege arose from the authority of the head of a family; but that the household of Abraham were entitled to this seal, because they were *under* his particular command; that is, they were so related to him, as that he had a right to command: his authority and their privilege both stood in the relation existing between them as subjects, and him as head, or father. The simple assertion of the dissenters in this reason is, that those males in the household of Abraham, to whom he stood related as father, whether by adoption or nature, and those orphans not standing in any natural relation to professing parents, he was bound to have them circumcised. It was his duty and their privilege: duty and privilege go together, and are always of equal extent. If edification, and not criticism, had been the object of the Synod's committee, the true doctrine at issue would now have fairly been before the public; that is, the true state of orphan children in the household of Abraham.

That the right which Abraham or any other parent had to command was independent either of circumcision or baptism, we are not willing to concede to the committee, that such a right was naturally in a father, or legally in a master, we will not dispute, and existed prior to church membership: but the moment they came under the covenant of grace by receiving one of its seals, they then possessed no authority independent of this new relation; but all their authority, and, indeed, the whole discharge of their relative duties, were to be regulated by it. Were they to fail in any of these duties, they would be censured, not merely because they violated the law of nature, but because they violated their covenant engagements.

An assumption is made by the committee, in their answer to this reason, which we are by no means disposed to admit; although it is

introduced as if no one would controvert it. They say, "Were the believing parents of a child both dead, and their authority at an end, its right to baptism, by the natural relation of parentage, would still be the same; because it does not originate from that authority." As this assertion goes far in determining the true matter of controversy between the Synod and the dissenters; that is, the amount of spiritual privilege arising from merely a natural relation, we shall pause, and briefly try the principle; and we assert,

1. That the natural relation subsisting between professing parents and their children, considered as distinct from a new covenant relation, never did give a right to baptism or any other new covenant blessing, through this natural relation, death, not new life is entailed. We will examine this more fully hereafter.

2. The natural relation subsisting between parents and their children is established by God, because he has chosen them to raise him a holy seed, as we will show afterwards; and therefore a relation by Divine appointment, and not founded in nature. They are heirs to their spiritual privileges by "promise," not by "flesh." Rom. iv. 8.

3. That in every case where an individual has a right to gospel privileges, arising from a relation which he may have to parents, whether natural or adopted, he must be under correspondent obligation to duty. Now, suppose the assertion of the committee be true, that a child of deceased professing parents should be baptized, who enters into these obligations? According to this system, none on earth can be its federal parents. It has the privilege, but cannot engage to perform the duties: duty and privilege must, therefore, be separated; which is absurd. The dissenters did not fix the right of circumcision in the power the parent or master had to command, but in the covenant relation existing between them and their household. But, throughout Divine revelation, we are taught, as also in all correct systems of moral philosophy, that the power to command is of equal extent only to the existing relation, and this power is to be exercised according to this relation. Relation is the foundation of obligation: now, here is a child declared by the committee to be entitled to baptism, and no one possessing a right to command. Would it be right for a gospel-minister, travelling among the Indians, and finding a child of this description among them, to baptize it, and leave it among them? Of what possible meaning could its baptism be? It never could have a knowledge of the covenant of grace among people of this class. And yet, in that situation, its natural relation to its parents was the same as if raised in a religious society.

4. This assertion of the committee clearly exhibits the ground on which the doctrine of the Synod stands; but it gives an importance to natural relation, which the dissenters are not willing to admit. It is made a sufficient ground exclusively for the administration of baptism. It is not, on this theory, necessary for any one to engage to train it up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. This is, we think, an incorrect view of the covenant of grace. This covenant contains at least two things: law and gospel, or duty and privilege. Baptism is a new covenant privilege. How will you carry out the law without the privilege? Who engages to the duties required in the covenant? No provision is made for this in the committee's theory. Do they believe that the duties of this covenant are of less

importance than the privileges of it? Would Abraham's household have been admitted to the right of circumcision, or the household of Lydia or Stephanas admitted to baptism, had not their respective heads been bound to command?

5. But, if an orphan child of professing parents be adopted into a religious family, and then baptized, its title to the ordinance, we fear, would not rest, where the committee has laid it, upon the relation it sustains to those *deceased*, who now have no power to command. But we think it will be found, where the dissenters say, upon a living relation it now has to those who have first the relation and then the power to command it; and, accordingly, to train it up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. We think that we are now ready for the following assertion. That no individual, whatever be the relation he may have possessed to persons deceased, can be entitled to baptism as a seal of the covenant of grace, unless he enters into obligations, either personally or federally, to perform the duties of that covenant. As we thus have disputed the assumption of the committee, we, of course, dispute the whole theory founded upon it.

The committee suppose that the dissenters "believe that there are two ways in which children may have a right to this seal of the covenant of grace: one way for children of believing parents, that is by parentage; and another way for the children of heathen and others out of the visible church, that is the authority of the believing master." We think, however, from the reasoning before, that it is now evident that the committee have not correctly understood the dissenters. But one leading ground, entitling children to this ordinance, has been offered by the dissenters; that is, by promise; and it does not matter whether the relation be natural or acquired in which the child stands, if that relation secures to it the knowledge of that covenant to which it appends the seal, and its being trained accordingly.

When we speak of relation by promise, we mean a spiritual relation, a new covenant relation, as distinct from that relation which exists merely by the *flesh*. Adopted children are children of promise, as are all the blessings to God's people. Surely, when adopted parents are required to perform the duties to those children committed to their care, as truly as if they were the natural parents, the promise to the children for a blessing upon their instruction, and for their salvation by means of this instruction, is as strong as if they were the children of those parents; and the adopted parents have the same encouragement to a faithful performance of their duties from the Divine promise. The salvation is as sure, the obligation to perform all moral duties as strong, as if the relation was by parentage. "Then why refuse the seal?"

Reason Third.

"That baptism does not appear to be confined to the natural posterity of professing parents by any declaration of scripture; but in Acts xvi. 33, and in other places, the contrary appears to be asserted."

The committee, as usual, in replying to this reason of dissent, prove successfully from scripture, that children of believing parents have a right to baptism; an assertion not contradicted by the dissenters. They introduce 1 Cor. vii. 14: "The unbelieving husband is

sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; else were your children unclean, but now are they holy." We believe that, with those who deny infant baptism, this text should be decisive in establishing the right of infants of professing parents to baptism; but this text decides nothing in the matter of controversy between the Synod and the dissenters: a very distinct question is at issue. If the very parents mentioned in the text above, had in their family an orphan child, one they had undertaken to raise, to whom they were bound to perform all the duties of parents, and indeed to love as their own, would it be their duty to have it baptized? or shall it remain *reproached* and *unclean*, to mingle with their clean children? This text does not decide their duty with respect to this child; but if this child was a male, and in the family of Abraham, we think Gen. xvii. 27 would decide the controversy at first sight: "All the men of his house, born in his house, or bought with money of the stranger, were circumcised with him."

In answering this reason of dissent, the committee have taken for granted the meaning of a text which we feel disposed to controvert, Matt. xix. 14: "Suffer little children to come to me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." Their construction is, "These children could be members of the church, or of the kingdom of heaven, in no other way than by the natural relations of parentage." Acts ii. 39: "The promise is to you and to your children." Where Peter's anxious hearers are referred to Abraham and to his seed. It would have been honest and correct to have quoted the whole of this passage as the Spirit has given it. When we look at the passage in full, we think any reader will be compelled to differ with the committee, and declare, at first view, that the passage cannot mean natural children alone. In Matt. xix. 14, it is not said who presented the children to Christ: we have no evidence, from the passage, that it was the natural parents. Verse 13: "There were brought unto him little children." But in the other passage quoted, (Acts ii. 39,) we are sure the passage cannot be understood of the children of natural parents exclusively: "For the promise is to you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Now the promise is used in the latter clause of the verse in the same sense in which it is used in the first clause; and it is evident that the latter clause cannot mean the natural children of professing parents alone.

Farther, it is granted that the above promise does refer to "the ancient promises made to Abraham;" but it is very difficult to see how this difference can aid the sentiments of the committee. The ancient promises made to Abraham, begin in Gen. xii., and were delivered upon different occasions, and in different forms, until nearly the close of his life; and, unless there is a direct reference to Christ as his seed, there is not one of all these "ancient promises" confined to his natural posterity. All these, either directly or indirectly, carry out the declaration of the first promise, Gen. xii. 3: "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed."

The committee, with as little ceremony, dispose of Acts xvi. 33, and 2 Cor. i. 16, by supposing that *οικος*, "commonly and properly signifies, not strangers or servants in a family, but children, in a strict and natural sense." We are not aware that ever pedo-baptists confined this term to the natural children of a family; but the term,

from its natural signification, is only confined to a person dwelling in the family as a resident, as distinct from occasional members of the family; and, indeed, it is not at all probable that the Holy Spirit would have selected this word to express *natural relation*, seeing the common use of the word, as well as the natural signification of it, expresses *residence only*; and, therefore, it as fully includes the adopted members of a family as the natural children. The committee, however, well aware that no Greek scholar would confine $\alpha\iota\tau\omega\varsigma$ to natural children, attempt to meet its common signification by observing, that "supposing the term were taken in the sense including servants, it would prove nothing in opposition to the doctrine we are defending; for, if these were adult servants, they were baptized upon their 'professing their faith in Christ, and obedience to him;' and if they had children, they were baptized as 'infants of such as are members of the visible church.'" We will agree with the committee, if they suffer us to add, that if they had orphan children adopted into their families, they were also baptized, as they were included in the term $\alpha\iota\tau\omega\varsigma$, the only thing for which the dissenters plead.

Reason Fourth.

"Parents stand in the same moral relation to their adopted children that they do to their natural children, and, of course, possess all the religious privileges of the latter; and why refuse them the seal of these privileges?"

As the committee seem at a loss to understand what the dissenters mean by the term *adopted children*, we would observe, that by it the dissenters mean, children standing in such a relation to other persons, and the permanency of that relation so secured, that those persons are bound to train them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Then the opinion of the dissenters plainly is, that when orphan children are placed in that legal relation to the heads of a family, as that these heads can discharge parental duty, then these parents are bound to perform all the duties of natural parents, in presenting the same profession to them, and requiring them to practise the same Christian duties; and for the security of the mutual performance of the duties of this relation, we require them to present these children to God in baptism, and thereby have them sealed members of that covenant that requires this profession and practice; and, at the same time, these persons covenant to discharge these duties. The duties are the same; moral relation the same; and why deny the obligation to all the duties to be the same? Parents are as truly bound to have the seal of baptism administered to their children, as they are bound to perform any other duty.

From the following assertion made by the committee, we are sorry to say we must differ from every feeling expressed in it. "The fifth commandment does not require this kind of parents to have the same ardour of affection, the same anxious love, the same unceasing labour and endeavours to promote the welfare and happiness of any kind of adopted children, they should have for their natural offspring. Neither does it require such adopted children to have such a warmth of love and gratitude, such reverence and confidence, such a lively concern for the home, the lives, and comfort of this kind of parents by adoption, as children should have for their

natural parents." It is asserted, indeed, by the committee, that "The love of parents for their natural offspring is employed by the Holy Spirit, as the finest and strongest figure to express the love of God for his people." That it is employed by the Holy Spirit to express the love of God for his people, we grant; but in no place is the figure stronger than that which exists between a servant and his master; and especially a servant born in the house. Jer. ii. 14: "*Is Israel a servant? Is he a home-born slave? Why is he spoiled?*" The word slave, in this passage, is not in the original. This relation is given in the strong language of the passage, as the reason why he should not be spoiled; he was a *servant*, he was *home-born*, and therefore beloved. This doctrine of the committee savours strong of slavery. The orphan child, bereaved of its parents, has little encouragement from this committee: its adopted parents are allowed to be more indifferent in every act of love, in every care, in every attention, than to their own children. The adopted parents are encouraged to make invidious distinctions among the children of their family, and to treat with neglect the defenceless orphan. No wonder the God of heaven declares himself a Father to the fatherless, when men on earth will not take the place of a father, and gospel ministers plead, as the language of a whole branch of the church of Christ, that they should not! that they should neither love them nor treat them as their natural children!

Upon this hypothesis, which we think wrong, the committee refuse baptism to these orphans; as there is less love due these children, so we should perform less duty. It would have been the justification of a dangerous principle, by the Secession Church, if this report had been adopted as their own. And, farther, it goes upon a principle not proved, and a principle that never can be proved, that all the males in Abraham's family had religious professing parents: never was there an assumption more unlikely. Considering the situation in which Abraham was placed, surrounded by the Gentile world, in the midst of heathens, was it probable he had none of them, and none of their children, in his family? And if he had any, how would the theory of the committee dispose of them? They must remain uncircumcised.

Reason Fifth.

"The act of the Synod appears to determine that the entailment of the covenant of grace is by natural generation, and not by promise, contrary to Rom. ix. 8."

The dissenters did not, we think, mistake the "determination of Synod," in supposing "that the Synod would assert the right of children to baptism by the natural relation of parentage, in opposition to the promise." The dissenters agree with the Synod, that the children of professing parents are the children of promise, and, therefore, possess a right to baptism; but the dissenters do think, that when the act of Synod looks exclusively at natural generation as the ground of baptism, and, at the same time, excludes any spiritual or federal relation between parents and children, as the ground of the title which children have to baptism, it seems to suppose that the covenant of grace is entailed, as is the covenant of works. This reason looks, perhaps, more fully at the ground of controversy, between the Synod and the dissenters, than any other of the reasons; we shall, therefore, reason a little on the subject.

1st. The reasons why the curse of the covenant of works is entailed by natural generation, is, that Adam was the federal head of the human family: had he been their father *only*, the curse would never have extended beyond himself; but, the fact of his being the *covenant* father, was the reason why the curse was entailed: his federal acts were ours; he was our agent, and we were held accountable for all the acts of his agency. This relation was as extensive as the human race; the fact, therefore, that we are his natural posterity, makes us covenanters in him; we, therefore receive the curse of the law by the equity of a contract, and this, in law, is not founded upon natural generation, but upon a *covenant*; and natural generation is the way by which we come under that contract.

2dly. This will serve as a key for understanding the entailment of the blessings of the covenant of grace; for, if in the covenant of works, the curse was not founded upon natural generation, but upon the covenant relation in which we stood to the head of that covenant, it will be found much more absurd to rest the entailment of the covenant of grace upon natural generation.

3dly. As the first Adam, who was head of the first covenant, receives the whole number of his represented posterity by natural generation, so Jesus Christ, who is the HEAD of the second covenant, receives his represented seed by regeneration; the entailment of the former is, therefore, by generation, while the latter is entailed by regeneration. In what sense, then, are the children of professing parents entitled to baptism?

1st. Not by natural generation, but by divine appointment. As God would raise up a holy seed, so he would appoint holy persons for that work. They must act as officers ordained by God for this special work. Their own will is not the rule by which they are to train up their children, but the will of their HEAVENLY FATHER, who has appointed them to this work. God would make every relation in which a child is legally placed, subservient to the great work of raising it for himself. And, in his infinite wisdom, he has so organized the church, that every minor, orphan, or child whose parents are not living, are placed in such relation to their superiors as to secure a godly education.

2dly. It plainly follows, that our Lord Jesus Christ appoints others to raise him a holy seed, as well as natural parents: these may be called masters, guardians, or adopted parents. Now in that account which all men will have to render before the judgment seat of Christ, for the discharge of relative duty, these persons will have to render an account of the discharge of their duty to those orphans thus placed under them: they must be found to have taught them the law as fully and as faithfully as if they had been their natural children. We care not whether the relation is "artificial" or natural, the moral obligation is the same, and, therefore, there is no escape from duty; the station must be filled. An inquiry, then, should not be deemed curious. If they are to perform to these *wards* all moral duty, why not baptism? They are to administer the whole matter of the covenant of grace, its laws, its truth, its promises, but the act of Synod prohibits the seal and security of these!

3dly. It is, therefore, evident that, as it regards the duties we relatively owe to God, it matters not how we come into that lawful relation, whether naturally or "artificially;" we are now there by

divine appointment, and, of course, bound to the duties of the station. The dissenters believe a step-father, or step-mother, may stand and *vow* with the surviving parent, in presenting a child in baptism, and thereby enter into all the obligations of a natural parent; because they are now, providentially, placed in that relation: and it is now evident God has appointed this "artificial" parent to assist in raising this child for him. But, if the views of the committee be correct, none but the natural parent can present the child; all other persons are excluded, although the spiritual relation be the same, and all duties founded on that relation the same. But, as shown above, the right which the child has to baptism, is not by natural generation, but by divine appointment. It follows, that orphan children, when placed under their superiors, who are bound to discharge the duties of parents, possess the same foundation for the receipt of the ordinance of baptism, that those do whose professing parents survive.

4thly. This accounts for the term *household* being used in the baptism of a family; and it also accounts for the fact of all the males being circumcised, *born in the house, or bought with money*; meaning the resident members of the family. The heads of the family, holding the same spiritual relation to all its members, were bound to discharge the same duties to all, without making any difference.

5thly. But there is another denomination given to a professing family, importing the duties and obligations of its head. "*A church in a house*," 1 Cor. xvi. 19. We think this, at first view, would comprehend the baptism of the *household*, the adopted as well as the natural members of the family. The expression seems to intimate that all the members of the family were dedicated to God. It is an intimation of the teaching, worship, and, in fact, of all the religious instruction of a family, as if they were the church of the living God. This gives them a holy character. This church may, like that of Abraham's family, include the permanent members, as well as the natural members of the family; it may include children whose parents were without the pale of the visible church in their lifetime; but those children are now the constituent members of a church in a house. "*Who then can forbid water that they should not be baptized?*" The great King and Head of the church has acknowledged them members of a family; he calls them a church in a house; but, until they are baptized, they are *unclean, unholy*; and not until their baptism is the reproach of their heathen state rolled from off them, Josh. v. 9. This is, in our opinion, a very different view of the religious state of a family, from that which the Synod's act contemplates, or their committee has described. Look at this family, the *church in a house*, as the committee would have it, a family, some members of which are declared holy, some unholy, and yet all members of the same church, and that church so organized by its great HEAD. And yet no possible relation found in this organic church that would render them all holy; a church, and yet they cannot all be cleansed; they must remain so, without any possible remedy, as there is no person appointed to offer them all to God. The heads of the family were, and are bound to supply all the temporal and spiritual wants of this little church. All duties must be performed—one only excepted—that is baptism!

The doctrines we have here exhibited, will not be found in oppo-

sition to the standards of the Secession Church, so far as the title to baptism is concerned. The administration and receiving of sacraments are placed among the ordinary duties of the moral law, and included in the general term of religious worship, Con. of Faith, chap. xxi. sect. 5. The term children is used in the general sense in which it is used by the dissenters, chap. xxv. sect. 2: "The visible church, which is also catholic, or universal, under the gospel (not confined to one nation, as under the law,) consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their *children*;" for the proof of this doctrine, and to determine the meaning which they affix to the term "*children*," Gen. xvii. 7, is quoted: "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and thy seed after thee." None will confine this promise to the Jews, the natural posterity of Abraham. "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

The whole view taken of the covenant of grace, by all reformed churches, justify, we think, the doctrine of the dissenters. It is a spiritual tie, founded upon spiritual relation, to which all carnal relation is only subservient. And while God announces himself a providential Father to the fatherless, he is also their gracious father. It is in behalf of these the dissenters plead. The act of the Synod places them irrecoverably, during their minority, without the pale of the visible church; they may look in vain for any individual to present them to God. Baptism, the emblem of regeneration, and of the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus, must not be administered to them; the act of Synod has excluded them. The Synod, indeed, has not rendered itself responsible for the report; yet, perhaps, no better reasons can be offered for the act, than those given by Messrs. Donnan and Allison.

J. W.

ART. II.—*In what Light is the Preaching and other Labours of Men under deposition to be viewed?*

IN my answer to this and the following questions, I promise to be very brief. Circumstances, inclination, and the patience of readers generally of such subjects, require me to be so. In answering this question, it is necessary to give some account of such preaching.

And, first, it is not preaching the gospel, nor obedience to Christ, nor service to his cause. They are not sent by him, nor acting by his authority; and, therefore, as has been shown in the answer to the first question, they *cannot* preach. The reader ought to bear in mind that it is not the mere annunciation of the truth that makes preaching the gospel. I make no question that truth may be spoken under deposition the same as before it; in the same place, and in the same course of public exercises, too, as formerly. And because people see no difference with their *eyes*, and hear none with their *ears*, they cannot understand what is the matter, and rashly conclude that it must be only some fastidious nicety of the court. But the matter is, that this preaching has not *Christ's authority*. He is not with it; he has not promised to bless it; he has forbidden it. If this be an obstacle to people's hearing, they may consistently enough find

* fault with stopping the mouth of a certain preacher, who said, "What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God, Most High? I beseech thee torment me not." For this was not only all truth, but the very points at issue between Christ and the Jewish nation at that time. Why stop the devil from giving so pointed a testimony against the prevailing errors of that time? But, you will ask me, if their preaching is not the gospel, what is it?

Answer. It is a *continuation of the sin* for which they were justly deposed. The overt act may be discontinued, but the principle which brought it forth continues in all its activity; and they *continue* to commit the same thing in *their heart*.

Their preaching is an effective declaration that "they have *not sinned*;" and what they *have* done, they are neither afraid, nor ashamed, nor unwilling to do again. They stand by it, and defend it. And, in scripture account, this is to continue in it. And so it would be reckoned among men too.

Farther, their preaching is a *covering* of their sin. They deny either the matter of fact, or the sin of it, or both. They say, "I have not sinned; I have done nothing to hinder me from preaching, or to render it improper for people to hear me, or to make my ministry unblest." This is surely to cover their sin: for it is to declare, in the strongest manner, that sin is not there. "He that covereth his sins shall not prosper," Prov. xxviii. 13. There is always an aggravation added to the first sin by covering it; but, in this case, the amount of aggravation is appalling. Let it be remembered, that, in the case which we are considering, the sin is generally, if not always, identified with some plain matter of fact, of which there is seldom even a possibility that the accused can be misled by ignorance or misconception. Yet he denies, and continues in his denial. Witnesses are next sworn and examined, and the charge is incontestably established. Yet, in the face of all the testimony, he denies it, and does it openly; and sets the truth at defiance. Arguments are used and reiterated, with a view to bring the man to acknowledge *that the sun shines*; but all is vain. All his powers of sophistry are put in requisition, to create darkness over the conscience. Time is given him, that he may reflect on his own conduct, on the testimony, and the arguments, and examine all, dispassionately, and alone, in the light of the Bible, and pray for the leading of the Spirit of truth, and at length come to Christian—to *honourable confession*. But of this he avails himself only as a beaten enemy does the armistice, to recruit his forces, and come again to the attack with redoubled fury. He hurls back the just sentence upon the court with every epithet of reproach. On the court? No: but on *Christ*, in whose name they act; and preaches, declaring, by this fact, that it is the *witnesses* and the *court* that have sinned, and that *he* is righteous. This is a fearful aggravation of the first offence. For, saith eternal Truth, "He that despiseth you despiseth me, and he that despiseth me, despiseth Him that sent me." Luke x. 16.

But it does not end even here; because, now, the offence rises yet higher, and becomes a daring wickedness in spiritual things. It clothes itself with the highest professions of zeal, love, and fidelity to Christ. It pretends to be *constrained* to take this step from love

* ERRATUM.—On last line of preceding page, (in some copies,) for "on," read *no*.

to him and the souls of men; to be *persecuted* for righteousness' sake; to stand single and alone for the purity of the faith; and it invokes that great and dreadful name, by which we are called, to countenance and bless all this! And, in this way, it endeavours to identify itself with all the ordinances and holy mysteries of the gospel! If we will but look at things as they are, we will cease looking at the man of flesh and bones before us, and consider that it is a *vicious principle* that stands in the pulpit, and makes all these solemn pretensions, and lofty claims—that preaches, that prays, dispenses holy ordinances, and cries, in the strains of suffering innocence, for succour against oppression. For, were it not for this vicious principle, (or legion of principles,) the man would not be there, nor utter any of these things. It was that which prompted him to make a stand, and that leads him onward in his career. *It has the ascendancy* over all his other principles, and is the master of the man; and to it, therefore, is justly ascribed what he does. But, how shocking is this! A wicked principle in man makes bold to do what Satan dare not by himself!

Farther, the preaching of such men is a systematic and persevering endeavour to prostrate the government which Christ has set up in the church. The fundamental principle of that government, and the principle which acts in them, are antipodes. The will of Christ in the word, explained and applied by fallible men, is to be answered by the obedience of faith. This is the principle of church government. The principle which acts in them is their *own will* explained and applied according to the inclinations of their own heart. If the latter could prevail, the former must fall to the ground, as a thing of nought. The whole of their ministrations tend directly to this issue. If they could prevail, the present order of the church would cease, and the despotism of the human will, not excelled by any thing in the dark ages, would take its place.

Again, their preaching is to be regarded as a measure to perpetuate schism and animosity in the body of Christ. That such is the effect of it, is too clearly seen, and deeply felt, to require any proof here. Ancient associations are broken up. The profitable interchange of thought and feeling, which often disburdened, and sometimes feasted kindred souls, is made to cease. Chief friends are separated for ever; parents and children are divided; husband and wife take opposite sides; society is torn up by the roots; and the worst of passions is blown into flame; and this preaching is a continual pouring of oil upon it. In a word, their preaching is to be viewed as a "speaking of perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." "Good words and fair speeches," they use. All would be perfectly correct which they say, if only *one thing* be conceded to them; namely, that they are *not guilty*. But this must be denied to them: and then it must follow that the whole they say is "perverse." Truth uttered by *them* deceives. The better they act the part of a sent minister of Christ, the more effectually they deceive the hearts of the simple. If they succeed, they succeed only in drawing away their followers from Christ, and his people to their pernicious ways. Surely such men do not think seriously of having to answer in the day of judgment for all this. For one would think that a thought of the fearful responsibility would bring them to conviction and repentance if not entirely given up to a reprobate mind.

The limits to which I promised to confine myself, will not admit of more than a few brief hints, and I must proceed to the next question.

What are likely to be the effects of such ministrations, and the course of such men?

First. Great hardness of heart must be one of them. Before men can take the position supposed in these questions, they must have come to a very great degree of it already. Every thing which they have met with in their course, would, inevitably, either soften or harden them: soften if they submitted, harden if they resisted. And if they resisted all the means to bring them to repentance, they grew harder at every step. And their continuing to claim and exercise official power, must augment it beyond all calculation. Suppose, reader, if you can, what must be the effect of his standing up every Sabbath, in the name of God, to commit his sin over again with a hundred fold aggravation, and of calling for the assistance of the Holy Ghost in doing it! In spite of *names*, this is the *thing*; and the heart, so long as it is not yet past feeling, cannot always evade being privy to it. Some diseases, it is said, are highly contagious; but I fear that none of them is so much so as this is; and, if so, how can the hearers escape it?

Secondly. Hardness of heart grows to *contempt* of sacred things. He who is often reproved, not only hardens his neck, but becomes proud of his iniquity, and scornful to his reprover. This is particularly laid to the charge of Israel, who was so often reproved for his idolatries, and became so hardened. "They mocked his messengers, and misused his prophets." This was the reception with which Hezekiah's messengers met, when he sent an invitation to the scattered remains of the ten tribes to come up into Jerusalem and keep the passover. And the same cause will produce the same effect still. The very fact of preaching is casting the highest contempt on that ordinance which called for their deposition; and it is expressly calling upon all that will hear them to do the same. One sin cannot remain alone. It will conceive and bring forth more ungodliness. This contempt of one ordinance will be quickly transferred to all.

Thirdly. Evil passions are the legitimate offspring of contempt. It seldom fails to beget a settled purpose of revenge. Hence arises persecution. If their power is so limited that revenge cannot immediately touch property, liberty, or life, yet it will endeavour to blast the reputation. The false teachers in Jeremiah's time did their utmost, first to make *him* out to be a false prophet, and then to put the law in force against him. The Judaizing teachers in Paul's time tried to persuade the people that he was *no apostle*; and that he was an enemy to the church. The times in which we live do not as yet admit the full sway of the persecuting spirit, (how soon we know not,) but its powers for murdering the reputation are almost without limit. The obsequious press, which lends its powers to every cause that will pay it, is the willing servant of persecution, also. And, if you will believe *it*, ecclesiastical authority was never exercised in a more despotic way, or did more to pervert Christ's ordinances, than it has been doing of late in the courts of Presbyterian Churches, in the United States. If no lie can be printed, they have deposed and cut off from the holy ministry, in the face of law, order, and equity, a set of as immaculate, faithful, honest, godly men, as ever suffered for conscience' sake on a scaffold. †

Fourthly. The pernicious effects of their preaching on the people

cannot be estimated. There can be no doubt that many countenance the preaching of the deposed, because it gives them liberty to do as they incline without any apprehension from too much strictness of discipline; and because it is very flattering to have a minister and a *great man* so circumstanced, that he dare not move hand or foot until he has taken their counsel, and is sure of their concurrence. Pride, worldliness, or any lust, may thrive in these circumstances; but humility, meekness, and faith, cannot live. And it ought not to cause any wonder, if, after the effervescence of controversy shall have subsided, they shall find, in despite of all their sympathetic wailings, a contempt springing up within, both for the deposed and his course, and an indifference for all that is sacred together.

It cannot fail to excite and cherish in them a spirit of *proud insubordination*. This is another effect. It is to be hoped that some will be enabled to preserve a better spirit. But, in general, the followers of a deposed leader have insensibly lost sight of the true character of discipline and government; and, regarding it as mere human dictation, they have rejected it. This is the first great step towards it: the second is not half so difficult to take, which is to set up their own judgment in matters ecclesiastic as their rule; and, when this is established, subordination is at an end.

All these things among professors of religion give very great *occasion to the infidel and the profane* to exult. This is another of the sad effects. Nothing is more welcome to them who hate the Christian religion, than such an opportunity to expose it to ridicule and contempt in the persons of its professors. For, with eagle eyes, they observe the weakness and infirmity of its real friends, and the dishonesty and intrigue of its disguised enemies, and lay it for a reproach to the cause of Christ. And, however unjust this may be in itself, it is to be charged to the account of those who, to hide their iniquity and save their pride, have resolutely set themselves against good government.

Such preaching we may also justly suppose will be, from its own nature, a stumbling block to many, over which they will fall into perdition. The inquirer after truth comes in his way on two sets of men, both professing to preach the same faith, both making the same claims; yet completely opposed. Where the truth lies, he knows not; and thinks it impossible, at this time, to find out; and therefore he gives up his inquiry after truth as vain and fruitless. The wavering become more uncertain *what* they should believe from this same cause, and they become more *indifferent* at the same time; and, finally, they give up all concern about religion together, and return to the world, or settle down in heartless, hopeless infidelity.

When the heads of a family are at variance on matters of religious concern, the children frequently take neither side, and grow up with no other ideas of religion than those that are associated with the most hateful strife, of which they naturally assign *it* as the cause. The effect of many of the youth that are growing up within view of the case we are considering, will probably be very similar. How long the cause of these bad effects may continue, or to what extent its pernicious influence may spread, God only knows. Deposed and corrupt men may be used by him as a scourge to the righteous, and as a judgment and a curse to the rest. "Howbeit *they* mean not so, neither doth their heart think so." Whatever may be the event, it is very clear, from many things, that such a judgment would not

come undeserved. There is no need to confine the application of these questions and answers to one case, or to the difficulties in one ecclesiastical body; for they are humerous: they are all over. Altar is set up against altar over the land. The house is often divided against itself. In some instances, it is about the most fundamental articles of the gospel; in others, it is whether men and measures shall be ruled by the law of Christ's house, or it by them. Without inquiring at present for the cause to which this state of things is to be attributed, it is our imperious duty dispassionately to view their present aspect, and prepare to act our part in our own place and station.

The history of ecclesiastical affairs in this country, as well as in Europe, for a number of years past, may convince any attentive observer that there is a spirit abroad that is adverse to all established order together. This does not appear so much from direct and formal attacks made upon it, as from the course pursued. That course, whatever it may be, does not coincide with order, but is frequently seen to lie across it. Perhaps some, who pursue it, may not have any specific object in view; but the greater part appear to be influenced by a strong determination to hold on their way; so strong, that obstacles of an ordinary or common kind do not stop them. Solemn vows and professions do not appear to be felt as any bar in their way at all. When these are brought into view before them, they make no more difference in their rate of going, than if nothing at all was in their way. Any thing like scriptural reproof calls forth only derision and contempt, and makes them go with accelerated speed. In times by-past, when men's iniquity was found out so fully that they could not deny it, it invariably made them slack their pace, or brought them to a dead halt. This was so common, that society were in the habit of concluding, when the iniquity was fairly discovered, that the matter was at an end. But, how altered is the case now! When a man's iniquity is proved beyond contradiction, he only *begins* in good earnest. It is then only that his course takes form, and becomes concentric and organic. This is a phenomenon so new and anomalous in the history of metaphysics, that it may be allowed to stand as a characteristic of this age. It used to be, also, that, when a man's course drew him into self-contradiction or absurdity, a blush would mantle his cheek, and he would slip out of it as quietly as he could: but this would be mere pusillanimity now. Our master-spirits would scarcely stay so long as to put a little varnish over such things, because it is neither consistency nor sound reason which they are in love with, but something very different. An oath seems to have also lost the force which it once had. "An oath for confirmation *was* the end of all strife;" but now it is far otherwise. Many hold it so cheap, that they appear willing to give it for *any* thing that would make in the least for their course; and, when it would impede them in it, it is nothing worth. If, however, ingenuity may construe it into a crime, it is made the *beginning* of strife; and they take occasion thence to go with double speed. It is unnecessary to say, after this, that candour and the common sense of justice have no place in this course of acting. If the truth of these statements be, as we believe, identified with the facts of history, which are not limited to one time or place, they sufficiently prove that there is a spirit abroad adverse to all established order. I know not what

name or definition would answer to the conceptions which men of this spirit have of the position to which they would bring the affairs of the churches. But, if they should unhappily succeed in their enterprise, an *absolute individual irresponsibility*, if not in name, must be the thing to which they would arrive. And this, disguise it as you please, is Atheism.

It must have been observed, by those who consider the times, that this spirit in the churches has, in its mad career, met with a kindred spirit in the world. Perhaps, I would more correctly say, brought forth a kindred spirit in the world. When the church holds fast Christ's name, she may have but little influence on the world; but, when she takes the opposite course, her power is irresistible and tremendous. Every step in her downward course will be answered by a corresponding one in the world. If it cannot altogether equal her in sin, it will follow close at her heels. The facts that substantiate the truth of this are abundant. If you look attentively at the course of all sorts of business, you will see that self-aggrandizement is the summit to which men of all ranks constantly aspire. And name that principle if you can, in law or equity, that has power on the conscience sufficient to hold them back from it. What species of fraud or iniquity is it, that is not every day committed in order to evade the authority or escape the detection of the law?

In politics it is no better. The great and leading object is to ascend to the highest pinnacle of power. To accomplish this, (each man in his turn) men are bound together, under imposing names, by a system of intrigue. The hundred-tongued press, the convention, the caucus, and the dinner oration, are the machinery, and any thing and every thing, by turns, can set it in motion, and keep it going, except *truth, honesty, and patriotism*. The most abominable absurdity under heaven will be eloquently defended, if it will only secure an election, or a re-election. The entire man, his eloquence, his knowledge, principles, conscience and all, is turned about by this one thing, as easily as ever a ship was by the helm. The very touch of this magic wand makes liberty to mean the support of slavery, and slavery to mean happiness. The acquisition of power is the political virtue which sanctifies all sorts of means, and makes our modern great man. But the spirit of which I speak, exhibits itself more fully, still, in the mob and the Lynch law. In this, which is the nearest of any thing to its own proper form, it has traversed almost every state of the union, and filled the country with terror—paralyzed the arm of the civil law, and menaced the public press into silence. But I have no room for any detail; and the facts will not be disputed.

It will be difficult to point out, in a sentence or two, what are the peculiar duties of honest men and sincere Christians at such a time. Our ship is caught in a hurricane, let every man on board go to his own proper station, nor leave it at his peril. Let every one be attentive to the orders of our Captain, and prompt in action. See that every thing is fast. Place all your dependance on him who is at the helm: he is of more might than many waters, or great sea billows.

The present state of things comes not without a commission from the great Head of the Church, and will accomplish, under his control, great and salutary things in her behalf. If it correct us for our

backsliding, if it arouse us from a careless and easy formality, if it put us on watching against being caught by the spirit of the time, and make us more active and diligent in doing all that we can to leave our children in possession of the blessed attainment with which God has favoured us, it will be a gain to us and a benefit to posterity. The duty of every man lies in connexion with these things, whatever be his relation to society, or office in the church.

A. G.

ART. III.—*Is the Expression proper, that "God is a reconciled God?" or, that "God is reconciled by Christ?"*

IN the Religious Monitor, vol. xiv. page 220, &c., there is an extract from Symington on the Atonement, supporting the affirmative of this question; and Stevenson on the Atonement, and on the Offices of Christ, adopts the same view. These writers view the question in connexion with Socinianism, which may fix a very incorrect impression on the minds of many respecting the sentiment of those who embrace the negative on very different grounds. It is true, the Socinians deny that God is reconciled to sinners in Christ; but in this denial they mean that Christ made no proper atonement for sin, or rendered no vicarious satisfaction to divine justice, on the ground of which God forgives and accepts the sinner in Christ; and they avail themselves of this expression, used by many Calvinists, that "*God is reconciled in Christ,*" as an occasion of charging the true doctrine of the atonement with hostility to the doctrine of divine immutability. Sound divines are sometimes found defending an *argument*, or an *expression*, which is by no means necessary to their sound doctrine; and thus they embarrass their subject, and give, at least, an apparent advantage to their opponents. So Symington, Stevenson, and others, seem to defend the expression in question, as though it were essential to the doctrine of the atonement, and as though this doctrine must stand or fall with it. But though these writers have clearly shown that the word *reconcile*, as applied to God, is not, in the sense in which they use it, chargeable with a denial of divine immutability, yet their whole defence of the doctrine of the atonement would be firm and clear without the defence of this expression; for the scriptures certainly do not use it in reference to God; it is only a word or expression used by Calvinistic writers, which was judged convenient, but can well be spared on this subject. There are some, then, who embrace the negative of this question, and oppose the use of the word *reconcile*, as applied to God, on very different grounds from those on which the Socinians oppose it: some who, as Stevenson candidly acknowledges, are "firm friends of the doctrine of the atonement;" and the following remarks are intended to support this opposition.

Symington and Stevenson are valuable writers, and their just celebrity may excite a prejudice against any attempt to correct any of their arguments; yet it is presumed that the candid reader will see that they have fallen into some confusion of argument on this point, and into a defence of an expression which may be given up without the least loss, either to their doctrine of the atonement, or to their illustration of it.

It is true, this is a question of words; but as words are the medium of communicating ideas, so, when incorrectly used, they may, at least to some minds, communicate important errors, which those who use them do not intend. There are some errors, to which the human mind seems to be peculiarly inclined, in perversion of the doctrine of the atonement; such as, that God's mercy to sinners must be exercised, in some measure, at the expense of justice and truth—that its exercise must be by some change in God—that Christ is more gracious than the Father, and the moving cause of his love to sinners. To many minds, inclined to these errors, the expressions in question gives encouragement. And though Symington, Stevenson, and others, explain the expressions very differently from these views, yet, by their favour, it will be used where those explanations are never seen, and even when seen are not understood. Dr. Anderson justly objects to Bellamy's expression, "*God willing to be reconciled,*" and Mr. Stevenson to the expression that "*God is a reconciled Father.*" Though these errors are very different, yet the expression, "*a reconciled God,*" will, to many minds, convey both ideas. But it may be replied that some will pervert scripture expressions, which we ought not, for this cause, to lay aside. True, but let it be a scripture expression, or, at least, scriptural, when we make this plea for its use. It is said, however, that the expression in question is scriptural, for *reconcile* is synonymous with *pacify*, which is a word used in scripture in application to God. It is agreed that *reconcile*, in its ordinary use in civil matters, and *pacify*, in the scripture use of it, are so nearly synonymous, that we will not contend about the difference. But *pacify* is in scripture applied to God, in one uniform, figurative sense, and the explanations of the word *reconcile*, given by Symington and Stevenson, are good and sufficient in application to the word *pacify*; yet *reconcile* is, in scripture, applied only to the sinner, *the offender*, and has, in this application, a peculiar meaning. If, then, we take it at one time as applied to the sinner in scripture, and at another, as applied to God, in our ordinary sense of the word in civil affairs, we produce confusion, and perhaps encourage error. In our common affairs, the word *reconcile* signifies a change of mind, from a state of enmity or disagreement, to a state of peace and harmony: holy scripture uses it in a very different sense, and very seldom, if ever, in this ordinary sense. And so far are the words *reconcile* and *pacify* from being synonymous in holy scripture, that God is pleased to say that *he is pacified*, and that the *sinner* in Christ is *reconciled*; but never, that the *sinner is pacified* in Christ, and *he reconciled*.

In order to a clear and definite view of the question, we shall first define it. The question is not, whether Christ made a proper, a valid, and a definite atonement for sin; whether he made a vicarious satisfaction to divine justice in the stead of his people, on which ground alone they are completely justified; whether God is at peace with his people in Christ—nor whether the atonement by Christ is the entire ground of this peace, to which there is nothing to be added by the sinner. All this is held affirmatively on both sides of the question; but do the scriptures ascribe to Christ the work of reconciling God to sinners? or, is it scriptural and proper to say that "*God is reconciled in Christ?*" The position we assume is, *that this expression is not scriptural nor proper*. And we think that

little more will be necessary on this point than to ascertain the true meaning of the word *reconcile*, in holy scripture: and this we shall endeavour to do, first examining some meanings that have been attached to the word.

Mr. Stevenson asserts, that those "firm friends of the atonement," who oppose his use of the word *reconcile*, have "limited its meaning to the change which takes place in the mind of the sinner in conversion." We will not dispute his assertion, that those with whom he was conversant did so, but *we* do not so limit the scripture use of it. So far from this, we believe, it is seldom, if ever, used in this sense in holy scripture.

Symington and Stevenson both *assume*, that the word *reconcile*, in holy scripture, must be understood to mean the same that it does in the ordinary affairs of life, which is a change of mind, from enmity to peace; and, under this assumption, they feel compelled to strain texts to a meaning directly the reverse of that which they express. Thus Symington, quoting Mat. v. 23, 24: "If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift;" says, "This passage is most decisive. The person addressed, is the offender; he has nothing against his brother, but his brother has something against him; yet is he exhorted to go and be reconciled to his brother, that is, *to go and reconcile his brother to himself*. This is the only meaning which the passage can bear, consistently with the terms employed." But why is this the only meaning the passage will bear? Why will it bear no meaning but the reverse of what it says? Solely, in Mr. Symington's mind, because he had inadvertently fixed the meaning of the word *reconcile*, to be a change of mind or affection. On this supposition, indeed, the words would bear no other meaning. But why did it not occur to him, rather than reverse the expression of the text, to look into the meaning of the word *reconcile*? A discovery of its true meaning would save the text from this torture. And this was the more necessary, because this is but one specimen of the many texts which must be thus tortured, by assuming such a meaning of the word *reconcile*. In almost every text where the word *reconcile* occurs, this same process must be used, or another meaning of the word be found. Stevenson falls into the same mistake, on the same and similar texts. See OFFICES OF CHRIST, page 195, 198, First Amer. Edit. Mr. Stevenson also formally defines reconciliation, as applied to God, to be "the turning away of God's anger or judicial displeasure by the death of Christ." This is the same thing, namely, that to reconcile signifies a change of mind from enmity to peace, or from displeasure to kindness. This we reject as the scripture meaning of the word, and adopt the following as the ordinary, if not the only, meaning of the word *reconcile* in scripture, namely, *the removal of the cause of displeasure*. And to reconcile any one, is *to remove the cause of displeasure which that one has given*. Now if this be the true meaning of the word, the cause for which we contend is evidently gained; for none can say in this sense that God is reconciled to man, as it would mean what no believer can think of without horror. That this is the scripture meaning of the word, we propose to show by a reference to several texts of scripture. We do not consider this a

new discovery of the meaning of the word, but that, in explaining texts, it is generally overlooked; and Mr. Stevenson several times states it, but seems to forget it on the question before us. To support this view of the word *reconcile*, and its use in scripture, consider,

1. When the scriptures speak of reconciliation, it is always the person who has given the offence, and not the person displeased, that is to be reconciled. To support this position, consider Matt. v. 23, 24, before quoted: "Rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee—go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother"—that is, remove the cause of the displeasure which thou hast given. Consequently, as it does not suppose him to be displeased, it does not require him to leave off his displeasure. To the same purpose consider 1 Sam. xxix. 4:—"For wherewith should he reconcile himself to his master?"—Here it is supposed that David had displeased Saul, and that he must remove the cause of the offence by some deed of atonement. To the same purpose consider 2 Cor. v. 18, 19. Where sinners who have given thee offence, are reconciled; that is, the cause of displeasure is removed by the atonement of Christ; and those who gave the offence are the persons reconciled. For supporting the same position, the reader may, at his leisure, examine Rom. v. 10. Eph. ii. 16. Col. i. 21, 22.

2. In offences between men, the person giving the offence is required to make the reconciliation himself.—Mat. v. 23, 24. 1 Sam. xxix. 4, before quoted, plainly support this position. This shows that it is not only his duty, who has given the offence, to make the reconciliation, but that, in the cases supposed, he is able to do it; because it refers to his own deeds, and not to his neighbour's affections immediately, which are not in his power. That is, he must remove the cause of displeasure which he has given.—This is to reconcile himself.

3. Under the idea of offences against God, as it is man, the offender, that is always said to be reconciled, so it is always the Lord Jesus Christ that is said to make the reconciliation. The proof of this is abundant, as Rom. v. 10: "For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son." To the same purpose we might quote 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, Eph. ii. 16, Col. i. 21, 22, with many other passages. The reason of this is, that though man was bound to suffer the penalty of the law, or remove the offence given, yet being unable, Christ as his surety performs this work. And as it is the sinner, the offender, that is to be reconciled by Christ, so it is the *cause of divine displeasure* given by man, that is to be removed by Christ. This is the reconciliation.

4. When our reconciliation by Christ is spoken of, it is always referred to his priestly office; that is, as effected by his death. So Rom. v. 10: "For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son." To the same purpose consult Eph. ii. 16. Col. i. 21, 22. Dan. ix. 24. If *reconcile* signified our change of heart in conversion, it would have been referred to Christ's kingly office, in the exercise of which he subdues us to himself; but as reconciliation is always referred to Christ's priestly office, in which he has made the atonement, it necessarily signifies the removal of the *cause* of God's judicial displeasure, which man had given. It is true that without the atonement of Christ, our hearts

could not have been changed in conversion; but the atonement is only the meritorious, not the efficient cause of our conversion; it is the ground on which Christ exercises his kingly office in our regeneration and sanctification. Thus in Rom. v. 10, a distinction is plainly made between our reconciliation and our change of heart. "For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life? That is, our reconciliation is ascribed to Christ's *death*, which takes away the *cause* of judicial displeasure, but our change of heart in conversion, which is necessarily included in our salvation, is ascribed to Christ's *life*, and is referred to reconciliation or atonement as the meritorious ground of it. Thus reconciliation by Christ signifies the removal of the *cause of judicial displeasure*, and not directly the *judicial displeasure* itself, which, in holy Scripture, is always expressed by other terms.

5. Reconciliation is the same as atonement. Heb. ii. 17:—"That he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people." Here reconciliation evidently means atonement, which is the removal of the *cause* of judicial displeasure, and not directly the removal of displeasure itself, although it is the ground on which that displeasure is removed. Again, Dan. ix. 24, says, that at a certain period, Christ should "make reconciliation for iniquity." That was to be an atonement by his death, when innumerable of his elect were unborn, and consequently their hearts were unchanged when their reconciliation was made. Lev. xvi. 20, supports the same idea: "And when he hath made an end of reconciling the holy place, and the tabernacle of the congregation and the altar." While the ceremony is here called "*reconciling*," it is in the 18th verse called "atonement," showing that the words are synonymous. Observe also, inanimate things are here said to be reconciled, where there are no affections to be changed; but the sin of the people, as the 16th verse shows, was to be taken away by a reconciliation or atonement.

6. Reconciliation also signifies the application of the atonement in our justification or pardon, when the guilt of the sinner is actually taken away. This appears from 2 Cor. v. 17: "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." Here, "not imputing trespasses" is made synonymous with "*reconciling*." Thus, in the death of Christ there is a meritorious removal of our sins, and on believing there is an actual removal of them, both of which are called *reconciling*, or a removal of the *cause of displeasure*. Besides, this reconciliation is, in the 18th verse, called *reconciling us to God*, and not *reconciling God to us*; and for this plain reason, because here, as well as elsewhere, *reconciling signifies a removal of the guilt of him that is reconciled*. But it is supposed, by some, that in the 20th verse, the word *reconciled* signifies a change of mind from enmity to peace;—"We pray you, in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." We do not view it so. But though this change of mind is implied, the direct meaning of the exhortation is, consent to be in a justified state through Christ, as is provided according to verse 18th: "God hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ."

From all the above considerations we judge ourselves warranted in the following statements:—

1. That *reconcile*, in the uniform scripture use of it, signifies the removal of the *cause of displeasure*, and not the removal of displeasure itself.

2. That *he alone* is, in holy scripture, said to be *reconciled*, whose fault or guilt is removed by an adequate satisfaction. And, therefore,

3. That we cannot, in the scripture sense of the word, say that God is reconciled to us by Jesus Christ. And, consequently,

4. To use the word *reconcile* in application to sinners, in the scripture sense of it, and the same word, in a very different sense, in application to God, is calculated to produce confusion of ideas, and encourage error, especially in the ignorant.

ASPASIO.

ART. IV.—*Farther Remarks on Societyism.*

(Concluded from page 538.)

THE success of the Anti-Slavery Society has been triumphant in foreign countries; and its recent organization has effected in our own, fully as much as its friends had anticipated. It has been one efficient means of bringing the question before this nation, which is an article of her creed—whether “all men are created equal,” or, whether a portion of them are mere appendages of humanity? And our Anti-Slavery Societies, antecedently, were very efficient, particularly in New York and Pennsylvania.

In Great Britain, those societies have been an efficient means of removing mountains on the subject of slavery. For more than two hundred years prior to the abolition of slavery in the British Colonies, had the African slave trade been carried on by Christian nations, both Catholics and Protestants—by the subjects of monarchs, and citizens of republics. The feelings of humanity, and the powers of conscience, were almost universally and totally paralyzed. Individuals were occasionally found, who protested against the traffic, but their voices were unheeded. For two centuries, not a word in reprobation of the trade had been uttered, within the walls of the British Senate. In 1776, this long silence was first broken by Mr. David Hartley, who moved, in the House of Commons, that the slave trade “was contrary to the laws of God, and the rights of man;” but the resolution was promptly rejected. Seven years afterwards a petition against the trade, the first ever offered, was presented by the Quaker Society, to the House of Commons; but that body did not condescend, even to consider it. At this unpropitious period, the moral world was enveloped with an impenetrable veil of darkness on the subject of slavery.

July, 1783, six Quakers met in London, to take into consideration, what could be done to effect the liberation of the Negro slaves, in the West Indies, and for the discouragement of the slave trade on the coast of Africa. These men were determined to hold frequent meetings, of which regular minutes were kept. Their first object was, to enlighten and purify the public mind, which they adopted means to effect—and they engaged the celebrated Clarkson as their agent, who was very successful in arousing the sensibilities of the British public. This enterprise was divested of its sectarian character, and the committee added six to its number, from other deno-

minations—from which period we may date the commencement of the British Anti-Slavery Society from the year 1786, or 1787. This society soon became an important body—it was soon apparent, that in union there is strength;—gradually members of Parliament, dignitaries of the church, and political leaders, subscribed to its funds, and avowed their hostility to the trade. Petitions were multiplied to the Parliament. It now condescended to notice them in 1788, and voted, that at the next session, they would take their petitions into consideration. Soon active opposition was raised to them, and all the conflicting elements brought into requisition—they were denounced as fanatical hypocrites. The good and great Wilberforce had these opprobrious epithets applied to him in the House of Parliament by name. Their enterprise would lead to insurrection, massacre to the colonies; and Great Britain, herself, would be ruined—her revenue would be reduced, and her merchants and manufacturers would become bankrupt. The trade was justified by the press, and even ministers of religion stepped forth to vindicate it on scriptural authority. As illustrative of public opinion, at this time, we give the title of two pamphlets, published in London, in 1788, namely, “Slavery, *no Oppression.*” And “Scriptural Researches on the Licitness of the Slave Trade, showing its Conformity with the Principles of Natural and Revealed Religion, delineated in the Writings of the Word of God: by the Rev. R. Harris.”

What were God’s two special organizations, which *he* has established for the benefit of mankind, *civil government and the church*, employed in at this period? Civil government, contrary to her appointment by God, was the inflicter of the evil, and refused redress; but more particularly, what were the watchmen on Zion’s walls doing?—had God given them up to a “spirit of slumber?” Having eyes, saw they not? Did they not know there was an express statute against man-stealing, which *stood unrepealed*? Exod. xxi. 16. Nay, but was confirmed by the Spirit of God, spoken by the apostle, and was transcribed into the Christian code of laws, 1 Tim. i. 10. Were these things hid from the wise and prudent, and revealed unto babes? We repeat the question, What were the watchmen, on Zion’s walls, employed in, when those six obscure Quakers had to sound the tocsin of alarm? Those that we consider *stones*, as to spiritual life, *had to cry out*; and did they do any *more than* their duty, at so important a crisis?—Alas! alas! for the *light* of the world, she underwent a most *disgraceful eclipse*. Dost thou cry for her sake?—Bless God for a flickering light, if it is a true light from any quarter. “Things that are despised, hath God chosen.” Yet, thanks be to God, he did not leave himself without a witness, even in the church. Though slavery was not judicially condemned, in any of the branches of the Christian church, at that period, except in the Society of Friends; yet it was ministerially rebuked, as the enemies of the cause complained, that the slave trade had been condemned from the pulpit.

Twenty years after the period of the formation of the British Anti-Slavery Society, the slave trade was abolished; and fifty-one years afterwards, slavery was abolished in the British Colonies, on the first of August, 1838, when eight hundred thousand slaves were emancipated in the West India Islands in one day, and put in possession of all the privileges of British subjects; without the clangor

of fire-arms, or garments rolled in blood, as was predicted by the enemies of the cause. Let us not be weary in well-doing, for in due time we shall reap, if we faint not. Jehovah had heard the groaning of those mournful prisoners, and came down to deliver them, and most signally watched over the whole transaction, until it was brought to a happy termination. No Bacchanalian feasts, no vociferous shouts for liberty were heard to disturb the solemnities of that glorious day of jubilee, when liberty was proclaimed to the captives. Nothing was to be seen but the negro going and returning from his place of worship, and thanking God in his rude speech, that he was now elevated to the standing of a man—from which elevated stand the cupidity of his brethren had torn him, and put him on a level with the beasts of the field; not till *seven times had passed over him*, but more than *thirty-five times seven had passed over him*. This momentous event, most triumphantly demonstrates the safety and practicability of immediate emancipation. And why did we doubt it? The path of duty is always the path of safety. The abolition of slavery and the slave trade, by so powerful and conspicuous a nation as Great Britain, certainly was a momentous epoch, and the great zeal *she now* manifests, to have it *expunged* from the world, inspires hope of complete success. So we see, God has made use of these moral combinations that do not *legitimately* belong to either *church* or *state*, as links in the chain of means, to bring about his purposes—"God has chosen the weak things of the world, to confound the things that are mighty, and things which are not, to bring to naught the things that are." They had, at least, the honour to be the first to sound the trumpet, and array for the battle.

God raised up prophets, under the Old Testament dispensation, to rebuke the Church for her delinquency, and *she* is now providentially *rebuked* by *others* performing the work which it was her duty to do. Is it to be wondered at, that God should take the honour from the Church and give it to another, when she is so palpably remiss to her duty? Though *He* never will take his love totally from her, as he will always have a seed to do him service in a church capacity, as long as the world stands. But that such an important reformation should be carried on, by the aid of a number of the men of the world, when the church, as a body, not only refuses her aid, but in a great many instances, openly opposes, is certainly to be deeply deplored—joining hands with the man of sin, excluding revelation from perishing sinners, giving her sanction to wicked laws, knowing that where there is no vision the people perish. Does not a majority of the members of the church say, "Prophecy smooth things" on this subject,—"*like priest, like people?*" But still it may be said, that it is the church that is acting, though not in an organized capacity, yet her members are diffusing her light through the different ramifications of society; these societies are chiefly made up of church members, though non-professors are not excluded from participating, yet they generally exclude themselves. And these church members plead with their *mother*, in their associated capacity, and most earnestly invoke the pulpit, to come up to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord, against the mighty. They have no idea, that they can effect the abolition of slavery without the aid of both church and state. We do not propose to do any thing that is exclusively the duty of either church or state. We do

not think that the time has yet arrived, when it will be no more necessary, for every man to teach his brother, saying, Know the Lord. All that is proposed to be effected by these associations, is to call forth investigation, which we know will be a means of renovating public sentiment, as we know truth is mighty, when presented in her true character. This is particularly necessary in a popular government like ours. We cannot expect to have faithful rulers, as long as the people are corrupt.

It is extremely painful to us, to see such a diversity of sentiment amongst the friends of this reform, as it respects the instruments. But no marvel, Paul and Barnabas differed, as it respected the instruments for the work. We have a gigantic foe to contend with, whose iron grasp threatens to crush both church and state. It is of momentous importance, that we should speak the same things, and act in unison. It is a pity that the friends of so good a cause should fall out by the way. As to the church being one appropriate and potent instrument, we believe there is no diversity of opinion amongst the friends of emancipation. Christ has promised his gracious presence to the faithful preaching of his word, teaching them "To observe *all things* whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo! I am with you always, until the end of the world." We believe, if the word was thus faithfully preached, declaring the whole counsel of God, through the length and breadth of the land, it would supersede the necessity of any other organization to enlighten public sentiment. But in the present rent and divided state of the church, it is very difficult to get her to act in unison, on any subject, particularly on the subject of slavery, where she is herself so *deeply involved in the crime*. Is it not in our time, as with the sins of the Jews, in the time of Nehemiah, when he set a great assembly against the rulers for their oppression?—that even the officers of the house of the Lord are deeply involved in the guilt, to the great disgrace of the Christian religion, and the civil power in the infliction of the wrong, and refuses redress, which is a wicked violation of its duty, Psa. lxxxii. 3, 4. Yet, if we thought that the church and the state were exclusively the instruments, we would be far from putting in the plea of necessity, as a reason, why we should break the beautiful order that God, in his wisdom, hath ordained in his word. We are extremely anxious that the discussion of this question may be continued by others better qualified to do it that justice which its importance demands; and if it is found, on examination, that these organizations are derogatory to God's institutions, we wish them to come to naught.

The information and piety of many of the friends of emancipation, who have conscientious scruples against the action of voluntary associations, entitle their opinions to respect—and we award to them the same integrity of purpose that we claim for ourselves. That they will carefully and prayerfully re-examine this subject, and if, on investigation, they consider these associations lawful means of performing the duties we have specified, which, we presume, will not be denied, are duties which devolve on every human being in society, who is capable of moral action—if such cases in the providence of God present themselves, that they will, with alacrity and energy, promote their interest, as combination of effort often effects what individuals cannot. Union is strength. May we all be directed by that wisdom which is from above.

E.

ART. V.—*Psalmody of the Presbyterian Church.*

As our correspondent "C." has declined to follow up this subject, so well commenced in the last number, it seems incumbent on us to pursue it a little farther. Since the communication of C. was prepared, several articles have appeared in the Presbyterian equally entitled to notice, from which the subjoined extracts are taken.

"I am far from thinking that the present book is perfect; but I should be sorry to see the knife applied so freely as seems to be suggested by one of your correspondents. On the *principle*, alluded to by him, there will be comparatively few hymns left. The "*solecism*" of which he speaks, is not perpetrated by *every* pastor—nor need it be by any. How properly can it be said, "Let us unite in singing,"—"Come, humble sinner," &c. Besides, are not many of the *Psalms* of the same character? and must they not be prefaced in the same way?

"Your correspondent thinks it 'would be too great a happiness to be hoped for, to see all the ministers and people of the Presbyterian church uniting in calling for a thorough *expurgation* of our *Psalms* and *Hymns*,' and he sneeringly quotes the first line of several hymns which have long been favourites in our social meetings, and have been given out by some of the most pious ministers in the Presbyterian Church.

"These hymns have long been endeared to me by the tenderest associations, and no ridicule can hinder me from still singing them with delight, but young persons may be deterred from uniting in them with holy pleasure, when they see them blown upon by one who professes to be a minister of the Gospel.

"But not only the hymns but the psalms also must be *expurgated*, in order to satisfy the poetic taste of Mr. 'W——.' Indeed I do not like the word *expurgation*, if for no other reason, than because it is the favourite word of the Roman Catholic priests of Ireland, who, before they would allow the Bible to be introduced into the public schools of that country, had it *expurgated*, which gave occasion to an eloquent divine to say, that the first expurgator of the Scriptures was the devil, when he set the Redeemer on a pinnacle of the temple, and urged him to cast himself down, in order to prove that he was the Son of God.

"In conclusion, I would remark that the names of Watts, Dwight, Newton, Davies, Cowper, Addison, Nettleton, and others, will continue to be revered by the pious and the good, when the *essays* of your correspondent shall be forgotten."—*Presbyterian of Feb. 22.*

"I infer from what that writer has published, that he is opposed to the introduction of any hymns into the collection now to be made, which do not express direct praise to God.

"Surely he will not pretend to say that all the *Psalms*, as found in the Bible, are the expressions of direct praise to God? Take, for instance, the very first Psalm.

"Every one will see at a glance, that many of the *Psalms* consist almost entirely of prayers; some of curses; some of prophecies; and others of the expressions of pious feelings, and desires, as the 119th: others of Christian difficulty or trial, as the 42d, 73d and 77th; and that others are exhortatory, in whole or in part. Take, for instance, the various expressions of the 34th Psalm, "O magnify the Lord with me, and let us exalt his name together"—"O taste and see that the Lord is good"—"O fear the Lord, ye his saints"—"Come, ye children, hearken unto me; I will teach you the fear of the Lord."—*Ib. March 7.*

In the paper of the same date, the editor remarks as follows:

"We regard it as a question of no small moment, whether the unbounded latitude indulged in framing hymns, has not had a sensible effect in lowering the exalted standard of praise. May we not often be singing for our own entertainment, or for the pleasurable excitation of our animal feelings, when we ought to be expressing our awe of the divine majesty? May we not be led away, by the style of the address, from the profound homage which the act implies we are rendering to God? In our humble opinion, to praise God for his majesty, power, dominion, justice, goodness, word, providence, and grace, is one thing, and to address impenitent sinners is another: whether they should be confounded in public worship as one and the same thing, is the point in controversy."

"The changes proposed are the following:

"1. Let the psalms be so reduced as to be about 150: and let them be in as plain a poetical version as possible.

"2. Let many of the hymns in the present collection be omitted, and the num-

ber increased by the addition of several, more especially on doctrinal subjects; and let them be arranged in a *theological* order, with a suitable index.

"It appears probable, if we had but one version, and one metre for each psalm, of course not all the psalms to be of the *same* metre, all the purposes of interest and instruction would be secured, the people would soon become better acquainted with such a version of the psalms, and consequently would have a much greater attachment for that which they knew so well. Many persons too, might be induced to adopt this version who would not unite in singing our hymns. For if they would use the forced and stiff version of *Rouse*, they might surely use another that would be smoother and more like the original.—*ib. March 23.*

"TO CORRESPONDENTS.—Although we have invited suggestions in relation to our Book of Psalms, yet we do not wish to renew a discussion of the divine warrant of singing hymns of human composition. Our correspondent, 'A Presbyterian of the Old School,' must excuse us therefore for not inserting the remarks denying such a warrant.—*ib. April 11.*

On these extracts we have room and time only to offer a few thoughts, which they naturally suggest to a mind impressed with the vital importance of an uncompromising adherence to divine institutions, in every part of public Christian worship. This is not, indeed, the point in controversy in the columns of the Presbyterian. It appears to be taken for granted, that *taste, public sentiment, or the will of the majority*, are to decide on the *matter* of the church's public praise to Almighty God, in respect both to quality and quantity; and that a decision resting on such a basis, which may be modified or reversed by the *taste* of the next generation, or the public opinion of the next year, is a sufficient foundation for this interesting and holy ordinance of divine worship! What! a *divine* ordinance, in respect to its matter, subject to the ever varying changes of *taste* and public opinion? For this is the question at issue between God and a backsliding church, disguise it as we may; and the reflection that this *is* the question, and that so great a portion of the church *refuses* to meet it, is truly mournful. For it indicates that all the grounds of God's controversy with his professing people have not yet been removed. And we cannot see in these subsequent articles, any foundation for the hope expressed by our correspondent C., "that the claims of the scripture psalms will, perhaps, ere long, be acknowledged by those who have abandoned their use." The discussion in the *Presbyterian* has, in our opinion, developed uncompromising hostility to a scripture Psalmody. But to be a little more particular:—

1. The *first* thing that strikes the mind on a perusal of this discussion, is the *effect* produced by the habit of using human compositions. It has destroyed that reverence for the word of God which it justly claims. The article which appeared under date of February 22d, is sufficient proof of this point. The writer evidently regards the poetical compositions of Watts, and others there named, with an *affection*, and even *reverence*, which are due only to the unadulterated word of life. "They have been given out by *most pious* ministers," and "no ridicule can hinder him from still singing them with delight:" he then intimates virtually, that the suggestion for their *expurgation* is diabolical, as any such suggestion respecting the scriptures certainly would be. Is any ordinance scriptural which leads to such reverence for the works of men? May we not as well worship men themselves as their works? Which is most superstitious, the religious *reverence* yielded to the Pope in the Romish church, or that given to the poetical compositions of Watts and

others, in the Presbyterian church? This writer, however, is quite confident that "the names of Watts, Nettleton, &c., will continue to be *revered* when the essays," published in the *Presbyterian*, "shall be forgotten." Quite possible. But did it never occur to him that the songs of Zion, the holy effusions of the inspired Psalmist of Israel, will be *revered* when every name on the calendar of this world's saints shall be lost in one common oblivion? "The word of the Lord endureth for ever," 1 Pet. i. 25. "And they sing the song of Moses, the servant of God,* and the song of the Lamb,† saying, Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty;‡ just and true are thy ways,§ thou King of saints.|| Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name?¶ for thou only art holy:** for all nations shall come and worship before thee;†† for thy judgments are made manifest."‡‡ Rev. xv. 3, 4. Thus, whether we regard this song of praise for victory over enemies, as belonging to the militant or triumphant church, (it is applicable to both) its *matter* is taken from the Book of Psalms; from which the conclusion is irresistible that this book is to be for ever the matter of the church's praise. Nor does it weaken this argument that the same sentiments are found in other portions of the inspired volume, because all that infinite wisdom saw necessary to constitute a perfect system of praise, has been selected from other places, and imbodyed in this book, (2 Sam. 22: Ps. 18: 1 Chron. 16: Ps. 105: 1—15,) which, thus perfected by the Spirit of God, has been appointed to continue in the church, to the exclusion of every thing else, 2 Chron. 29: 30. Eph. 5: 19.

2. These articles manifest a slight regard for divine appointment. The arguments urged by the different writers have generally no more regard to the authority of scripture, than a discussion in Congress respecting the tariff, or any other question of public policy. This constant appeal to public opinion, majorities, taste, &c., is in bad *taste* for Protestants, and has a powerful tendency to unhinge the very foundations of the Christian church.

3. There is great ambiguity of language used, and even a misrepresentation of facts. The writer under date of March 28, speaks of their collection as a *version*—frequently calling it such. Is this fair dealing with the people? Is it even candid? Or must we suppose it arises from want of information? But whatever may be the cause, which belongs not to us to determine, it is an imposition on the public. For the composer of these Psalms regarded their departure from the original, which he represented as "almost *opposite* to the spirit of the gospel," "*contrary* to the new commandment of loving our enemies," and finally attempted to "*convert* David into a Christian," as their chief excellency. And now we are gravely told that these Psalms, and others like them, are "more like the original," than the "forced and stiff version of *Rouse!*" Shame, that such perversion of facts should dishonour religious controversy!

But the asperity of feeling against a scripture Psalmody, it must be confessed, has been a little softened since the days of Watts. It is not now *contrary* and *opposite* to the gospel, it is only the

* Ps. 90.

† Ps. 26; 7. 40: 6. 118: 23.

‡ Ps. 24: 7—10. 110.

§ Ps. 50. 72: 2.

† Ps. 22, and indeed most of the Book of Psalms.

§ Ps. 89: 14.

¶ Ps. 2: 6. 45: 1, and elsewhere.

** Ps. 16: 10. 98: 1. †† Ps. 72. 89.

“forced and stiff version of Rouse.” We are thankful even for this small crumb of favour, in our painful anxiety to see divine institutions more esteemed in the church. But, here again, we are compelled to complain of misrepresentation. The version now in common use, by those who still maintain a scripture Psalmody, is **NOT** the version of Rouse. Will our opponents ever admit the truth on this point, so important in the controversy? If not important, why persist in repeating an untruth, after it has been denied again and again? Why maintain dogged silence respecting this denial? Will it be said that it continues to be repeated only by those who have never seen the denial? This is not satisfactory. Because the repetition is *published* by such as certainly have seen it. Brethren, let us maintain fair dealing. Nothing valuable is gained by an opposite course; but much is lost.

We will once more briefly state the truth on this point: Sir Francis Rous, or Rouse, a member of the British House of Commons, made a metrical version of the Book of Psalms, some time before the year 1640.* This version was sent by the House of Commons to the Westminster Assembly, who, in the language of the historian, “dismissed from Rous’ version, every extraneous composition. The Assembly were determined to keep not only *the sense*, but, as far as possible, *to the very words* of the sacred text.” In this work the Church of Scotland assisted. It was then sent to Scotland for correction and improvement; and, *after many alterations were made on the original copy*, the English Parliament, in 1645, approved Rous’ Psalms, as amended by the Westminster Assembly. But the improvement of this version of the Psalms did not rest here; it afterwards passed through three consecutive commissions of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 1647–48–49, and was finally sanctioned by the Scottish Parliament, January 8, 1650. As thus improved, it was preferred by many in England to the version which had been adopted by their own Parliament. Accordingly, we find an edition of this Scottish version, the one now in use, published in England in 1673, with a recommendatory preface by Dr. Owen, and subscribed by twenty-five other English divines, to the following effect: “Our devotion is best secured, where the **MATTER AND THE WORDS** are of immediately divine inspiration; and to us, David’s Psalms seem plainly intended by those terms of *Psalms and Hymns, and Spiritual Songs*, which the Apostle useth,” Eph. v. 19, Col. iii. 16.†

3. While the determination of the editor of the Presbyterian not “to renew a discussion of the divine warrant, for singing hymns of human composition,” is to be deeply regretted, we have no sympathy for “A Presbyterian of the Old School,” to whom this privilege has been denied. He is most likely one of those *consistent* individuals, who, seized with an itching for popularity, or some other equally worthy motive, has *crept away* from some one of those *smaller* bodies which continue the use of a scripture Psalmody into the General Assembly. Honourable men in that church regard these individuals much in the same light as do those whom they have abandoned; and they have no right to complain, though they should be denied the privilege of a hearing in their publications.

* Baillie’s Letters, January 1, 1644. Neal’s History of the Puritans.

† For a more full account, see an article copied from the *Christian Recorder* into the second volume of the *Religious Monitor*, p. 247.

When we reflect upon this determination of the Presbyterian, upon the judicial enactment of a portion of the Associate Reformed Church, that some in her communion cannot conscientiously be *restricted* to the use of a scripture Psalmody, and upon the eager desire of a portion of the Reformed Presbyterians to unite with them, their conscientious scruples to the contrary notwithstanding, we have little hope we shall live to see any portion of the Protestant churches *returning* generally to the use of a scripture Psalmody. Yet we have not the least doubt that that day will come, in God's set time to favour Zion. And knowing as we do, that God has promised his blessing only in the observance of institutions of his own appointment, and that he has threatened the heaviest kinds of spiritual judgments upon every departure from these institutions, it is surely incumbent on us to warn, to admonish, to entreat our fellow men to return to these old paths.

Finally: we are not conscious of any sectarian, or party, or other improper feeling, in these remarks. On the point in question, and especially one other, which shall be nameless at present, we conscientiously regard our brethren of the General Assembly as dangerously, radically wrong, while we discover, at the same time, much in that church worthy to be admired and imitated. Her devotion to learning; her zeal for a more general diffusion of religious knowledge; her large contributions to the cause of God; her enlightened, warm-hearted attachment to her own institutions (we speak of the Old School;) her liberal support of her religious periodicals; may well flush *our* cheeks with a deep tinge of shame. These are the monuments of her glory. But how is it with us? We could point to some sections of our own church, distinguished above others for wealth, who give comparatively nothing; whose annual contributions are less than those of the daily labourer for his bread, in other sections. Others manifest little or no attachment to the peculiarities of our profession; and others, again, betray open hostility. Where then are the fruits of a sound profession? You condemn others, justly, for disregarding the *form* of godliness, and yet withhold the offerings of the Lord yourselves! You maintain one divine institution, but disregard another! In this you also are dangerously, radically wrong. Know ye not, that some among us have the form of godliness, but deny its power? that some are mere hearers of the word? While they would justly shudder at the thought of profaning gospel ordinances, by their indifference and worldly mindedness, if not avarice, they are prevented from lifting a finger to sustain those institutions which they profess to regard with so much veneration! They support neither their ministers, their theological seminary, their missionaries, nor their publications! To these evils the appropriate remedy should be applied without delay: "I know thy works, and thy labour, and thy patience, and how thou canst not bear them which are evil: and thou hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars: and hast borne, and hast patience, and for my name's sake hast laboured, and hast not fainted. Nevertheless, I have somewhat *against* thee, because thou hast left thy first love. Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent," Rev. ii. 2—5.

ART. VI.—*Answer to B.'s Queries in the Number for October.*

YOUR correspondent's first query is, Wherein does a divine commission consist, by virtue of which, a man is entitled to the prayers of the church as a minister?

Second, Are all who profess to preach the Gospel, so entitled?

I propose giving only a very brief answer, and shall reply to the second query first, and that in a word. All who profess to preach the Gospel, are, undoubtedly, not entitled to be considered as having a commission from the Head of the Church, and, of course, are not to be prayed for as if they had. For this simple reason, that many who make such a profession, have no such commission; neither is it the Gospel which they utter. But the question on this point need make no difficulty in the exercise of prayer, because we are not in the habit of specifying, by name, those for whom we pray, nor is it necessary, in all cases, to determine in our own minds, the persons or societies of men to whom the characters, mentioned by us, properly belong:—for example, when I pray for a blessing on *all that love our Lord Jesus Christ*, I am sure it is but a very small part of them that I have any knowledge of, and I also know that many who claim and profess that character, have no right to it, yet even among such professors as come within the sphere of my knowledge, I may not decide, peremptorily, to whom it belongs and to whom it does not. Such a decision belongs to the Searcher of hearts, the Hearer of prayer; and the same applies to such as profess to preach the Gospel. As to the commission of many, I may be entirely in doubt, and if I were called to any such act as implied a recognition, I would be under necessity of examining and making some kind of a decision, but I am completely relieved from this difficulty in prayer, for I can leave it with Him who knows perfectly, and to whom it belongs to bestow the blessing.

The first query is of more practical importance, especially in such times as we live in, when any bold and lawless individual may arrogate to himself the title and authority of a minister of Christ, and be supported in his pretensions by many calling themselves Christians. Here we might observe—

1. God never sent any man on any work, without sufficient testimonials that he was sent. This is indispensable to warrant men to receive them in the character they claim. And the testimonial given will always be of the same nature with the commission. If any have an extraordinary commission, they will also have extraordinary evidence of it, such as a power of working miracles; so it was with Moses, Exod. iv. 1—10; so it was with the apostles, and so it was even with our Lord Jesus himself. "The works that the Father hath given me to finish, even the same works that I do, they bear witness of me that the Father hath sent me." If any have an ordinary commission, he must also produce the ordinary evidence or testimonial of it, namely, the appointment and ordination of presbytery after trial, 1 Tim. iii. 10, compared with chap. iv. 22.

2. This ordinary commission for the ministerial work is of no less importance than the extraordinary, it may be considered the very link that connects divine influence with human instrumentality. We are well taught that the efficacy of all ordinances is not from

them, nor from him that administers them, but solely from Christ the fountain. By observing his appointed order we acknowledge this truth, and neglecting the order, our administrations are cut off from the fountain of influences. Moreover, he who presumes to preach the Gospel without a regular scriptural commission, is guilty of a manifold falsehood and impiety: in the scripture reckoning, indeed, it is not preaching at all, for *how can they preach except they be sent?* Preaching is not merely a declaration of scripture truths, but an authoritative offer of the Gospel. And how shall he who has no authority to make such an offer, presume to do it without the greatest impiety?

3. There are many cases that might seem to be exceptions or difficulties, according to the foregoing remarks, as the reformers who had not ordination by presbytery, and yet we acknowledge them truly commissioned by the Head of the church.

Answer. There is great difference between an ordinary and settled state of the church, and what may be lawful in an unsettled state, such as they lived in; this they themselves particularly considered on this very point.

Again, there are Episcopalians and Independents who have no proper scripture commissions, and yet we own them as truly ministers of Christ.

Answer. There is a difference observed between the essence and the form of ordination; these may have the first, as the reformers also had, though they may not have the last. But a question that comes much closer in our times, is, if a man who has been regularly commissioned to preach the Gospel shall be again, by the church court, unjustly deposed from the ministry; is he to be considered a minister or not? Without hesitation we answer he is not a minister. This answer will no doubt startle many, and the case of the first seceders will occur as a difficulty as well as many others which might be cleared, if our limits permitted; but two or three simple cases we think will clearly establish the soundness of the answer given. When civil powers depose any from office, however unjustly, and though the whole community might cry out against the injustice, yet they would hold the person as deposed, because the proper authority had done it, the case would be in all points parallel, if the same were done in the church. Again, if the church courts were unjust, and, in some respects, disorderly to admit one to the ministry, he would still be a minister till the former deed were reversed. Once more, if the courts were unjustly to refuse admission to a person into the ministry, no one would ever think of considering him a minister: there is no essential difference between these cases and the one proposed. And the main reason, I might say the only reason, why the civil decision in the supposed case would be regarded more than a similar ecclesiastical decision, is, that the civil authority may inflict corporeal or pecuniary penalty, of which transgressors are generally much more sensible than of those that are aimed only at the conscience.

The question we have here considered, supposes the ecclesiastical decision to be unjust, because this is the general cry of all culprits, sustaining themselves judges of their own case, and taking for granted, the main point to be proved; but the fact is, that ecclesiastical decisions, essentially wrong, are very rare, and where church courts are

allowed to act with that liberty which properly belongs to them, there is no hazard of such a result, for they have the promise of the Holy Spirit's guidance. This subject may afford us many useful reflections, such as—

1. They who support the pretensions of unauthorized men to preach the Gospel, cannot receive any spiritual benefit from them, but are partaking with them in their daring wickedness. The case is the same, whether such men have never had authority, or that it has been again taken from them.

2. It is the duty of every hearer to be satisfied of the regular scriptural commission of the preacher to preach. The rule of trial is in Deut. xiii. 1—namely, orderly as to form, and agreeing with the received standard as to doctrine. The church of Ephesus is commended for faithfully applying this rule, Rev. ii. 2. They who disregard this rule are utterly inexcusable, when, in the just judgment of God, they are given up as a prey to seducers.

3. When the adherents of refractory culprits say they can preach as well as ever, notwithstanding they be under the heaviest church censure, they in effect say that the efficacy of ordinances proceeds from him that administers them, and not from Christ; because they see the man possesses the same ability of utterance, without divine authority as with it, and they ask for nothing more to produce the effect.

C.

ART. VII.—*To Patrons.*

As the time for the annual meeting of Synod approaches, it is expected that patrons and agents will remember our liabilities, and that the Monitor would be as useful to many of their neighbours, over whom they have some influence, as to themselves. We doubt not that the course we have pursued, on the question of Slavery, meets the general approbation of the church. Her public acts warrant this conclusion. Some think we have published too much on this subject; others think too little: but the more judicious will perceive the necessity of variety. Whatever may be the judgment passed upon the sixteenth volume of the Religious Monitor, we have endeavoured to select from the great mass of matter which presented itself, such as appeared to us most interesting and valuable. We have excluded some things against our inclination, through fear of giving offence; and, after a review of the whole, we see nothing that can be justly regarded as offensive; though it is not supposed that all have been *pleased*. This could not be expected.

It is, perhaps, proper to state, that the agitation of the abolition question has reduced our subscription list more than all other causes combined; and, in many cases, not so much from opposition to the cause of equal rights, as a regard to *personal safety*. In most of the slave states, no person can receive any publication through the post office, which advocates emancipation, without hazarding life;

nor, if once suspected, a letter from a friend. The following is a copy of a letter recently received from an old patron residing in one of those states :

“ ———, March 17, 1840.

“ *Rev. Sir,*—I have just received my March number. As it contains some things peculiarly offensive to this community, which have already been noticed, and as this might bring me into serious trouble, I hope you will discontinue it, and not send the April number. Please let me know the amount of my arrears, and I will forward it.
Respectfully your humble servant, ————.”

Those who are informed of the many acts of violence which have been recently perpetrated in the slave states, will not think these fears groundless. To send another number might, and probably would, lead to the murder of this individual. It seems he is already marked: *offensive things have been noticed*. Thus our friends, who approve of the course we have taken, on the question of Slavery, will see the necessity of additional exertion, that this deficiency of support may be supplied.

That so many have continued its unwearied supporters through a period of sixteen years, notwithstanding all its defects and vicissitudes, is cause for gratitude and devout thanksgiving to the Giver of all good, in whose hand are the hearts of all men. To the instrumentality of such men is the church indebted for her stability and continuance. Death, only, has terminated the patronage of many of this class of persons. In running the eye over these honoured and beloved names of departed brethren in Christ, the mind is involuntarily filled with mournful, but animating reflections.

Mournful, that the period of human life and usefulness is so exceeding brief. Those who, sixteen years since, directed the affairs of state, filled the seats of science, or called, with fervour and eloquence, upon their fellow men, to “flee from the wrath to come,” have, with comparatively few exceptions, gone to their reward. We must follow them speedily. Before the lapse of another period of time of equal length, the hand which traces these lines, and the eye which may happen to give them a passing, and, perhaps, thoughtless glance, will, most likely, be a senseless, corrupted mass; and then, reader, your moral character and mine shall be consummated, and our eternal destiny fixed—irrevocably fixed. “For the living know that they shall die; but the dead know not any thing, neither have they any more a reward: for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished; neither have they any more a portion for ever in any thing that is done under the sun.” “Now, set your heart and your soul to seek the Lord your God.”

Animating, because their steadfastness in this, as in other and more important duties, evinced the sincerity of their profession.

They did not inquire who was the instrument in any good work, but what was its character and tendency. That *natural* love, and hatred, and envy, which has perished, did not regulate their conduct. They were not men-pleasers; neither did they seek honour one of another. Happy are all such as have learned to pursue an undeviating course of moral conduct, under the guidance of the word and Spirit of God; regardless alike of their own, or the natural passions of others, and of the smiles and reproaches of a guilty world. And *animating*, because we have good hope, through grace, of participating with them in the felicity and glory of heaven when this brief, but rugged warfare shall have terminated. "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God! Therefore, the world knoweth us not; because it knew him not. Beloved, now are we the sons of God; and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is."

With such views and feelings, we purpose to go on with another volume, not knowing whether we shall be spared to complete it. The best articles we can procure from all the sources within our reach, which have a tendency to impart a knowledge of the doctrines, and to enforce the practical duties of the Christian religion, especially union and harmony in maintaining our public profession, together with such intelligence as may be deemed most important, will comprise its contents.

ART. VIII.—*John Welsh.*

WHO am I, that he should first have called me, and then constituted me a minister of the gospel of salvation these years past, and now, last of all, to be a sufferer for his cause and kingdom! Now let it be so that I have fought my fight, and run my race, henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, will give, not to me only, but to all that love his appearing, and choose to witness that Jesus Christ is the King of saints; and that his Church is a free kingdom under heaven, not only to convocate, hold, and keep her meetings, and conventions, and assemblies, but also to judge all her affairs, in all her meetings and conventions amongst her members and subjects. These two points, 1st, That Christ is the head of the church, 2d, That she is free in her government from all other jurisdiction except His—these two points, I say, are the special cause of our imprisonment, being now convicted as traitors for maintaining them. We have been ever waiting with joyfulness to give the last testimony of our blood in confirmation thereof, if it should please our God to be so favourable as to honour us with that dignity; yea, I do affirm, that these two points above written, and all other things which belong to Christ's crown, sceptre, and kingdom, are not subject, and cannot be, to any other authority but His: so that I would be most glad to be offered up as a sacrifice for so glorious a truth; it would be to me the most glorious

day, and the gladdest hour, I ever saw in my life; but I am in His hand to do with me whatsoever shall please Him.—*John Welsh, to the Countess of Wigton. Scots Worthies. Glas. 1833. Vol. 1, p. 129.*

ART. IX.—*Present Conflict of the Church of Scotland with the Courts of Law.*

WE subjoin the latest intelligence of the present position of the ecclesiastical and civil courts of Scotland, in relation to those vacant parishes which have been affected by the decision of the House of Lords, and interdicts of the Court of Session. The parish of *Marnoch*, we believe, in Aberdeenshire, was nearly in similar circumstances with that of Auchterarder, at the rising of the General Assembly in May last. Steps, however, have been very recently taken in this instance which are deeply interesting, and which give a decided tone to the whole proceedings in the controversy of non-intrusion. The facts of the case are briefly these:—The trustees of Lord Fife, the Patron, in 1837, presented Mr. John Edwards, licentiate, to the vacant parish of Marnoch. He had been schoolmaster, and assistant to the former incumbent for three years, and his character and abilities were, of course, well known to the parishioners. At the time of moderating the call, out of 300 heads of families, 261 publicly dissented against his settlement, and only *one* resident communicant signed the call. In 1838, the General Assembly directed the Presbytery of Strathbogie to reject the presentee, which was done accordingly; the patrons acquiesced in the rejection, and issued a new presentation in favour of another licentiate. After the decisions of the House of Lords, and of the Court of Session in the case of Auchterarder, Mr. Edwards applied for, and obtained an order of the Supreme Law Court in Scotland, to the Presbytery, to take him on trials and proceed with his induction. This decree was obtained in June last. The General Assembly of 1839, had delegated to the Commission special power to deal with this case, and they accordingly prohibited the Presbytery from proceeding to the settlement of Mr. Edwards, and instructed them to report any change of circumstances at the next meeting of the Commission. The majority of the Presbytery, however, being *seven to three*, resolved to obey the civil Court, rather than the superior ecclesiastical Court, to which, by a fundamental law of Presbyterianism, they were amenable; and after various disorderly proceedings at different meetings, on the 4th of December, they determined to disobey the Commission, and take Mr. Edwards on trial. The minority, consisting of the Moderator and two other ministers, who had throughout ably contended for the independent jurisdiction of the church, and for sustaining the acts of the Assembly and Commission, protested, and the whole matter came before the Commission, at its adjourned meeting, which met in Edinburgh, on the 11th December. As much expectation had been previously excited, this meeting of the Commission was the largest that had ever been known to assemble. The Commission adopted a series of resolutions, submitted by Mr. Candlish, in which they disapproved of the conduct of the Presbytery of Strathbogie, suspended the seven ministers of the majority until the next meeting of the Ge-

neral Assembly, appointed ministers to intimate the act of suspension in the several parishes, and made provision for supplying these parishes with public ordinances. This bold and decisive measure was carried by a very large majority;—121 voting for it, and only 14 against it. The speeches of several of the members in favour of the resolutions, particularly those of Mr. Candlish and Dr. Chalmers, were admirable, breathing a spirit of lofty Christian determination, and displaying an extensive knowledge of the principles of the church's constitution, and an increasing regard to her spiritual liberties. This bold measure, it is manifest, was unexpected by the opponents of the church's independence, and has no little non-plussed them; and it has brought the collision between the Civil and Ecclesiastical Courts to a point, in which the church has publicly committed herself to a course, in which she has declared there will be no vacillation or compromise.

On Sabbath, the 22d December, the ministers appointed by the Commission proceeded to the parishes of the suspended ministers, preached and publicly intimated the sentence of suspension. Previously, the suspended ministers had applied for, and obtained an interdict from the Court of Session, but not in terms as extensive as they or their friends expected. The judges only declared that the ministers sent by the Commission might not preach in the churches or church-yards, or school-houses, in the respective parishes, but declared they had no power to prohibit them from preaching or making intimations in any other places of the parishes. It is evident, whatever enemies or timid friends may assert or surmise, that the Commission carry with them the good sense and friendly feeling of the vast majority of the people of the Church of Scotland, in the step they have taken. The ministers sent to the parishes of the suspended ministers, not only met with no opposition in the discharge of their solemn duty, but were attended by numerous audiences when they preached, many of them, though in the depth of winter, in the open air.

We perceive, from a late number of the *Scottish Guardian*, that, at the instance of the Earl of Kinnoul, and Mr. Young, his presentee, a summons of reparation and damages has been lately served on the individual members constituting the majority of the Presbytery of Auchterarder: the damages are laid at £5000, for Lord Kinnoul, and £10,000 for Mr. Young, and £1000 for the expenses of process; in all, £16,000. A Bill of Interdict and Suspension, from the Court of Session, against the Presbytery of Inverness, has been obtained by Mr. Simon Mackintosh, the Crown presentee to the united parishes of *Daviot* and *Dunlichity*, who had been vetoed by a majority of male heads of families. The Presbytery have referred the case to the General Assembly, at its next annual meeting. Once more we say, let the Church of Scotland faithfully and fearlessly do her duty, and she has nothing to dread from these confusions. The truth is mighty, and it must ultimately triumph.—*Belfast Covenanter*.

[From the Canadian Christian Examiner.]

ART. X.—*Presbytery versus Episcopacy.*

IN the present times when a party in the Church of England are proceeding with a retrograde movement to unite themselves with the Romanists, whom they had professed to have forsaken for ever, a few remarks on the unscriptural character of episcopacy may not be unprofitable. It is to be regretted that the ambition and blood-thirsty spirit which the heads of the Church of England manifested during the reigns of Charles the First and Second, as well as during the brief reign of James the Second, should be so soon forgotten by the Christian community. The late Mr. M'Gavin, of Glasgow, though an Independent, previous to his death, showed a truly Christian and patriotic spirit in publishing, in two handsome volumes, accounts of the martyrs who suffered in Scotland by the hands of their prelatical enemies, together with the dying testimonies of these holy men against prelacy. Mr. M'Gavin was a man who had studied the Popish Controversy, and who, in the course of these studies, saw the resolute stand which these men made against its encroachments into the kingdom, and it was doubtless his desire to draw the attention of his friends to a portion of history well worthy of their thoughtful consideration. Another motive, also, doubtless influenced the mind of that eminent man, in undertaking the editorship of these volumes, and this was the debt of gratitude which all denominations of Christians in the kingdom owed to the martyrs in lifting up a standard against popish and prelatical usurpation. The prelates sought to overcome them in argument by captious questions; the brethren were mighty in the scriptures, and their adversaries were worsted—their rage was now kindled, and for thirty years they persecuted them to the death. Considering these things, we cannot but think that a yearly commemoration of the doings and sufferings of our Presbyterian forefathers might be of advantage in the present times, more especially when the followers of Laud are again on the field, ranging themselves side by side with their popish allies. Meanwhile we shall offer a few hints to show that prelacy is unwarranted by scripture.—The fabric of this system rests on the distinction which they make between a Presbyter and a Bishop. We say that the office is identical—thus in Acts, chapter xx. 17, “And in Miletus he (Paul) sent to Ephesus, and called the *Elders* of the church.” And in addressing them, the apostle thus speaks, verse 28, “Take heed therefore unto yourselves and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you *overseers*, (bishops) to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.” It may be said, why do they receive different names if the office is the same? The explanation is easy. They are called elders, as the heads of the congregations—they are called overseers as set over them in the Lord. A man may be called a parent, and in another view the guardian of his child; but how absurd would it be to infer that it required two separate individuals to perform these offices, merely because their names were different! We give another passage: Titus i. 5, “For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain *elders* in every city, as I had appointed thee.” And in marking the identity of the office, he im-

mediately adds in the 7th verse: "A *Bishop* must be blameless," &c. The inference here is unavoidable—the ordained Presbyter is a Bishop, and possesses all the functions which belong to his brethren, who in another passage, are designated "the Presbytery." It is needless to say that this is subversive of English episcopacy, seeing a Bishop without Presbyters under him would be no Bishop at all.

It is not wonderful that High Churchmen should manifest a strong leaning to popery—their system of a diversity of ranks among the clergy leads to this. In arguing with a papist he would find it a hard matter to defend the ground he occupies. The Romanist would tell him that the Church of England was not apostolical. He would say that the Pope was the vicar of Christ on earth, and head of the church—and inasmuch as her bishops were not confirmed by his authority, they had no power to ordain—yea, the dispensation of word and ordinance by priests ordained by such men was unwarranted by Christ. The man, we say, who believes in a diversity of rank among the clergy, such as exists in the Church of England, will find his mouth closed in opposing the papacy, seeing it is the very principle he sanctions which will justify the office of the Sovereign Pontiff. But on the other hand, should he, on the authority of scripture, deny the Pope's supremacy, and contend that all bishops are equal—he concedes first, the principle we contend for, namely, that scripture is of a superior force to tradition, both in matters of faith and discipline: and second, he is led to adopt another principle inconsistent with episcopacy—we mean the parity of ministers of the Gospel. The Bishop in Rome has no dominion over a Bishop in any other city. His rule is simple usurpation, and so all are equal—a truth we may observe which the Primate of all England would be slow to admit. But we observe farther, that the episcopal theory of church government bears on the face of it the marks of its earthly origin. It obviously supposes that ruling is more honourable than preaching, seeing they deprive the Presbyters of this power and confer it on the Bishops. Hence the Bishop must be decked up and addressed in the courtly phrase of "my lord," and he must, moreover, have his grand cathedral, with its costly appendages. Honour is to be given to whom honour is due; and as ruling is more honourable than preaching, so the Bishop must needs receive *triple* honour. But what says the word of God on this matter? "Let the Elders that rule well be accounted worthy of double honour, *especially* they who labour in the *word and doctrine.*" It is utterly preposterous, with this plain declaration of the mind of the Spirit, to set the ruling Bishop above the preaching Presbyter. The obvious conclusion from such a text is, that the Bishop is *not* superior to the pastor, and, therefore, seeing he does assume a superiority, yea, seeing the fabric of episcopacy rests upon this principle, we say that it is earthly, that is, it is deduced from the maxims current among the "Princes of this world," but wholly opposed to the word of God.

The usurpation of power, by the Bishops of large towns, over the rural pastors, is easily accounted for, by the principles of corrupt human nature; but it is wholly at variance with the wisdom that is from above. When the mother of James and John asked for a lordly power over their brethren, the Lord Jesus disapproved of her peti-

tion, and the reason which Christ gives, strikes at the root of the Bishop's power—"Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. *But it shall not be so among you.*" It will be observed, that Christ does not here refer to the *tyranny* of civil rulers; he refers to them simply as exercising a lordly power over their subjects, which, so far from condemning, the scriptures every where sanction and approve. But however salutary such power might be, when vested in a prince or a magistrate, it is to have no place among the pastors of his people. All are to stand precisely on the same footing, stripped of every mark of personal authority, which would raise them above their brethren engaged in the same work; just as a prince or a magistrate would be one of the people, if denuded of his official power and authority. He would then be of the same rank with them, which he is not, so long as he possesses a power which they have not. Bishops may twist the passage to save their "dominion" and "authority" over their brethren in the ministry; but it manifests that the power which they have received over them has no countenance in scripture.

And neither is their aught of enlarged expediency to justify it—worldly expediency, doubtless, there is, otherwise the office would not be so much coveted and grasped at—but we say, that the power would be better exercised by the presbytery, that is, by all the bishops of a district, than by one man. The chief duty of a presbyter, is the preaching of the gospel, and who better fitted to judge of the qualifications of a candidate, than men engaged in the work, who know its difficulties, and the gifts and graces it requires? To say they can preach and administer the ordinances, but have no concern in the matter of appointing others to the same work, savours of earthly wisdom, a device invented by metropolitans, and their coadjutors, to enhance their authority. It may be said, that in following out this line of argument, we are reducing church government to simple expediency, without any regard to Divine authority. We reply, that we rest church government on Scripture, which requires two orders of men, and only two, which are preaching elders, and ruling elders, or deacons, and seeing no foundation in Scripture for the ordaining bishop, we say that in the nature of things there can be none. What doth the church require of the candidate for ordination? Is it the Hebrew and Greek tongues, to enable him to peruse the original text of holy writ? or, is it the Latin tongue, to enable him to read the writings of the reformers and others? Is it a knowledge of the saving truths of the gospel? Is it an aptitude for teaching—for rebuking the careless, and comforting the afflicted? Then we say, that all and each of these qualifications can be tried and judged of by the presbyters; and not only so, but inasmuch as the wisdom of two, in matters of importance, is of more avail than one, we say, that the Presbyters are better qualified for this work than the bishop: and were a history of the episcopal ordinations, by the churches of Rome and England, drawn up, we think it would bear us out in the assertion. Who are the men the Roman bishops, acting on the *jus divinum*, ordain? They are the men who uphold the reign of idolatry, and will-worship, who suppress the Scriptures, and teach the people to bow to graven images. And who does not know that the bishops of the Reformed Church of England have in general selected those

men on whom to lay their hands who have been most forward in preaching the Arminian doctrines, which their own articles, honestly interpreted, condemn. But it may be said, this is an abuse of the power, on the part of the bishop, for which the doctrine is not responsible. We grant the admission, and would concede these evils to be of no weight, were it established to be a doctrine taught in Scripture, that bishops only have the power of ordination; but we say it is a usurpation on their part, and in the monstrous progeny of evil which it has produced for ages, we see a confirmation of this truth.

On what grounds do episcopalians reject the Pope's authority over the bishops? it is simply on this ground, that there is no scriptural warrant for it; and, therefore, however long standing it may be, the absence of such warrant is fatal to the claim. We apply to themselves the same test. We deny *in toto* the distinction which they would draw between a presbyter and a bishop—we deny the authority of the former over the latter, it being unsupported by the word of God; and however long it may have continued in the church, this can never make good a claim which *ab initio* was of no force and effect. It was the riches and glory of Rome, which led the bishop of that city to claim authority over all bishops. It was no considerations of wisdom and spiritual advantage. It was simply the love of power, which his station, as Bishop in Rome, enabled him at first to make, and afterwards to persist in. And the claim of ordination by the bishop, who preaches in the chief town of his diocese, we trace to the same origin with the usurped dominion of the sovereign pontiff—the superior riches of the congregation over which he presides. The conclusion, therefore, to which we come is this, that episcopacy is unsupported by the word of God: and we may add, that the learned deny to it the authority of the earliest of the fathers. “As to bishops, distinct from presbyters, we have no evidence except that of Ignatius, for the first two centuries. Clement and Polycarp most clearly recognise but two orders. Barnabas and Hermas have nothing very distinct on the subject. Justin mentions only two officers in the church in his time,” (from the year of our Lord 132 to 167,) whom he calls “president,” (πρεσβυτερος) the very word which Paul applies to presbyters, in 1 Tim. iv. 14. and “deacon.” Irenæus (A. D. 184.) uses the terms bishop and presbyter indiscriminately. Thus we see the weight of evidence during the first two centuries; is against the three orders, which may naturally create a suspicion that those passages in Ignatius which refer to them are interpolations; for he stands alone in what he states, for the first two centuries, and not only alone, but opposed to the strongest authorities during that period.*

ART. XI.—*Marks of True Revivals of Religion from a Student's Note Book.*

THE extensive prevalence of the spirit of revivals at the present time renders it important to discriminate the true from the false, the chaff from the wheat. Genuine outpourings of the Holy Spirit, may be distinguished from the spurious by such marks as the following:

* Letters on the Fathers, by Misopapisticus, p. 67, quoted in the Edinburgh Christian Instructor, for June, 1839, p. 249.

1. In true revivals, truth will be the instrument employed. Men are to be sanctified by the *truth*, if sanctified at all. Error, like its father, is the source and great instrument of sin. Truth is in order to godliness.

2. The effects of a genuine revival will be apparent in all the scriptural fruits of the Spirit: submission to the will of God, desire to promote his glory: strong attachment to the institutions, ordinances, and ministers of Christ, that distinguish it from enthusiasm and fanaticism, which affect to despise as needless these appointments of Heaven.

3. The subjects of a true revival will be meek, respectful, humble, and disposed to think others better than themselves; not proud, censorious, and dictatorial.

4. Christ will be the radiant centre and foundation of their clearest views, their strongest affections, and their brightest hopes.

5. There will be a prevalent spirit of peace, concord, and good will—a disposition to remove offences and grounds of alienation.

6. True revivals will be characterized by acts of charity, justice, and mercy.

7. Order, propriety, solemnity, attention to scriptural truth, in reading the Scripture, and giving heed to the things that are spoken, will also appear.

8. There will result from a true revival, more true piety than before its occurrence. The very meaning of the term implies that its power will be especially manifest in the hearts and lives of those who have been truly converted, but who, having lost their first love, are now refreshed with the early and latter rains of Divine grace. To revive, is to quicken into greater life and activity that which was languishing and sickly, though not entirely dead. If this work has been performed, the consequences will be apparent in the church especially, through which, principally, it will reach the hearts, and transform the lives, of the world, that lies in wickedness.—*Presbyterian Advocate*.

[From the Sunday [Sabbath] School Journal.]

ART. XII.—*Profane Use of Scripture.*

THE custom of using scriptural language with levity cannot be too much discountenanced; and one of the best means of correcting the practice in ourselves, and reminding others of its impropriety, is to abstain from any evidence of pleasure or amusement when the sacred text is so used in our presence. The writer of an essay on this subject, in the *New York Observer*, gives these three reasons for his strictures:

1. The practice has no wit in it. The Bible contains truth of such universal application, that passages may be found adapted to every subject, time, and place. Ordinary familiarity with it will suggest these passages on all occasions; and, therefore, a man, with very small pretensions to real wit, may often apply a text, and make a laugh to enforce his own words.

2. The practice is profane, because it is making a vain employment of that which is in itself holy. The Bible is the revelation of God, a transcript of the Divine mind, a glass in which His attributes shine more gloriously than any where else out of heaven. His *name*

is not more sacred than his *word*. But many, who would shudder to utter God's name to make their declarations emphatic or to raise a smile, will prostitute, and garble, and misapply God's word, for these very purposes; and, when censured for it, have no other excuse than the vain plea, "Am not I in sport?"

3. The practice depreciates the reverence which the community feel for the word of God. It brings the Bible into disrepute. You cannot expect men to regard that as *sacred*, which is employed on common occasions, and in a light and trifling manner. Infidels may, with all reason, ridicule the word of God, if Christians incorporate its most solemn truths into their political speeches, and secular writings, and mirthful conversations, when they have no reference to the great object of Divine revelation—to make men wise unto eternal life.

ART. XIII.—Theatres—Philadelphia Museum.

"The newspapers seem generally to regret that the public taste for theatricals begins to subside. What a deplorable thing, to be sure, that people begin to prefer reading and attending lectures, to seeing terrific combats with edgeless swords, and gazing on lovely actresses that are seen best by lamplight! There *will* be revolutions in public taste, and, when it has come to the lowest point, we may reasonably expect to see it rise. The theatres have injured themselves considerably, by their various humbuggeries, their foolish starring system, their tremendous announcements, and their frequent slim performances. They have often disappointed the expectations they have raised, and they must expect to be sometimes disappointed in return."

The foregoing is from the Public Ledger of this city. It intimates a fact, of which we have been, for a long time, suspicious, namely, that theatricals are on the decline amongst us. We have inferred it from a variety of circumstances,—the complaints of managers,—the reduction of prices,—the presentation of low and degrading exhibitions, and, lastly, an attempt to *reform* the stage, by establishing, on a princely scale, an "opera-house," for the benefit of the moral and religious portion of the community. The cause of this decline, in what is called the *genuine drama*, may be attributed, partly to the efforts which have been successfully made, to direct the public attention to literary and scientific lectures; and, partly, to the extensive and powerful influence of practical religion. This state of affairs should be hailed with joy by every true follower of Christ; and no exertion should be spared to push the victory to a final and glorious consummation. But while we congratulate each other upon the success of our efforts thus far, we must be careful, that, in stepping out of one evil, we do not involve ourselves in another. We are apprehensive that Satan has set a trap for us in a quarter where we may not have anticipated it. We refer to many of the exhibitions which are given in the saloon of the Philadelphia Museum. Upon these we have, for some time, looked with a considerable degree of distrust, when we have seen grave and unsuspecting professors of religion crowding, night after night, to witness them. On this subject we may be permitted to speak with some feeling, as we were, a year or two ago, unwittingly caught ourselves, and, like a burned child, we have ever since dreaded this fire. Many of the performances which take place in the Museum, approach so near to those which are often exhibited on the stage, that the only difference between them is the name of the place. Let parents think of this matter a little; and when they are solicited by their children to take them to the Museum, let them examine the bill of entertainment. The name, *Museum*, has a very inoffensive sound. We have been accustomed to connect with it, nothing but what was innocent and instructive; and in our juvenile days, we hailed the approach of Christmas-eve with delight, as the time of our annual visit to the old rooms in the State-house, and, subsequently in the Arcade. But the Museum is not what it formerly was. We give it as our decided opinion, that there are times when it cannot be visited with propriety by any, much less by professing Christians.—*Pearl and Repository*.

ART. XIV.—*Literary Notice.*

RAMSHORN'S LATIN SYNONYMES, from the German, by Francis Lieber.

This is, indeed, a valuable book. The necessity of an accurate study of what are called the Synonymes of a language is obvious; and in regard to no language more than the Latin. Dr. Lieber has placed the teachers and students of this country under great obligations, by furnishing them with so neat an edition of a useful work. Were it necessary, we might set forth the peculiar excellencies of Dr. Ramshorn's Dictionary,—but it will suffice to say, that while *Gardin Dumesnil's Synonymes Latin* is the basis of the work, it is much more accurate and discriminating than that work: and that the treasures of philological learning which abound in Germany, have been brought into requisition to enrich its pages. Dr. Lieber is correct in the opinion expressed in the preface, that this abridgment will supply a want which has long been felt by those who instruct in Latin. We recommend this book cordially to every Latin scholar, who desires to obtain a critical and perfect knowledge of the internal structure of that noble tongue; and sincerely hope that it may find a place upon the desk of every student in our schools and colleges.—*Pearl and Repository.*

QUERIES.—1. What is the use and importance of *music* in the exercise of praise?

2. If you approve of reading the Scripture, when learning to read, why not sing the Scripture when learning to sing?

3. What is duty, as to *singing the praise* of God, by those who can make nothing like music, nor learn to do so? D.

ART. XV.—*To Correspondents.*

THE first Article in the present number, though long, is exceedingly compact, and the importance of the subject will richly repay a second perusal. The contributions of original articles to our pages have never, at any period, been more liberal or valuable. Let the patronage bear a suitable proportion. We have received two replies to "QUERO" on the subject of *Occasional Hearing*, and one in opposition to the views of "A Ruling Elder," which shall receive proper attention in due season, as also other favours of correspondents. The next number will be delayed for the minutes of the approaching meeting of Synod, which is to take place on the fourth Wednesday of May, at Baltimore. Want of room has prevented the insertion of Farther Remarks on Voluntary Associations, which were intended for the present number. We cannot yield assent to the position of C., that unjust deposition deprives a minister of his office. Such a doctrine is not only despotic, but unscriptural and dangerous. We, therefore, take our position among the many whom C. thinks his doctrine will startle. His reference to civil government is not conclusive; because the cases are not parallel. We hope never to see such a doctrine acknowledged in the Secession Church. It is not only repugnant to the Scriptures, but grates with that intuitive principle of right and wrong which God has implanted in the bosom of every man. *Particular cases* may take such hold of the mind, as to warp the judgment respecting *first principles*—a danger to be guarded against with much care.

INDEX TO VOLUME SIXTEENTH.

Page	Page
Abolition of Con. Faith.....276	Duty of Professors.....188
Act for a Fast.....61	Dying Thief's Petition.....168
Adams, Rev. James, case of.....39	Early Religious Instruction.....251
Address on Slavery.....505	Ecclesiastical Jurisprudence.....503
Adopted Children, right of, to Baptism.....34, 553	Ecclesiastical Record.....118, 311
Advertisement.....2	Education of young men.....56
Ancient Christianity.....550	England, Socialism in.....273
Anniversary Statistics.....110	Episcopacy versus Presbytery.....592
Anniversaries.....152	Esther, Lectures on.....267
Annual Mela.....112	Evil, appearance of.....188
Answer to Logan.....73	Explanation.....301
Answer to Queries of B.....585	Family worship.....393, 430, 489
Anti-Slavery Convention.....242	Farel and Calvin.....391
Appeal to the Associate Church on the subject of Funds.....313	Farther Remarks on Societyism, 535, 576
Appeal to the Associate Church.....343	Fast, Act for.....61
Appointments.....57	Ferguson, case of.....59
Articles of A. R., Strictures on.....131, 169	Foreign Periodicals.....359
Associate Reformed Synod of New York.....234	France.....214, 303
Associate Ref. Synod of the South.....292	Funds.....60, 313
Associations, Voluntary, 221, 404, 483, 498, 524, 535	Gaily, Mr.....231
Auchterarder case.....341	General Assembly.....119
Baptism of Adopted Children.....34, 553	Gray, Rev. Andrew.....258
Bengal, religious movements in.....164	Greek Grammar.....551
Biblical interpretation.....334	Have me excused.....547
Bible and Romish Priests.....262	Have we any warrant for expecting a blessing on the labours of men not sent?.....529
Bibles.....64	Hearing, Occasional.....279, 319, 377, 413
Breckenridge, Rev. J.....549	Hindoos, conversion of.....116
Calvin.....397, 542	Hindu goddess Kalee.....167
Candidates for the Ministry.....539	Holland, churches of.....445
Carolinas, Presbytery of.....55	Hope.....532
Children, right of to Baptism.....34, 553	How are men sent to preach?.....417
Christian's paradox.....456	How are we to regard the labours of men deposed, or not sent?.....564
Circus.....248	How shall they preach except they be sent?.....386
Collins, Archibald, case of.....58	How may people know when to countenance men as sent?.....477
Coloured Population.....121, 854, 463	Idoltrous representations.....327
Communion, terms of.....87, 136, 265	Immersion.....393
Complaint of Presbytery of Cambridge.....27	India.....454
Conflict between Government and Church of Scotland.....212, 260, 590	Instruction, Religious.....251
Convention of Reformed Churches, 59.....346	Intelligence, summary of.....214
Convention of Ministers.....117	Italic additions in the scripture.....339
Correspondents, 119, 216, 264, 312, 359, 408, 456, 498, 552, 598	Jackson, David, case of.....58
Decision of S. C. of Pennsylvania.....90	Jews.....178
Diary of a Clergyman.....324	Jewish creed.....211
Diocese of New York.....402	John Knox.....349
Discipline.....391, 403	King of Prussia.....253
Dissent by Dr. Bruce.....49	Knox, the Reformer.....349
Dissent Second, by Dr. Bruce.....50	Laing, Rev. Robert.....70
Doctrine and Practice.....451	Language of scripture.....409, 470
	Law of libel in Ireland.....109
	Lectures on Esther.....267
	Letter from Rev. R. Laing.....149

Page	Page		
Letter from Messrs. Russell and Strang,.....	163	Report of Presbytery of Alleghany,....	17
Letter to editor,.....	300, 382	Cambridge,....	10
Letter of Calvin,.....	542	Chartiers,.....	12
Libel against Rev. J. Breckenridge,....	549	Illinois,.....	6
Literary Notice,.....	598	Indiana,.....	14
Logan's reply to A. R.,.....	196	Miami,.....	7
London Anniversaries,.....	152	Muskingum,....	8
Love of Home,.....	453	Philadelphia,....	26
Man of Sin,.....	503	Richland,.....	15
Malachi iii. 8,.....	81, 130	Shenango,....	12
Marks of a true Revival,.....	595	Stamford,.....	9
Marriage, publication of,.....	30	Vermont,.....	18
Martin, Robert,.....	424	D. Houston, Treasurer,.....	52
Melancholy, Religious,.....	437	D. Murphy, Treasurer,....	31
Memorials, Report of Select Committee on,.....	32	Wm. S. Young, Treasurer,....	64
Minister wholly in his work,.....	487	Remarks on Malachi iii. 8,.....	81, 130
Minutes of Synod,.....	3	com. of Elihu,.....	238
Missions,.....	60	Romish Priests,.....	262
Missions in India,.....	455	Sabbath,.....	97
Missionary Society,.....	19	Schismatics,.....	361
Mode of Baptism,.....	546	Scotland, Church of,....	212, 260, 590
Museum,.....	597	Scroggs, J. M.,.....	207
Names of Ecclesiastical bodies,....	384	Seceders, Original,.....	59
Native festival,.....	403	Secession and Relief Churches,....	502
New publication,.....	166	Septuagint version,.....	457
Obituary of Rev. Robert Laing,....	70	Sick-bed,.....	145, 174, 217
Obituary of J. M. Scroggs,.....	207	Slavery,.....	505
Obituary of Rev. A. Gray,.....	258	Societyism,.....	366, 535, 576
Obituary of R. Martin,.....	424	Spiritual-mindedness,....	285
Occasional hearing,....	279, 312, 377, 413	Stalker, Rev. D., case of,....	41
On conformity to the world,.....	222	Statistical tables,.....	65
On the use of the word reconciled,....	571	Strauss, Dr.,.....	101
Original Seceders,.....	59	Strictures on Articles of A. R.,....	138, 169
Oxfordism,.....	273, 545	Superstition in India,.....	454
Patrons, to,.....	587	Supreme Court of Pennsylvania,....	90
Paucity of Candidates for the Ministry,.....	539	Symbolical language of scripture,....	409, 470
Pious Sayings, 215, 263, 309, 358, 407,.....	504, 548	Taxe Chanoellaria,.....	455
Popery in Philadelphia,.....	494	Tennessee,.....	355
Post office regulation,.....	168	Terms of Communion,....	87, 136, 266
Prayer,.....	456	Texts, in the way of accommodation,....	332
Presbytery of Carolinas,.....	55	The Theatre,.....	550, 597
Presbytery versus Episcopacy,.....	592	Treatment of our coloured population,....	121, 369, 463
Presbyterian Church, Psalmody of,.....	516, 580	Treatment due to ministers,....	542
Profane use of Scripture,.....	596	Troy, congregation of,.....	38
Protest by Dr. Bruce,.....	20	Union of Seceders with the Synod of Ulster,....	449
Protest by Dr. Bullions,.....	23	Vermont Baptists,.....	346
Protest by Rev. A. Heron,....	42, 45, 47	Voluntary Associations, 221, 404, 483,.....	498, 524
Psalmody,.....	308	Way of Salvation,.....	486
Queries,.....	264, 502, 598	Watchfulness,.....	433, 432
Quotations from Old Testament,....	457	Welsh, John,.....	581
Reconciliation,.....	571	Whyte, Rev. A.,.....	382
Reflections on a sick bed,....	145, 174, 217	World, on conformity to the,....	222
Reformed Presbyterian Church,....	290	Worship in the family,....	393, 430, 489
Report of Presbytery of Albany,.....	11	Zurich, Canton of,.....	101

